

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

VOLUME XXVI.

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

1875.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Memoir of Roger B. Taney,	1
The Place of Theology in the Work and Growth of the Church,	14
Calvin and Calvinism,	42
The Revival in Scotland,	60
The Pastoral Relation and the Support of the Ministry,	76
The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance: A Political Expostulation,	94
Prophets and Prophecy,	138
The General Assembly and the Columbia Theological Seminary,	160
The Genesis of the New England Churches,	201
The Relation of Pagan Systems to each other, and to the Revealed System of Religion,	239
Church Union,	254
Modern Scepticism,	268
The Baltimore Conference,	283
"Unthinkable" Propositions and Original Sin,	298
Modern Doubt,	316
History of the Vatican Council,	339
Ferdinand Christian Baur,	376
The Deacon's Office in the Church of the New Testament,	421
Italy and its Religions,	461
Lex Regit: Law is King,	475
The Example of Christ,	493
Ordination, With the Laying On of the Hands of the Presbytery,	512
The Proposed Presbyterian Council,	529
William Carstares,	547
The General Assembly at St. Louis,	605
A Presbyterian Clergyman Looking for the Church,	674
Sketch of the Minor Prophets,	716
The Numerical Figures of the Bible,	735
The Eucharist,	748

CRITICAL NOTICES:

The Genesis of the New England Churches, 181. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, 188. The Combination Speller, 190. Delivery and Development of Christian Doctrine, 191. Public Worship, Partly Responsive, 195. The Genius of the Gospel, a Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew, 196. Solar Hieroglyphics, 198. A Commentary

upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, 199. Dale's Christic and Patriotic Baptism, 392. Livingstone's Last Journals, 396. The Paraclete, by Dr. Parker, 403. Farrar's Life of Christ, 406. LaBorde's History of South Carolina College, 409. Motley's Barneveld, 412. Nordhoff's Communistic Societies, 414. Timrod's Poems, 419. Christian Ethics, 581. Apologetic Lectures on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity, 589. An Expositor's Note Book, 590. God's Rule for Christian Giving, 592. Johannis Buxtorfii Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum, et Rabbinicum, 594. Assyrian Discoveries, 595. The Odd Trump, 596. Home Sketches in France, and other Papers, 598. All about Jesus, 599. Sports that Kill, 600. The American Evangelists, D. L. Moody and Ira D. Sankey, in Great Britain and Ireland, 601. History and Significance of the Sacred Tabernacle of the Hebrews, 789. Four Years in Ashantee, by the Missionaries Ramseyer and Kuehne, 791. Conditions of Success in Preaching without Notes, 793. The Case of Tilton vs. Beecher, 800. Douglass Series of Christian Greek and Latin Writers, 801. Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, 802.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVI.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCLXXV.

ARTICLE I.

MEMOIR OF ROGER B. TANEY.

Memoir of Roger B. Taney, LL.D., Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. By SAMUEL TYLER, LL.D., of the Maryland Bar.

This volume will be interesting to many readers, on account both of the author and the subject. The author is a gentleman of deserved distinction in several important and independent spheres of intellectual exertion. In the profession of which Chief Justice Taney was so brilliant an ornament—the profession of the law—and in the principles of jurisprudence, he is known to be profoundly versed. More than twenty years ago he had the honor to be appointed one of a select committee to codify the laws of his native State, Maryland, and is understood to have performed his work with such philosophic insight, such practical sagacity, such mastery of details marshalled and adjusted on comprehensive principles, as to afford equal satisfaction to the Legislature and to the profession. But he is not less widely known in letters than in law. He has contributed various articles to the *Princeton Review* on questions connected with theology and philosophy, which have deservedly attracted marked attention. In pure philosophy he was pronounced by Dr. Thornwell inferior to no writer which this country has produced. His writings in elucidation and defence of the metaphysical doctrines of the late

Sir William Hamilton, drew forth tributes of admiration and gratitude from that prince of philosophers and of critics in philosophy. His work on Burns, whatever may be thought of the Theory of Beauty therein propounded, exhibited a deep and fine sense of poetic beauty, and a nice discernment of the elements which compose it—like the several colors of the rainbow, separately, beautiful; and combined, altogether lovely. Burke's early Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful, is surely not less fanciful and arbitrary as a philosophical theory, and is very far inferior to it in genuine enthusiasm and eloquence. Macaulay remarks the coldness with which an essay was written on such a subject by a young man of Burke's genius as a psychological phenomenon, and thinks that the order of development of his mind and that of Lord Bacon the reverse of that which usually occurs, the didactic and logical powers having the priority, in point of time, of the poetic and imaginative. Mr. Tyler's work on the Baconian philosophy, is a work of far higher pretension and of far greater importance than the essay on Burns. We incline, however, to the opinion that this last and most mature production of his cultured and thoughtful mind, dedicated to the defence of his lifelong friend, and to the exposition of the most important questions of constitutional law, illuminated as it is with deep and wide learning, and inspired with the enthusiasm of kindred convictions, will be more permanently remembered and more highly prized than any of his earlier works.

If we were to find any fault with the volume, it would be that it is throughout too perfect an illustration to the motto prefixed to it: *Qui nihil in vita nisi laudandum aut fecit aut dixit aut sensit*; that it is perhaps too uniformly laudatory; that the zeal of the biographer and friend is a little excessive; that, in a word, the picture may need a little shading, the tone of admiration and praise a little abatement. But with every allowance on the score of the unconscious bias of sympathy and affection, and just indignation at persistent and unmerited abuse on the part of his unscrupulous opponents, there remains before us the bright image of a man of singular probity, wisdom, nobleness, and honor; equally excellent in the sphere of private life and of public duty.

The contemplation of such a character as that delineated in these pages, must leave a salutary impression on the mind. It is a moral tonic. The sympathetic contemplation of high virtue is one of the effective agencies in our education in the love and practice of all that is great and good. As the æsthetic faculty is developed by the study of the noblest models of art; as the painter is at once humbled and inspired by the masterpieces of Raffaele and Titian; as the ardor of the poet is kindled and guided by the matchless works of Homer and Milton, so is the moral tone purified and heightened by the visible exhibition of what is most beautiful and noble in life and morals. The ancient Romans were accustomed to carry the effigies of their distinguished ancestors in their triumphal processions, as the strongest incentives to deeds of kindred greatness. It cannot but produce a most wholesome effect on the rising generation, to have such an example of stainless integrity and simple greatness presented to their view as this volume discloses. In this degenerate age, when political corruption seems to be the rule and political integrity the exception, the adequate delineation of such a character as that of Roger B. Taney is like the work of Praxiteles on Parian marble, compared with the monstrous and grotesque products of barbaric art.

The life of Taney will naturally divide itself into three distinct periods: the first, extending from his birth to his entrance on the practice of his profession; the second, to the time when he received his first Cabinet appointment; the third, the period during which he discharged the functions of his office of Chief Justice of the United States, which continued to the close of his long and illustrious life. The first chapter, which is very simple and pleasing, is an autobiographical sketch of his early life, and will remind many readers of a similar chapter in Lockhart's charming biography of Sir Walter Scott, and of the earlier portion of the life and correspondence of Robert Southey, the contemporary and friend of Scott, edited by the Rev. Cuthbert Southey, the son of the poet. To us there is something particularly affecting in these fragmentary endeavors to write their own lives, in each instance interrupted by death, like the broken

monuments which we see in cemeteries, the solemn and significant symbols of hopes unfulfilled and of enterprises unfinished. It must be an irksome task to record the events and reproduce the scenes and trials of his own life and write them out for the cold inspection of the general public, and one of which it is not surprising that any man, and especially any old man, should tire. It is the same feeling of sadness which the Trojan prince experienced when urged by the Queen of Carthage to rehearse the painful incidents of his past life :

“Infandum, regina, jubes renovare dolorem,
Trojanas ut opes et lamentabile regnum
Eruerint Danaï ; quaeque ipse miserrima vidi,
Et quorum pars magna fui.”

Chief Justice Taney was born on the 17th of March, 1777, in Calvert county, in the State of Maryland. His father, though not wealthy, was a man of good estate, and was descended from the early emigrants to Maryland, and his family had owned and lived on this estate for many generations. His mother had higher ancestral claims. She was the daughter of Roger Brooke, who owned a large landed estate on Battel Creek, and his family record ran back nearly two hundred years. Her name was Monica, a name familiar and dear to Christians as that of the mother of the great Augustine. Both parents were of the Roman Catholic religion. Thus it will be seen that he was a gentleman by birth, by tradition, by training. Throughout his whole life he evinced the instincts and habits of a gentleman. It would be simply impossible for such a man to descend to the baseness so common now among those who occupy stations of exalted trust. The sense of self-respect and personal honor, apart from the sanctions of faith and piety, would suffice to prevent it.

He received his education at Dickinson College, Pennsylvania, then under Presbyterian control ; and the kind and cordial manner in which he speaks of Dr. Nisbet, at that time the President of the College, and of the Rev. Henry Williams, a fellow-student and rival for the valedictory, and afterwards a distinguished minister of the Presbyterian Church, is even more honorable to himself than to them. His sketches of the great lights of the Mary-

and bar when he first began the practice of the law, are highly graphic: Arthur Shoof, John Thompson Mason, Luther Martin, and William Pinkney. These last were strong dramatic contrasts: Martin, coarse in style, in diction, in pronunciation; offensive in his habits and in his dress at once fine and filthy; Pinkney, elegant, polished, courtly, commanding; *point de vice* in his accoutrements, style, and manner; altogether one of the most brilliant ornaments of the legal profession which this country, so fruitful in great lawyers, has ever produced. It is sad to relate that, like so many Southern orators and men of high literary culture, he has left no written memorials worthy of his genius and his fame.

The law is justly reckoned one of the hardest and least sentimental of earthly callings, and to the law Chief Justice Taney had been devoted from his youth; to its steepest and most toilsome paths. He never seems, however, even to the day of his death, to have lost altogether the fine bloom of romantic sentiment, without something of which even a man so coarse and cynical as Dean Swift declares that no human being can be considered truly noble. It is a little curious to find such a record as this in his memoir of himself by the Chief Justice: "There was always a love of the romantic about me; and my thoughts and imaginings, when alone, were more frequently in that direction than in the real business of life." May not this suggest a plea not merely for the study of the noblest poets, from Homer to Tennyson, but of the best productions of the writers of romantic fiction, from Cervantes to Sir Walter Scott, as an intellectual alterative, as well as a most delightful cordial to professional men generally, wearied with hard work; and especially to members of the legal profession, whose business brings them into daily contact with the baser and worse part of mankind? To regale and refresh one's self with a good poem or romance, after long confinement to legal studies, might have the same effect upon the mind as to rest the eyes on the green grass after they have been made to ache and burn by long gazing on the hot and glaring sands.

The time which Mr. Taney spent in Frederick, Maryland, during which he formed the most enduring and delightful ties,

and laid the foundation of his after usefulness and fame, was probably the happiest period of his life. His biographer, who has passed so large a portion of his own life in the same beautiful town, describes it *con amore*, and sketches its picturesque surroundings with the life and grace of a poet or a lover. As Antæus, when he touched the earth, felt his strength renewed, so does Mr. Tyler when he sketches the scenery and the society of Frederick. The beautiful surroundings of this gem of Western Maryland have reminded more than one person of the Psalmist's expressive description of the protection which their gracious Father affords to the righteous when he compares his all-embracing care to the mountains round about Jerusalem. It was while residing at Frederick that Mr. Taney married the lady to whom he was indebted for so much of the domestic happiness with which his spirit was solaced when jaded by the conflicts of the forum and the fiercer antagonisms of the political arena. He had previously met Miss Key, the sister of Francis Scott Key, the immortal author of our only great national lyric, at Annapolis. But it was while residing at Frederick that his earlier admiration ripened into love, and that she became his wife. John Ross Key, the father of Mrs. Taney, was the possessor of a large estate in Frederick county, and it was at the family mansion that he was married, in 1806, to Miss Ann Phebe Charlton Key.

Among the many evidences of his punctuality and faithfulness at every period of his life, and in every department of duty, it may be mentioned that while a visitor of the Frederick Academy, Mr. Taney was never absent from the meetings, with one or two exceptions, for a period of twenty years. Prof. Henry testifies that he was not less punctual when Chancellor or chairman of the Board of Regents, in his attendance at the meetings of the Board, and discharged all the duties of a presiding officer in the most satisfactory and admirable manner. This is only another illustration of the Scripture maxim, he that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much. Although so long a period had elapsed between his residence in Frederick and 1872, when Prof. Henry bore witness to his fidelity in the discharge of the duties which he had in connection with the Smithsonian In-

stitution, we find him the same man, equally faithful at both periods and to both claimants on his time and attention.

As a member of the Federal party, Mr. Taney was originally opposed to the war with England. But when the war was actually entered upon, he nobly stood by his country. This was the turning-point in his political life. From that period he acted no longer with the Federal, but with the Republican party, of which Mr. Jefferson was the founder and chief. Like General Washington, he seems to have been of a temper vehement by nature, but habitually kept under strict control. In his interpretation of the sentiments of those who differed most widely from himself, he was candid and liberal when he believed them disinterested and sincere. The whole history of the connection of this eminent civilian with the agitating question of African slavery, is given in this instructive volume. It shows that in his relation to this subject he was a strictly representative man of the South, in the moderation, the conservatism, the consistency, the liberality, and the justness of his views, as a statesman and as the interpreter of statute law. A more humane, considerate, and gentle master never existed. His first public appearance in connection with this subject occurred as the counsel of the Rev. Jacob Gruber, a Methodist minister, who was indicted for an incendiary harangue, such as we were all, alas! so familiar with at a later day. Although a member of the Romish communion, he defended Mr. Gruber on the grounds of the rights of conscience and the freedom of speech. He thought a Christian minister should be protected in the exercise of his liberty to discuss any question of national policy fully and freely in the pulpit or elsewhere; and in this view he was undoubtedly correct, provided the doctrines were not immoral or inimical to the peace of society. He conducted the defence on these grounds before a slaveholding jury and a slaveholding Judge, and his client was acquitted triumphantly. This may serve not only to vindicate the candor and sense of justice with which such cases were conducted in the South, but to show that in the celebrated Dred Scott decision his course was not biassed by political acerbity or party affiliations, but by the same courageous regard to the rights

of conscience, the claims of justice, and the guarantees of public law, which he had uniformly recognised from the outset of his public and professional career. It is pleasing to note how truth and freedom have had their brave confessors and champions in all ages, and especially in the land from which our fathers, for the most part, came, and the race from which they sprang. It is delightful to see the same priceless and immortal principles of toleration and liberty, both of thought and speech, maintained in our own day by the pure and learned Taney, for which Jeremy Taylor and John Milton and John Owen so eloquently contended in the heroic age of England's History; which John Locke in the next age sustained with not less zeal and vigor; and which Roger Williams, to his lasting honor, affirmed at an early period on this continent.

The view presented in this volume of the historic formation and growth of the Federal Constitution, seems to us in perfect accordance with the real course of events. There had been a gradual providential preparation for it, in the circumstances and needs of the people, which is set forth with great clearness and accuracy in the progress of the narrative. It is well to remark the hand of God in the development of nations not less than in the lives of individuals. Dissatisfied with the confederation on account of its inefficiency, and to form a more perfect union, the representatives of the several States, each sovereign and acting for itself, met in Philadelphia in 1787, and framed a Federal Constitution. It was adopted at a time when it was imperatively demanded by the circumstances of the States: after the conclusion of a successful war with the mother country, when the need of a common bond and instrument of government was felt by all, and a common protection against the dangers to be apprehended in the event of foreign invasion. Never before was such a government formed, and never before had such an assembly of men met together to form a government. The down-trodden South may proudly point to that assembly and to that day. As she had been foremost in the ranks of war, she was foremost in the councils of peace. The names of the distinguished men from the Southern States who gave lustre to that assembly, are names

that men "will not willingly let die" while courage, truth, wisdom, patriotism, eloquence, are honored on earth. Of Greece it has been said that every hill bore the tomb of a hero or the temple of a god; of our Southern land it may be as truly said that in the hour of the country's need, she has never been asked in vain for a hero or a martyr!

What is undeniably true of the Roman government—that it was a growth, not an invention or a creation—is even yet more conspicuously true of the British Constitution; with its numberless theoretical anomalies conjoined with unrivalled practical advantages and eminent suitableness to the genius and needs of the people. It is well for us that the Federal Constitution was not the work of dreaming enthusiasts or philosophical reformers—however ingenious and original and brilliant—such as unhappy France has swarmed with and suffered by; but was carefully considered and cautiously adopted by men of unrivalled practical sagacity and of the purest patriotism. The debates on the adoption of the Federal Constitution—the speeches of Patrick Henry in particular—display a foresight almost prophetic. There is not a single practical peril or abuse which time has disclosed, that was not distinctly foreshadowed in those debates, and most clearly and eloquently of all by

"The forest-born Demosthenes,
Whose thunder shook the Philip of the seas."

Two parties existed at that period: the one leaning to a stronger and more centralised form of government; the other more anxious to define and secure the rights of the States. But both parties were equally patriotic, and opposed not less to domestic oppression than to the tyranny of a foreign power. After the adoption of the Constitution, one of these parties was known as the Republican, the other as the Federal party. The government of the United States went into operation on the 4th of March, 1789; the inauguration of Washington was deferred until the 30th of April. These two parties, represented in the Cabinet by Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, strove together from the beginning, like Jacob and Esau in the womb of their mother—the one contending for a strict, the other for a

latitudinarian construction of the Constitution. The government early fell into the hands of the strict constructionists, and remained in their hands for twenty-four years; and yet even during this period, in its practical working the Federal Government encroached upon the reserved rights of the States. The gravitation always was in this direction from the very first. On the plea of state necessity, Jefferson purchased Louisiana, without even the pretence of constitutional authority. Mr. Madison, although he had argued with consummate ability that the Federal Government had no power to charter a National Bank, under the urgency of the same consideration, consented to the charter of one.

It is striking to observe how history repeats itself. Originally, as we have seen, Mr Taney had been opposed to the war of 1812, as were most of the Federal party, to which at that period he belonged. But no one sustained the Government more zealously than he after the war began. He never had the slightest sympathy with those Federalists who opposed the war in every possible way except by actually taking up arms on the side of the enemy, and whose hostility to the war culminated at length in the Hartford Convention of unsavory memory. His course on that occasion finds a remarkable parallel in that of Lord Falkland, who so bitterly opposed the inauguration of hostilities between Charles I. and the Parliament, and who afterwards lost his life gallantly fighting on the side of the wrong-headed Prince, whose policy of pushing matters to extremes he had resisted with such heroic persistency. It finds a more recent and remarkable parallel still in the course of the great body of conservatives of the South who resisted the efforts of the fanatics of the North and the fanatics of the South to rend asunder the Union, but who, when war came despite all their efforts to avert it, bravely took part with the men with whom they were identified by every natural tie and by every honorable instinct.

With the same judgment and practical statesmanship which was so marked a characteristic of his mind and of the administration of the national government, Gen. Andrew Jackson recognised the distinction between the men who disapproved of the

war before it began, but supported their country in the contest, and those who sided with the enemies of their country throughout. He accordingly appointed Mr. Taney his Attorney General. The success of the United States in that war was the death of the Federal party. From the period when he became a member of Gen. Jackson's Cabinet, Mr. Taney acted with the States Rights party, and he has left on record the fact that he objected to some of the principles stated in the proclamation prepared at the time of the South Carolina nullification. Believing with his chief, that the United States Bank was an instrument of public corruption and dangerous to the liberties of the people, Mr. Taney became Secretary of the Treasury after the dismissal of Mr. Duane, and exhibited the same disregard of public clamor and sublime sense of public duty which he evinced at a later period, in the celebrated Dred Scott decision. The chapter which details Gen. Jackson's war with the Bank, and the triumph of the modern Hercules over the modern Hydra, is one of the most instructive and animated in the volume.

One incident in the life of Taney, though in itself inconsiderable, deserves to be signalled, especially at the present day. It were well indeed if it could be written in blazing capitals over the doorway of every Washington official, from the highest to the lowest. It was known that he was an inveterate smoker, and while he was Secretary of the Treasury some one sent him anonymously a box of cigars, market price just ten dollars. Such was his scrupulous integrity, such his delicate sense of personal honor and of public duty, that he made diligent inquiry concerning the donor, and insisted on returning the article or paying the price when he ascertained that the giver was connected with the Custom House at New York. In these days of the Credit Mobilier scandal and the Sanborn frauds, when a man who attains high office and fails to make *a good thing of it*, is accounted a man of impracticable honesty and of eccentric virtue—that is to say, when so many suppose that a man who is not a knave must be a fool—it is quite edifying to read an incident such as this.

In 1836 Mr. Taney was made Chief Justice of the United States, and was in that office the immediate successor of Chief

Justice Marshall, the greatest jurist this country has ever produced, and unsurpassed in all the great qualities, intellectual and moral, which go to make up the character of a great Judge—in simplicity, integrity, wisdom, and worth; in an instinctive sense of justice and an intuitive apprehension of truth; in a singularly calm and judicial cast of mind, undisturbed by passion, unbiassed by interest; a man who united in himself the severe virtue of Cato the Censor, with the Christian meekness and gentleness of Sir Matthew Hale. It is enough to say of Chief Justice Taney that he was the worthy successor of Chief Justice Marshall. No man could preside in that august Court with more dignity, impartiality, and conscientious uprightness.

“Deep on his front engraven,
Deliberation sat, and public care.”

Chief Justice Taney shone in the sphere of private life, and was not more exemplary in the discharge of his official duties than in the performance of those which pertain to the man and the Christian. His constant attachment to his excellent wife appears in a letter which he addressed to her on the forty-sixth anniversary of their marriage. This letter will remind many readers of a similar tribute which an English orator of Irish birth—a statesman of equal virtue, private and public, and of even greater gifts—Edmund Burke, addressed to his wife on a like occasion; and he might have said, as Burke did, that “every care vanished the moment he entered under his own roof.” The picture of a wife which Burke presented to his wife on the anniversary of their marriage, is one of the most felicitous and admirable delineations which even this master of eloquence has ever drawn.

It so happens, that very few eminent Southern gentlemen have been so noted for kindness rendered to the African race, and by testimonies of their confidence, gratitude, and affection, as the maligned author of the Dred Scott decision. An incident is mentioned by Mr. Tyler, which shows Mr. Taney’s goodness of heart and consideration for a little colored girl. When a member of the Cabinet, and hurrying to his office at an early hour on a very cold morning, he saw a poor little negro girl trying in vain to fill

her pitcher from the town pump ; he did it for her himself, and said : " Tell whoever sent you to the pump, that it is too cold a morning to send out such a little girl."

The historic and constitutional relations of the painful subject of African slavery are discussed more thoroughly in this volume than in any work with which we have any acquaintance. The vindication of the fair fame of the Chief Justice, especially in regard to the decision in the Dred Scott case, rendered it necessary. To those who feel an interest in this aspect of the subject, this learned and philosophic exposition will be invaluable. We have long been persuaded that the freedmen have no better friends than their former masters ; that there are none who would more rejoice in their improvement in solid knowledge ; in moral worth ; in religious principle ; in a word, in all the elements of personal and social progress. The better class of the Southern people feel relieved of an enormous burden of responsibility, and, as we have heard some of them say, deem that *they* have been *emancipated* rather than the negroes. If it were proposed to restore the system to-morrow, many of its most determined opponents would be found among the former masters of the South. All the Christian people of the South wish well to the colored race, and the Christian ministers and churches of the South are resolved to make systematic effort for their religious instruction. As the feelings of alienation between the people of the North and the South, engendered by the war, become softened by the lapse of time, and by the re-awakened memories of early attachment, may we not hope that there will be a generous rivalry as to which portion of a common country shall do most and best for the highest interests of the African race on this continent ?

As we approach the close of his life, the interest of the volume grows upon us. This is due not merely to the increasing importance of public events, but to the fuller development of the great qualities of his mind and heart. A Roman Catholic by birth and education, and sincerely attached to the body in which he had been born and nurtured, there was still no trace of rancor toward men of theological convictions most remote from his own, and no taint of bigotry in his large and generous heart. In

the uprightness of his life; in the deserved distinction which he attained in his profession; in the amiable qualities of his personal character, especially in the tenderness and strength of his domestic affections, he may remind us of Sir Thomas More. Had Sir Thomas More lived in the time and under the moral influences which determined the sentiments of Chief Justice Taney, he might have been as liberal in his religious convictions as he; and had Taney lived in the reign and under the cruel eye of Henry VIII., he might have shown the same cheerful courage on the scaffold; for according to the testimony of all who knew him, he was a sincere and humble Christian, and the light that was in him burned with growing brightness to the close of his life. He died on the 12th of October, 1864, in the 88th year of his age, and at his own request was buried by the side of his mother.

ARTICLE II.

THE PLACE OF THEOLOGY IN THE WORK AND
GROWTH OF THE CHURCH.*

The study of theology may be looked at from several distinct points of view. It is manifest, in the first place, that a study which enters so deeply into the region of personal life, is capable not only of being loved and cultivated, but of being hated and proscribed. This is a character which in great measure distinguishes all the sciences that deal with man, from those that are concerned with nature. But the prerogative of appealing to the heart as well as to the intellect, belongs in peculiar measure to the topics with which theology concerns itself. No problems are so radical in their influence on the whole scheme of human life, as those that handle the existence, the nature, the revelation of God; and so the very right of theology to exist, and to discuss

*This paper was delivered as the closing lecture of last session in the Free Church College, Aberdeen.

these things, becomes, in a preëminent degree, subject of fierce controversy. But even the enemies of theology are divided into several distinct camps. There are those who regard all theology as jugglery, because they hold all religion to be superstition. Religion is conceived as a morbid condition, affecting certain stages of human development; and the study of its phenomena forms part of the science of social pathology. A more modern school of thinkers detects the unhistorical complexion of this view, observing that religion has exerted an unquestionable influence in carrying forward the moral and social development of our race. An active and useful factor in history cannot be a mere disease of humanity; but it is imagined that the truly beneficent forces of which religion has hitherto been the vehicle, have been clothed in a false idealism, and unnecessarily engrafted on transcendental theories as to the relation of man to God. It is held that a better social philosophy would enable us to find on earth all those ethical motives, and all those springs of bliss, which the imagination of early ages placed in heaven. And this new religion of humanity has no need for a theology, because it finds no place for a God. The religion of humanity is as yet in a somewhat undeveloped state, and its adherents are, for the most part, either unable or unwilling to lay down with logical precision the features that distinguish it from Christianity. But when we hear it asserted that religion is a necessary and an excellent thing, while theology, on the contrary, is useless or noxious, we may in general assume that we have to deal with a man who, more or less consciously, derives his views from the school in question. A religion without theology means, for the most part, a religion without God. It can mean nothing else in the mouth of any man who does not possess that mystical habit of mind which conceives of communion with God as a state of the soul too purely passive to become an object of intellectual cognition, too purely individual to be the basis of a general doctrine. And this extreme form of mysticism is at present so rare and so uninfluential that it cannot be credited with any share in establishing the currency of the formula which contrasts religion with theology. That formula has a clear meaning only for the man

who has satisfied himself that the really valuable elements of religion are quite separable from all belief in God, or in any other transcendental fact. It is a formula, therefore, which is so far from being the self-evident foundation of a new religious liberalism, that it possesses no value for any man who has not got at it as the last result of an elaborate criticism of all religious ideas, who has not satisfied himself, by a strictly philosophical inquiry, that the transcendental convictions of Christianity are, not the true mainsprings of Christian life, but simply an illogical projection into the superhuman sphere of notions, which have always had their reality and power only in immanent relations of a region purely human. When the assertion that theology perishes but religion remains, passes from mouth to mouth, among men who have no pretensions to have even looked at these difficult problems of the philosophy of religion, who, being either destitute of all habits of exact thought, or occupied only with purely physical science, do not possess the most elementary qualifications for the researches which alone can give their words a meaning—in the mouths of such men the formula in question is nothing more than a cant phrase, which decently veils pretentious ignorance, or nothing less than a disguise of affected sentiment cast over the nakedness of shamefaced atheism.

Thus, if we set aside, on the one hand, the objections drawn from a mysticism too exaggerated to deserve serious refutation, and, on the other hand, those derived from that old-fashioned atheism which, in its plain-spoken contempt for all religion, can so easily be proved unhistorical that even its friends are glad to disguise it in scraps of new-fashioned philosophy—if we set both these classes of objections aside, it appears that the only serious attack which can be made on theology as a whole, must proceed from a system of the philosophy of religion not less elaborate in construction than Christian theology itself. The right of theology to exist can no longer be disputed *in limine*. The contest must now be between the developed systems of the philosophy of Christianity and the philosophy of the religion of humanity. Each of these systems must base its argument, not merely on speculative considerations, but on the closest study of the whole history of

religion, especially of the religion of Christ. The battle with unbelief which in the last century was fought on broad general grounds and with arguments addressed to the general intelligence, is now resolving itself into a series of detailed contests, intelligible for the most part only to men specially trained, and extending over every theological discipline. True, this new phase in the contest between Christianity and infidelity has not yet been adequately realised by either side. Nor can a time ever come when those cruder forms of unbelief, which have their strength in passion and prejudice, shall cease to advance the old objections and call forth the old replies. But ever since the publication of Strauss's first *Life of Jesus*, the new conditions of the battle have been growing more and more visible. The more sober and cultivated opponents of our faith have ceased to regard theological studies as unworthy of their attention. Theology, it is admitted, can be overthrown only by theologians. Unlike those superstitions that vanish at once before the light of superior truth, Christianity can be subverted only by the most refined process of criticism operating against the detailed developments of Christian belief. This new wager of battle has not been refused by the defending camp. The critical study of Christianity has been taken up both by friend and foe, with an energy which indicates considerable revival of interest in exact theological research; and the conception of theology as a science, which in this country had very much dropped out of sight, is again impressed upon men's minds.

At first sight, the stimulus which has thus been given to theological inquiry seems very valuable. But before we give ourselves up to the unreserved self-congratulation which we hear around us, it is well that we should ask whether it is a wholesome thing that all theological interest is at present so exclusively supported by apologetical and polemical motives. We should ask whether such a theology is likely to be really fruitful, and whether such interest is likely to be really lasting. Both these questions, I apprehend, must be answered in the negative. Discussions which have for their object the defence or overthrow of Christianity as a whole, may indeed attach themselves to the de-

tailed problems of theology, but cannot possibly devote to questions of detail the loving interest by which alone the sciences advance. Such discussions, therefore, can hardly be very fruitful. Nor can they continue to inspire a wide and deep interest. For the apologetic problems are becoming yearly more intricate, so that, in an increasing degree, they either cease to interest all but a very few, or attract the attention of the many only when set forth in a superficial and inaccurate manner. The fact is, that no religion which contains within it such elements of power as still reside in Christianity, can be annihilated by a process of critical dissection. Both assailants and defenders will at last weary of this endless conflict of detail. The battle, which can never cease, will assume a new form. It is probable enough, that instead of a mere war of opinion, we may have to face attacks of a more practical kind. But at all events, the preparedness of the Church to meet a new onset can bear a very remote relation to the completeness with which an apologetic adapted to the present system of attack, has been organised. The merely propugnacular part of theology has very transitory value. A theology capable of doing permanent service, must not allow itself to be shaped with reference to the present attitude of unbelief. It must not, in the first instance, look at unbelief at all, but must be framed in accordance with a large and just view of the service which systematic Christian knowledge is able to do in promoting the internal growth and the natural work of the Church herself.

The point of this argument may perhaps become more clear if put in another way. Apologetic theology, though practical in its bearing on those who are without the Church, has, for those who are within the Church, either no value at all, or a value purely speculative. The most finished apologetic which can be conceived, would, in fact, be a complete theoretic delineation of the relations of the different parts of the Christian system, and a complete critical philosophy of the history of our religion. But as apologetic is entirely directed to persons who have no sympathy with the practical tasks that lie before the Church, the theoretic disciplines in question would, in the hands of the apologist, be necessarily framed in quite an abstract manner. And

therefore, when all the unbelievers were convinced, a new and higher theological task would arise: it would be necessary to recast the abstract theory of Christianity, and construct a practical theology for the guidance of the Church in the positive task of attaining the ideal set before her by her Lord. But of course a perfect apologetic can never be constructed by an imperfect Church. It is the actual imperfection of the existent state of the Church, much more than the theoretic imperfection of our present theology, which is the source of unbelief; and it is not possible to give a perfect theory of an imperfect organism. Thus not only the highest, but the most immediately practical task of theology, is to guide the internal growth and activity of the Church. Those who allow themselves to be carried away from this aim by the apparent urgency of danger from without, and who therefore, according to the fashion of the present day, direct their whole energies, as theologians, to apologetical tasks, misapprehend the real needs of the Church and the real sources of the weakness and the strength of Christianity, which is always invincible from without, except when weakened by corruption and divisions within.

It appears, then, when the thing is looked at more closely, that the extreme and one-sided development of apologetic in the recent theological literature of our country, is by no means an unambiguous sign of a healthy interest in theology. On the contrary, this is rather to be regarded as one of many signs that we are lamentably deficient in theological interest of the right kind, that we have very little sense of the real services which theology ought to perform for the Church and kingdom of Christ. When we observe that our whole theological literature, even when not apologetical in subject, is impregnated with an apologetic flavor; that the most popular commentaries, the most current works on doctrine, do little or nothing to carry theology forward to new results, and direct all their energy to the refutation of attacks from without, we are constrained to ask whether the Church itself is likely to be aggressive, if her theology is purely defensive. But, in fact, the mass of men seem to think that, for all purposes except the refutation of new objections, our theology is already

quite perfect enough. It is not felt that one main reason why the Church falls short of her true ideal, is that the ideal has not yet been accurately conceived in thought.

But, in truth, where the need for a growing theology is not felt, the theological results which the Church has already reached are sure to be very inadequately mastered by individuals, and very imperfectly applied to the details of Church work. When the Church as a whole is quite content with the theology which she already possesses, individual ministers and students will very readily be content with the amount of theology which they already possess. If all our ministers were fully impressed with the conviction that a thorough discharge of their ministry is only possible if they bring to bear on the details of their work the most developed theological grasp of the meaning of the Church and the Church's work as a whole, we should no longer have to complain of a stationary theology. But, in the meantime, the general indifference to the growth of theology finds its counterpart in individual indifference to theological acquisition and thought. If nothing new is brought out except in the way of sermons, books of practical religion, and apologetic, it is only natural that our ministers and students in great measure confine their reading to these less profitable topics, and that their pastoral efficiency is correspondingly impaired. Finally, this indifference to theology is not confined to the ministry. It is widely spread among the members of the Church, and takes shape in depreciation of the value of a regularly trained ministry, and in an inclination to believe that personal earnestness, some natural eloquence, and a fair measure of familiarity with the easier parts of the Bible, and perhaps with the Shorter Catechism, are all that can reasonably be thought necessary to fit a man for the office of a teacher in the Church.

Against all these delusions we possess, humanly speaking, only one strong practical barrier—the institution of the divinity hall for the systematic training of our ministers. When we part for the session, after spending five months together in practical protest against tendencies which surround us on every side, and which sometimes threaten to exert an evil influence on our own minds, it is fit that

we should endeavor to carry with us a clear conception of the purpose and value of the methodical studies on which we have been engaged. I propose, therefore, to spend the rest of this lecture in an attempt to develop, in a constructive manner, the subject which in my remarks up to this point I have approached indirectly, and in the way of criticism of current habits of thought.

Christianity is a new life. The Christian takes his place in a society, where his life is guided by new motives, and supplied with strength arising from his new relation to God. Every point in this new situation implies knowledge of a quite definite kind. The believer's relation to God is not of the nature of a physical union, which can be realised in him without his knowing what kind of relation it is. The new motives that stir him have power only in proportion as they are intelligently grasped. He is not mechanically grafted into Christ, but becomes a member of the mystical body only in conscious submission to the Head. And the new strength of grace by which he lives, is not given magically by physical infusion, but morally to those that seek it by prayer, and therefore with a real knowledge both of their need and of the way in which it must be supplied. In short, whatever of real living power there is in Christianity is *moral*, and deals with man as a conscious, intelligent personality, who is in no sense fulfilling the ends for which God placed him on the earth, if he is not fulfilling them in the free play of understanding and of will. A moral growth such as Christianity sets before us, means that every step in advance is deliberately taken in pursuit of a moral ideal already grasped in thought. It is, indeed, a law of such growth, that the ideal unfolds itself more and more perfectly as we come nearer to it, just as the towers and spires of a fair city display themselves with increasing clearness of detail to the pilgrim who approaches its gates. But the very first step of true advance towards the goal implies a true, though it may be only a general, knowledge of the ideal pursued. No kind of moral action, be it Christian or not, is an affair of pure subjectivity. All morality implies purpose, and all purpose is conditioned by antecedent knowledge of the thing proposed. If we refuse to apply this law to the Christian life, we degrade religion

to a mere material thing, and place it on one line with the functions of bodily growth. For every part of life that goes on working whether it is understood or not, is physical, not moral. And so the theorist who proposes as possible a life in God which is not based on a knowledge of God, is really depicting Deity in the manner of pantheistic materialism, as a subtle principle of physical influence, which a man sucks in as he does the breeze and the sunshine.

This extreme antithesis to the position, that all real Christian life rests on true Christian knowledge, is characteristic of pronounced unbelief, with which in this part of our discussion we are no longer concerned. But even within the Christian Church, the pantheistic notion of God has always influenced a certain class of minds, and shows itself in that tendency to conceive spiritual and moral facts on the analogy of physical processes, which is technically called mysticism. The mystical schools incline to make Christianity an affair of feeling and instinct, rather than of knowledge and will; though, of course, where this tendency is limited by positive Christian motives, it results not in absolute denial, but only in certain modifications of the moral character of our religion. The palmy days of mysticism fall in the middle ages, and in these ages, it must be remembered, even the Catholic Church exempted a most weighty part of the spiritual energies of Christianity from the laws of moral action. The doctrine of the *opus operatum* in the sacraments unquestionably reduces certain features of the spiritual life to the level of a physical process, and this doctrine alone makes it possible for the Church of Rome to regard with complacency a degree of ignorance on the part of the laity, which is quite inconsistent with truly moral growth.

But in Protestantism, at least, it should be otherwise. When the Reformers taught that the means of grace are effective only in so far as they bring the *word* of God into contact with personal faith, they distinctly asserted that all true religious life is morally nourished. For the word of God meant to the Reformers the direct personal message of God's love in Christ; so that saving faith is neither a mere intellectual persuasion, nor a mere

subjective habit of mind, but the intelligent and moral outgoing of the personality and will towards a personal revelation of God. Hence the intense zeal with which early Protestantism threw itself on the study of the Bible, no longer seeking therein, with the middle ages, a body of intelligible truths not directly in contact with the practical Christian life, but that living voice of God himself, which, heard and joyously received into the heart, becomes the direct principle of all spiritual growth.

This principle is formulated in our Larger Catechism, in the proposition that Christ communicates to his Church the benefits of his mediation by means of his ordinances, the word, sacraments, and prayer. With this must be taken the doctrine—which historically was the very starting point of the Reformation—that the effectual factor in the sacraments is not the outward sign, but the word of promise signified. Thus the proposition is, that all participation in the benefits purchased by Christ is to be gained in converse with God, in hearkening continually to his word, and in making thereto the answer of prayer and thanksgiving. All Christian life becomes a thing of the understanding and of the will. Each step towards Christian perfection is possible only in the form of conscious submission of the will to a promise or precept of God, definitely grasped by the mind. The operation of the Holy Spirit in the calling and sanctification of the believer does not substitute a new and incomprehensible process for this plain rule of moral growth, but only makes that growth possible, by enlightening the understanding and renewing the will.

Every endeavor to set forth the importance of theology to the Church must necessarily rest on a clear apprehension of the importance of Christian knowledge for the individual religious life. And I have thought it the more necessary to recall to you the characteristic attitude of Protestantism on this point, because, where theology is undervalued by persons standing within the Protestant Churches, it will very often be found that behind this there lies a wrong conception of the whole nature of Christian faith and life. Instead of the Christian life being conceived as a conscious converse with God, by the aid of the ordinary means of grace, an inclination will be found to imagine that the highest

religious experiences dispense with these means altogether. In extreme cases, of course, this tendency leads to claims of special inspiration. But it is not in its extremest forms that the tendency does most harm, for then its falseness is easily seen. More generally what is put in the place of the objective converse of faith with God, is some kind of subjective emotion or persuasion. Faith, instead of going outwards towards God in Christ, is turned inward upon itself. It is supposed that a man is saved by believing that he is saved, by gaining, through some kind of empirical experience, a conviction that he has passed from death to life. Of course such a faith is not belief in God, but in something internal to oneself, and therefore has no necessary relation to any true knowledge of God, and gives no starting point for a theology. But the people who hold these views still use the name of justification by faith, and so often imagine that they are sound Protestants. In reality they are a kind of Protestant mystics, greatly inferior to the old mystics in richness of æsthetic fancy and warmth of religious feeling; and when they become sufficiently conscious of their own position to separate themselves from the Church, they form these monotonous sects, whose one spiritual weapon is the ever-repeated question, "Have you believed?" and whose theology consists wholly of abusive polemic and millenarian dreams.

It is plain from what has already been said, that the tendency to depreciate theology which marks a leaning towards these views, must be met in the first place by emphasising the true Protestant view of faith, and of its relation to the Word of God. It must not, however, be supposed, that when due stress is laid on these points, everything is done which is necessary to vindicate for theology its proper place. Indeed, at this part of the argument an error is frequently committed, which, though precisely opposite in character to that of the sects just characterised, is very nearly as fatal to a true understanding of the nature and business of theology. It is often said or implied, that because all true Christianity involves definite knowledge of God and his Word of Revelation, there is therefore no real difference between religion and theology. The specific Christian knowledge which every

believer possesses is called his theology, and is hastily identified with the theology of the Church in general. It is not of course pretended that every believer is necessarily master of all theology, but it is held that the knowledge indispensable to faith is, so far as it goes, theological.

Now it is to be observed, that the only kind of knowledge which it is necessary for every Christian to possess, is knowledge which stands in direct contact with faith and practice. It is not necessary that the knowledge in question be systematised, logically formulated, put into any scientific shape. It is not even necessary that he who has it shall be able to enounce it with precision in words, if it is always at hand to him when he wishes to act on it. In all practical ways of life there is a great deal of knowledge requisite which is perfectly definite, but which the practical man never learns to put into words. He has acquired his knowledge by practice. And so when any practical question arises, he *knows* the right thing to do, though perhaps he could not explain so as to make another know it. An extreme instance of the kind, which illustrates what I mean, in the simplest form, is the power of hitting a mark with a stone. This involves a real and accurate intellectual judgment of the object, its distance, and so forth. Implicitly, this judgment contains applications of a number of laws of anatomy, optics, dynamics, but not one of these laws is present as a law to the mind of the actor. The same thing obviously holds good with regard to moral action. Take the personal converse of a little child with its father. This converse, which is one of faith, love, and obedience, is guided by a real knowledge of the father's love and the father's wishes. But the child could not describe its father's character, or tell you how it reads his meaning in his face. The knowledge is a real knowledge, serving as a foundation for true moral action, but it cannot be expressed in propositions.

It is certain that similar considerations apply to the case of Christianity. The early Christians had no formulated doctrine of the person of Christ, and no theory of the atonement. But in a practical way they knew that Christ was a Divine Person, for they worshipped him; and they knew that he had reconciled

them with God, for they walked in the joyful consciousness of reconciliation. The Mediæval Church had no doctrine of justification by faith, yet certainly in all ages the Church is justified by faith.

Now, how does this bear on the position, that the specific Christian knowledge of the believer is always made up of theological propositions—differing only in extent and not in kind from a complete theological system? We have seen that true Christian knowledge is often unsystematic, even inarticulate, presenting itself to the mind of the believer not in the form of propositions, but only as a sound practical judgment in each special act of Christian life. To reconcile this fact with the notion that all faith implies a measure of theological knowledge, one of two things must be done. Either it must be urged, that however inarticulate much of the believer's knowledge is, there must always be some part of it, embracing essentials, which is clearly formulated; or, on the other hand, it must be maintained that clear formulation, logical arrangement, systematic structure, are not essential to theology at all. In general, I believe those who uphold the position which we are at present examining, are disposed to combine these arguments. But both arguments are inadequate, and both tend to establish a practical depreciation of theology.

Look first at the assertion, that every believer must at least have a definitely formulated knowledge about essentials, which is his theology. This argument is pertinent to establish the identity of theology with practical Christian knowledge, only on the assumption that it is the formulated part of his knowledge on which the Christian acts, the rest being really a superfluity. And this is obviously untrue, for the very doctrines which we rightly consider preëminently practical, were not formulated till a comparatively late date in the history of the Church. And without any appeal to history, it is enough to point to the fact, that genuine practical insight often keeps the simplest believer in the right path, on questions the theological discussion of which is full of subtleties. Here, obviously, we have action based not on elementary formulated knowledge, but on deep inarticulate knowledge elaborated in practice. The argument, then, is powerless

for the end proposed to it. But it is very powerful in leading people to undervalue theology. For when an eminent degree of practical Christian wisdom and goodness is found in a man whose explicit knowledge is scanty, this argument prevents people from seeing, that between these two things there lies a great development of unformulated knowledge. The importance of theology is supposed to be magnified by ignoring inarticulate knowledge altogether, and the result is, of course, that we have people saying on every hand, "What is the good of an elaborate theology, when a man who is so little a theologian as A or B is so excellent and so useful a man?" This is an objection which can only be answered by showing that the supposed useless elaborations of theology are just explicit statements of the very truths which, in an inarticulate form, in the shape of practical tact and insight, lie at the root of untheological wisdom.

I pass now to the second way of defending the notion that all true religious knowledge is theology. Theology is often taken in a loose sense, and permitted to include all manner of unsystematic illogical odds and ends of Christian thought and knowledge. A book of sermons, for example, or a volume of practical meditations, is taken to be a contribution to theology. In this loose sense of the word, at least, every Christian, it is maintained, has a theology.

But this is also a thoroughly false position. Loose, unshaped knowledge, never leads to clear and decided action. If a practical man can only tell in a rude, general way, the rules on which he works, you may be sure that he does not think of these rules at all in the actual process of his toil. The loose, vague rule is only an awkward attempt to express in words some piece of knowledge of which he has a practical grasp, perfectly firm and definite. In fact, vague and inaccurate theological generalisations are only a hindrance to Christian life. All generalised knowledge, which is not scientifically precise in its expression, contains some element of positive error, and applied in practice may very readily prove misleading. It will be found that the simple Christian argues safely only when, by direct personal sympathy with the personal word of God, he takes it home to his

own special case, without any generalisation whatever. He does this with the perfectly definite knowledge that the word is spoken by God to *him*; but this personal appropriation of a personal message of love, is surely not by any straining of words to be called theology.

Let me, in a word, sum up this part of our argument. Personal Christianity is not a play of subjectivities, but moral converse with God, practically dominating the life. Such converse is necessarily intelligent; there is no faith without knowledge. But the essential quality of the knowledge is its personal and practical character. The believer must be able to say, I know that God speaks *thus* to *me*; that he gives me such a hope in my present trouble, such a command as to present duty. But this personal knowledge is not, for the most part, reached by making a special application of a general truth; it is got at by sympathetic appropriation of the concrete and personal utterances of God's word. It is a mistake to call such knowledge theology. For however the notion of theology is stretched, it always must, to a certain extent, imply a knowledge which can be put into words, and so imparted to a man who has not shared the experience of him who imparts it. And of such knowledge a most experienced Christian may have very little, and that little very loose and inaccurate. And if it is supposed that this theology is really what his faith feeds on and his life is guided by, we must draw the inaccurate and dangerous inference, that a most rudimentary theology is practically quite as serviceable as the completest system of truth.

But, says one, if theology is not that by which individual Christians live; if, on the contrary, the great majority of Christians have theological notions so defective that any attempt to live by them exclusively would do more harm than good, what is the use of theology at all? And the answer to this question is, that the use of theology is to direct the administration of the Church.

So long as Christianity is looked upon as a purely individual thing, a converse of me by myself, and of you by yourself, with God in Christ, it is really not possible to make out for theology a sphere of genuine practical importance. For strictly individual

religion, that growth in knowledge and spiritual wisdom which is got by pure practice without generalisation or system, seems adequate enough. But the moment we begin to contemplate Christianity as a social thing, as organised into a Church, we reach a point where inarticulate knowledge of divine truth breaks down.

Let us consider what sort of Christian society it is possible to form, on the hypothesis that every member has just that knowledge which is directly given in his own personal religious experiences. Every society is bound together by a common aim and common principles. This society must be bound together by its common Christianity. But the Christianity of each man presents itself to him, on the hypothesis, only in the form of strictly individual religious experiences and frames of thought, so that the only bond of Christian union possible is similarity of experience in details, identity of individual frames and habits of mind. The society which arises when men come together on this ground, is a society of the like-minded, all busy with their common religious experiences. The principle of union goes no farther than the similarity of experience. Two men, whose Christian lives have run different courses, are, in proportion to the extent of this difference, debarred from Christian fellowship. We all recognise the description of such a society. It is not the Church, but the conventicle, the *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, the fellowship of separatists and sectarians. It is a society which never can be catholic, never a spiritual might, never permanent; never catholic, for its breadth of comprehension is limited by purely individual accidents of Christian experience; never a spiritual might, for the attraction of homogeneous individuals means the repulsion of the heterogeneous; never permanent, for if it does not split up in the first generation by the development of different types in the farther experience of those who started from a common point, it must at least fall to pieces in the next generation, from the certainty that the children will not be like the parents.

It appears, then, that the assertion that mere personal, inarticulate knowledge, serves all the necessities of Christian growth, is necessarily bound up with another assertion—namely, that the whole growth of Christianity on earth is simply the sum of

the independent growths of individuals; that Christian fellowship is not an essential factor in Christian life, but merely an ornamental additional to that life—a pleasure which the believer enjoys when he falls in with men of like religious tastes, not a Christian duty towards men even of unlike tastes. But all Christianity which has any pretence to be catholic, not sectarian, proceeds on very different principles, remembering that according to the New Testament, it is the Church as an organic unity that is the object of God's electing love and of Christ's redeeming work, and that each member of the mystical body of Christ grows up towards Him who is the Head only in sympathy with the growth of the whole body. On this view, Christian fellowship is an essential thing; and like all the essentials of Christianity, it is a thing which cannot be left to be secured by unconscious agencies. It is true that every believer is *ipso facto* a member of the organic body of Christ. But this membership is a moral, not a physical fact, and thus it is a supreme Christian duty to give practical and conscious realisation to the truth that growing union to Christ means fellowship in the united growth of all them that are his. The Church, therefore, is a divine ordinance, in which men of all possible types of religion, and in every stage of spiritual growth, are to come together on the broad ground of professed faith in Christ and obedience to him, and unite in such common activities as shall give fit expression to their unity and conduce to common edification.

There can be no difficulty in deciding the nature of the common exercises in which the Church of Christ expresses its conscious catholicity and seeks common edification. The fellowship of the Church is oneness in fellowship with God in Christ; the growth of the Church is increasing nearness to God of the life of the whole society. Thus the proper activity for which the Church is visibly organised is just to sist itself before God in visible oneness of faith, thanksgiving, and prayer. Wherever the fellowship of believers is able to lay hold of the gospel promise with common faith, to raise to God the voice of common thanksgiving, to unite with one mind in common confession and joint petitions:

there the unity of all believers in Christ receives a fitting practical utterance, and the whole Church is edified together.

At first sight this appears a very simple thing, so simple that it may seem impossible that it should fail to be realised wherever there is true Christianity at all. But a glance at the present divided state of Christendom is enough to show that this is not so, and that the attainment of an object, apparently so easy, really requires Christian wisdom and Christian knowledge of no ordinary kind. However simple the elements of Christianity may be, their simplicity is that of a living germ, not of a mechanical complex, and they are therefore capable of development into an endless variety of distinct types of life and feeling. And because of the continued presence of sin and imperfection in the Church, not one of these types will be a pure type. All will err, both by unequal development of certain Christian motives to the neglect of others, and by the admixture of motives which are not Christian at all. Nor does this divergence between brethren in Christ end in the establishment of personal types not perfectly sympathetic. Personal differences become embodied in formulated opinions and definite courses of action, and so the unity of all believers is confronted with the sharp antagonism of parties.

On the sectarian theory, at which we have already glanced, this state of things is accepted as inevitable. No attempt is made to give practical expression to the catholicity of the Church. The like-minded simply come together, and remain together as long as they can. The unlike-minded are suffered to depart, and, in the stricter forms of sectarianism, are even supposed to have no share in Christ. An opposite extreme characterises the Broad Church. It is observed that the divergent tendencies of Christians become fixed in the antagonism of parties only when allowed to take shape in explicit doctrines and courses of action. It is suggested, therefore, that the catholicity of the Church may be secured by avoiding all such explicitness. Let it be understood that constructive theology, which has so long placed barriers between the Churches, has a purely speculative and individual interest. The bond of Christian love should be sufficient to secure unity among Christians, whatever their individual type may be.

This theory is so vague in all points that it is difficult to criticise it. But it is obvious that no society can be organised simply on mutual love. Organised fellowship implies common interests, a common aim, some function in which the whole society visibly combines. In a word, the Church is not the fellowship of Christian love—which requires no unity of organisation—but the fellowship of Christian worship. The common worship of many individuals must be the expression in intelligible form of their common relation of faith towards God. We have already seen that all personal faith implies personal knowledge. The intelligent expression of faith therefore implies explicit and formulated knowledge. Put face to face with this argument, the Broad Church breaks at once into two camps. The one camp gives up the conception of the Church as the fellowship of worship, and proposes to have a national Church simply as an instrument of national culture, a view essentially Socinian. The other camp proposes either to omit everything from worship with which some may differ, or aims at a spirit of Christian charity which shall enable a man to be edified even by expressions of a faith which is not his own. On the first alternative, the Church must perish from inanition; on the second, worship becomes a mere sentimental enjoyment, and is no longer a real approach to God through Christ. But both the Sectarians and the Broad Church forget that church-fellowship has a moulding and upbuilding power on those who take part in it, that all believers are led by the one Spirit of Christ, and that the unity of faith is stronger than the diversity of personal experience. It is not the shallowest and most jejune apprehension of Christianity which forms the basis for a worship truly catholic. A full and all-sided development of Christian motives cannot fail to appeal to all true faith, if its fulness is not that of individual fancy, but of generalisation from the normal data of the Bible. Wheresoever the mind of Christ is set forth, there faith will be awakened and instructed. Men of diverse experience will not, indeed, lay hold with equal fulness and readiness on every aspect of Christian truth; but a truth really Christian, when set forth in a devotional shape, will at length draw forth the sympathy of every child of God.

These considerations, I think, make it clear enough what the real problem of Church administration is, and in what direction its solution must be sought. The object to be attained is the practical expression of the catholic faith of the Church in acts of worship, in which the fellowship of believers unites to the praise of the glory of God in Christ. The faith that utters itself in such acts is necessarily articulate, otherwise there could be no conscious fellowship. If the articulate utterance of faith expresses only the personal experience of an individual, the like-minded alone are edified; if it avoids everything that is definite, no one is edified at all. But the extremes of Sectarianism and the Broad Church may both be avoided, if we observe that there is such a thing as a normal Christian faith, which is in fact the faith of the Church made perfect, and which has the power to draw all believers to it; that whenever this normal faith is intellectually apprehended in all its bearings, and practically applied to the administration of every function of the Church, the Church has attained to catholicity, and that on this external unity cannot fail to follow. Thus the unity of the Church is not impracticable as the Sectarians suppose—nor is it to be attained by compromise and mutual toleration on the principles of the Broad Church. Catholicity must be produced by the internal growth of the individual communions which actually exist, before it can be manifested in the disappearance of Church parties in an outward unity. The catholicity of an ecclesiastical communion means nothing else than that all its functions are so adjusted, that in them every truly Christian impulse of the believing heart towards God finds utterance, and that every side of the gospel message is fully set forth to faith. And failures in catholicity are of two kinds; (1), failures lying in the direction of sectarianism—the admission into the constitution and worship of the Church of elements of local and temporary value, distinctive principles—political, national, or personal—which go beyond normal Christianity; and (2), failures lying in the direction of the Broad Church, that is, the omission to make prominent genuine Christian motives which are capable of social expression. The Church is now imperfect and divided, because there is no communion which is free from de-

fects in both these directions ; but every communion deserves the name of catholic only in proportion as it sets before it as the ideal aim of all Church administration to attain more and more fully to the expression in every social function of a full-grown, all-sided, and normal faith.

Thus the progress of the Church depends on the presence of two things—*first*, a vigorous theology, diligently engaged in bringing into clearer light all sides of Christian truth, giving to each Christian motive and belief its due prominence and right place in a comprehensive system, and placing in the light of this knowledge the present attainments of the Church. And with this must be conjoined in the *second* place a wise administration, by which every gain of insight into the ideal to which the Church has to attain is duly applied in government, discipline, and worship, so that the new insight, which is in truth nothing more than the explicit development of something involved in all true faith, may now be consciously presented to the whole community, and find an answer in the hearts of all.

To recapitulate : The functions of the Church as the society of public worship are imperfect, unless discharged in a way corresponding to the ideal unity of the fellowship of the redeemed. Thus all Church worship must aim at catholicity, and genuine catholicity is the principle that must guide the whole government and administration of the Church. But catholicity does not mean toleration and compromise. It means the gathering up of all aspects of truly Christian converse with God into a unity of devotional expression in which every believer can join. This is an ideal remote from the present state of the Churches. But it is an ideal that must at length be realised. For it is certain that a normal expression of Christian faith has the power of appealing to every believer, and of doing so, not in virtue of any abstractness and hazy generality, but just in proportion to the fulness with which it takes up everything that lies in the whole compass of Christian truth. Such a normal statement of Christian faith, rich in all Christian knowledge, but freed from everything of human idiosyncrasy, is what every communion that claims to be a branch of the Church catholic must seek to attain by theologi-

cal research, and to apply to the constant improvement of the practical administration of Church functions. A Church which ceases to theologise ceases in the same moment to grow, while conversely, from the constant action and reaction that connect knowledge and practice in all moral organisms, a Church whose life grows dull, will also cease to theologise aright.

And now let me, in conclusion, draw some practical deductions as to the value of theology as a preparation for office in the Church.

When we say that every living Church must have a living theology, we do not, in accordance with our argument, imply that every church member must be familiar with the theology of the communion to which he belongs. On the contrary, our argument has been that a Church becomes capable of attracting and edifying *every* true Christian, whatever his stage of knowledge and growth may be, just in proportion as every act of public worship and every ecclesiastical function rests on full and normal theological attainments. Public worship is not a theological exercise in which men meet on the basis of common scientific knowledge; it is an exercise of common faith, in which the gospel message is personally set forth and received with personal affection and obedience. Thus no theology is required in order that a man may with edification join in the worship of the Church. Theology is the affair of him who conducts that worship, the system of knowledge by which he is enabled to lead the service, not as a man calling on the like-minded to sympathise with his own personal experience, but as one who, out of the riches of an all-sided grasp of the fulness of the gospel, can bring forth words of promise and admonition, words of thanksgiving and prayer, suited to every Christian need, and yet free from all individualism. And what is true of the central function of public worship, is true of every Church act. There is indeed no act of government or discipline in which Church rulers can deal with imperial authority, indifferent to the necessity of carrying with them the mind of the whole Church. But it is not necessary that each church member should have the knowledge requisite to judge for himself from the first on all questions of administration. It is

Church rulers that must use their special knowledge to solve each practical question ; but the question is not solved till the decision upon it is put into a form which, expressing the mind of Christ himself, and so appealing directly even to uneducated faith, does carry with it the hearty sympathy of the faith of the whole Church.

Thus our principle assumes the practical shape that no Church act, whether of policy, discipline, or worship, can be rightly conducted except on the basis of a sound theology, and with such an application of theological principles as shall appeal to personal faith. The application of this rule demands a combination in the government of the Church of theological attainments with practical tact and sympathy with the untheological Christian, which is very fitly acknowledged in our Presbyterian system of Church courts. But it is to be observed that Presbyterianism distinctly provides, what there is now some inclination to forget, that no exercise of Church power shall take place, and no ordinance be administered, except under the presidency or with the active participation of men theologically trained. That is, the Presbyterian theory is strictly in accordance with the result of our argument, and is violated when a man who has not been duly recognised as adequately instructed in the theology of the Church takes upon him any such independent and individual piece of administration as the conducting of an ordinary diet of worship. The equality of the elder with the minister in acts of rule does not, in the sense of Presbyterianism, imply indifference to the position that every Church act must be theologically directed, but is the practical expression of the principle that theological knowledge is not rightly applied to practical questions, when it is not so applied as to carry the conviction of God-fearing and right-minded men who are not theologians.

Thus every candidate for the ministry who contemplates a sphere of life in which he shall be called to administer Church ordinances, to supply general principles of Christian knowledge for the whole internal administration of a congregation, and at the same time to take an active part among the technically instructed members of the higher courts, is looking forward to a

life-work for which the first and most indispensable qualification is a sound and thorough knowledge of theology. A minister who is not a theologian may be a useful man in his parish in the way in which an influential private Christian or a good ruling elder is useful, but it is wholly impossible that he can do well that work for which the Church places him in ministerial office.

The failure will be most striking and inevitable in the pulpit, though perhaps it is just in the pulpit that such men most readily imagine themselves strong. Many, it is to be feared, go forward to the ministry with the conviction that the necessary conditions of effective pulpit work are not at all theological, but consist merely in personal earnestness, combined with certain powers of vigorous expression and a measure of literary culture. It is thought that a congregation must be interested by good expression and literary grace, in order that so they may be edified by sympathy with the expression of the minister's faith. And so plausible does this view appear to many, that it is more than hinted that the ideal divinity hall would be half a prayer-meeting and half a school of rhetoric and style. But, in truth, rhetorical or literary culture has just the same value to a minister as to any other public man. Purely literary interest is wholly out of place in the pulpit, when it ceases to stand in direct subordination to the devotional aim of the service. It is no merit in a sermon that it is attractive to those who have not come together with the single motive of common edification in joint worship. But the man who, when his words are stripped of literary varnish, has nothing to offer for the people's edification but sympathy with his own faith, is not fit to be a minister. It is the Bible which is the true manual of a catholic religious life; and the Bible, not interpreted by that personal experience which only culls stray flowers from its pages, but set forth through diligent study in that many-sided fulness by which it supplies the Church's every need. That is no scriptural and no catholic knowledge in which the normal religious experience of the Old and New Testament is applied to the worship of the congregation only through the non-normal vehicle of uninspired experience. A man who handles God's word thus may sometimes, if his piety is deep and his

personality strong, become a great influence. He may even be instrumental in saving souls; but, on the whole, his ministerial work will weaken the Church. Working always under the guidance of his own partial and impure religious life, he will carry with him the like-minded, and will fail to edify others. All men whose minds are not of a peculiar type will cease to be edified. The all-sided growth of the congregation, which depends mainly on the right and profitable administration of gospel ordinances, will sustain a grievous check. The few like-minded who retain some semblance of congregational vigor will grow more and more narrow and one-sided, being nourished, not on the sincere milk of the Word, but on so much thereof as the minister can himself assimilate; and the usual marks of a sectarian development will appear in the alienation of the children of the congregation, whose places are taken by deserters from other Churches. Of all the temptations to which the student of theology is exposed, there is none more insidious, and none more dangerous, than the temptation to excuse want of diligence in study by concentration on the qualification of personal piety. There is no path of Christian duty in which a man can walk, unless he walks also near to God; but, for this very reason, no advance in Christian life is in itself a qualification for one sphere of usefulness more than for another. Nay, a high degree of spirituality cannot be maintained by any man except in the discharge of duties for which he is properly qualified. The man therefore who seeks the office of the ministry in reliance on his personal piety and earnestness of purpose, will not only be deceived in his hopes of usefulness, but grievously perils his spiritual life. Personal piety is no call to the ministry, unless it is also a call to full and zealous preparation for the ministry.

If the central function of presidency in gospel ordinances is intrusted by our Presbyterian system only to men theologically trained, the minister is associated in all other parts of his congregational work with untrained elders. But the minister who is supported by the Church in order that he may give his whole time to functions which the elders discharge voluntarily, manifestly lies under special responsibility in these duties also. In

all congregational matters the minister is justly expected to take a leading part, not only in the amount of work he does, but in the way he does it. Yet it is absurd to expect that in natural talent, in Christian experience, in good sense and tact, the minister shall excel all his elders. Even that preëminence which comes of greater practice is not possessed by a young minister who is called to preside in a court of old and experienced men. What the Church reckons on in placing a young unpractised man in such a position, is simply his theological training, his acquaintance with large views of truth, large principles of administration, deduced from the careful study of the Bible and the history of the Church. The minister who is really thus equipped will not fail to take the right place in his congregation, and to win corresponding respect; for all men feel that he has a claim to preside in practical matters who is able to throw on them the light of general principles. But the minister who is not a theologian is no where weaker than in his own session or in the midst of his congregation. He has no principles of knowledge which can give him a wide grasp of administrative questions. He maintains, therefore, only that influence which is due to his purely personal qualities, or which he can assert by clerical pretentiousness—by claiming for his office, as an office, the respect which is due to the right performance of its functions. He becomes a leader only to those weaker than himself, and the best office-bearers, who should be his greatest helpers, either wholly overshadow him or become objects of jealousy and centres of party feeling. There is no such source of congregational divisions as an ignorant ministry.

It is hardly necessary to remark that the theology which our argument contemplates as the proper preparation for congregational work, does not mean such a congeries of private speculations as some men pride themselves upon. A theology useful for practical work consists mainly (1) of Biblical knowledge, and (2) of a grasp, both dogmatical and historical, of that system based on the Bible which is embodied not only in the constitution but in the consciousness of the Church. The man who is not prepared to discharge his functions in the sense of the Church, has no right to stand in the ministry; the pretension to subordinate the

worship of a congregation to personal conclusions of speculative theology, is in spirit sectarian, and must always be resisted by Church-government. An appreciative mastery of the Church's present theology, with a recognition of its positive value for practical work, is the true basis of ministerial usefulness, and in congregational matters will seldom fail to supply adequate guidance even to a man destitute of theological originality. But the future of our Church depends on the solution of problems not purely congregational.

Every attentive student of the past history of Scottish Presbyterianism, and especially of the last few years, must admit that the larger problems that lie before a Church which aims at visible catholicity, are not yet even theoretically solved—that they remain problems partly because our higher Church courts are not sufficiently skilled in the practical application of our present theological ideas, but partly also because these ideas themselves are on many points too unclear and defective to serve present needs. The history of late events has shown that even those branches of the Scottish Church which have freed themselves from the hampering tutelage of the State still fall short, not only in knowledge of one another, but in clear comprehension of their own principles.

The fusion of separate communions has proved impossible, mainly because of the lack of true unity in our own Church; because with much brotherliness of spirit, and much common zeal for the advancement of Christ's cause, there is not that clear oneness of Church consciousness which it is the object of a growing theology to supply. The problem of advance in visible catholicity remains unsolved, partly because a sound doctrinal and historical appreciation of the present theology of the Church in its relation to present needs is not diffused throughout the ministry, or even among leaders in our ecclesiastical courts, and partly because theology has not yet spoken any decisive and convincing word on the questions of the day; because during two hundred years of Church life there has been hardly any marked advance in the Church's systematic knowledge.

It is plain that the supply of these two defects must go hand

in hand. Only by diffusing through the whole ministry a higher ideal of theological attainments, a greater aptitude for theological reasoning, a fuller understanding of the historical personality of the Church, can we ensure that those men shall come to the front who are able to deal with practical questions in a way truly catholic; and that when the right solution of a problem is set forth, its adequacy shall be generally realised.

Unquestionably this is the first step to the removal of present evils. No novel speculations, no new theological lights, can save a Church which has not learned thoroughly to understand and appreciate her present constitution. But withal it must be remembered that the theological consciousness of the Church requires not only to be awakened, but to be guided forward to higher conceptions of the truth. The doctrine of theological finality can never be accepted, save in a Church very ignorant of her own principles, or very indifferent to their practical application. It is not well that long years of bitter conflict should be necessary to produce the conviction, that on one very secondary point of doctrine and constitution, our theology has not yet reached completeness. On the basis of a thorough knowledge of what has been already obtained, it is the constant business of the Church, in knowledge as in practice, to reach on to more perfection. And this must be sought, not only by the private labors of individuals, but by the organised effort of the Church as a whole to increase her provision for the acquisition and the advance of sound science. That Church is not wise which grudges to spend her best wisdom, her ablest men, her richest means, on the two-fold task of theological research and theological instruction.

ARTICLE III.

CALVIN AND CALVINISM.*

However men may differ about the merits of the great Reformation, it has its undisputed place in the history of Europe as the real turning-point between the old and the new; and, among those who look upon it as a religious movement, it is truly regarded as second in the history of Christianity only to its introduction in the resurrection of old truths and the outpouring of new influences among men.

As in the first reformers of the world—the Apostles—we have four distinct types of mind, so here, in these true successors of the Apostles, Luther is the Peter, the primate of the group—fresh, passionate, homely, and out-spoken; Zwingli comes close to James in practical emphasis and direct manliness of character; Melancthon is a true younger brother of John, not so lofty, nor, in his moderation, so decisive in his accent, but full of the same contemplative love and deep fountain thoughts; and certainly Calvin may well take the place of Paul. For, while they differ by nature and grace, as every marked man does from another, in the amazing flexibility of mental movement and winning tenderness of personal affection, which, in Paul, sprung up amidst the strictest and widest logical processes, yet they are kindred in a certain continuity of absorbing purpose, a love of clear-cut definition in statement of truth and unswerving consistency in its development, and, above all, the central predominance of the same high landmarks of grace and predestination. These two men look out towards each other from the distance of sixteen centuries, and are felt to be essentially the same.

I have been asked to speak to you on this important occasion on Calvin and Calvinism. I have not been limited to any particular phase of a subject so suggestive on many sides. I shall therefore try, so far as I am able, to gather up various and vital

*Read before the English Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in October, 1873, and afterwards privately printed.

impressions about him, his work, and its relation to present circumstances. I shall take for granted your possession of details which there is no space to include, and am encouraged, as I advance, by the assurance, that there is no theme that comes so close to the principles and history of this assembly.

What is of greatest value in any man is the work which he himself is, through the gift of God, and the course of his life. And, to any thoughtful minister or Christian, nothing so unfolds or verifies the meaning and power of Christianity as a great life which it has inspired and governed. The beginnings of Calvin were small. Of parents one stage above the mechanic class, in Noyon, a little town in Picardy—of an able, aspiring father, and an earnest, anxious mother—he was born in the year 1509. Luther was already twenty-six years, Melanchthon twelve, Zwingli twenty-five, and Knox fours years old at this time. Herein, too, he is like Paul, the last of the Apostles—the one who was to sum up their labors, to bind up their scattered sheaves, and to garner them in strong storehouses for the use of many generations. His death took place in 1564, so that he lived only to his fifty-fifth year. None of the reformers lived to the threescore and ten. Luther and Melanchthon died at the same age, sixty-three; Zwingli was struck down in battle when thirty-seven; Calvin wore out his life wearily and bravely, in long years of a lonely sentinel's watching, and as lonely commander's burden of a hard and wide battle. John Knox lived eight years longer than Calvin, and the last words read to him were from his friend's "Commentary on the Ephesians."

Calvin was, "from certain vital signs," as Milton says of himself in another relation, destined for the Church. He began his training at an early hour, and the stuff out of which God moulded the reformer, we discern already in the boy of ten, whom, from his strict conduct and bold reproofs, his school-fellows, as is the manner of boys, nicknamed the Accusative. Calvin was a man not accustomed to speak of himself. Luther is always Luther. Calvin is, for the most part, Calvinism; but in his preface to his "Commentary on the Psalms," he gives, in rapid outlines, his own rendering of the way in which God had led him. Strange

to say, it is in David that Calvin saw most of himself and his history. David and Calvin—how opposite! Yet it is always the contraries that clasp in closest affinity. And so he writes: "But as David was taken from the sheepfolds and elevated to the rank of supreme authority, so God, having originally taken me from my obscure and humble condition, has reckoned me worthy of being invested with the honorable office of a preacher and minister of the gospel."

Calvin could not help feeling that he was a king, though the king was hidden under a Geneva cloak; and none ever felt more than he did that he was so emphatically by the grace of God. He was thoroughly trained at Orleans, Paris, and Bourges. His first stage was as a scholar: the old Latin classics became his masters, models, and companions. From these he drew the style which has carried his masses of truth down to the present times, and by which he stamped upon the French language that firm precision and fine grace which have made it supreme in the expression of thought. Moreover, with the new-born zeal of the times, he added to these monuments of genius—among which Cicero remained his favorite to the end—the knowledge of the Greek classics. More than the discovery of the Nineveh marbles in our time, as much as the reading of the old foot-prints on the geological strata, was this exhuming of the old Greek thought and life. It created the *Renaissance* with its humanists—men who turned from the Church, and, in many instances, from Christianity, and gave themselves up to pagan letters and philosophy. Rabelais and Montaigne in France, Mirandola and Bembo in Italy, were the fathers of our modern literature.

But, looking in another direction, the influence which loosened many from the Church turned them to the Bible, and especially to the Greek Testament, by his edition of which, in 1516, Erasmus, a sort of well-clad John the Baptist, with irony, instead of denunciation—a man as much humanist as Christian—prepared the way for the Reformation. During those years when Calvin was at College—the period of life when the young and empty mind is open to all impressions, and especially the latest and most living—the air was full of the stir of new ideas, the soil charged with

the sap and promise of a glorious spring-time. Cicero, on the one hand, and Paul on the other; Plato, with his glorious old ideals, and John, with his divine, ever-young revelations—these stood over against the Church, and claimed supremacy over fresh and enthusiastic spirits. Calvin was graciously, and after a sharp but comparatively short struggle, led to choose Paul and John, and, through them, Christ. With that instancy and thoroughness, which are Calvin all through, he renounced the Church of Rome, and surrendered absolutely to the almighty grace of God. In full accordance with his open nature, Luther lets us into the whole secret of his long struggle ere the battle was won. Justification through faith in Christ was his living experience and doctrine. In the story of his conversion, therefore, the successive phases are most vivid and touching. But Calvin, consistent here with himself, only gives hints, brief but burning, of a movement in which God was the great agent; and so he gathered his experience, rounded and shaped his doctrine, on the master-theme of grace. This inward change was taking place from his eighteenth to his twenty-second year; and in 1531, when he was twenty-four, he renounced definitely all his old allegiance to the Roman Church—and to more than the Roman Church, to all influence of any decisive sort from his humanist studies. Luther was pushed out of the Church, and was thirty-four when, as was congenial with his poetic and sympathetic nature, he broke off, though with much of the old adhering to him. Zwingli and Melancthon came clean out of Rome, but leant in much to the Greek masters. In Calvin there was, rightly or wrongly, a thoroughness, which marks the man, and made him the reformer he became. I cannot help thinking of him here as of the young Napoleon, coming late in the day of Revolution, and, with new methods, changing the whole situation; or rather, afterwards, he reminds us of Wellington, in the coolness and patience of his courage, as well as the minuteness of his organisation, waiting in his corner in Geneva, and ruling large portions of Europe from his camp on the entrenched heights of truth. But, besides this thoroughness of conviction, Calvin had gained in his training as a lawyer, the method, the strategy of his

future battle. He had turned aside a year or two from the Church and its studies to the law, and there, as in all things, he speedily became foremost among the first. This faculty of taking a definite and far-reaching grasp of a subject served him well in every department of his religious work, and made him the first pleader, as well as final judge, of the great cause of the day—Reformation against Romanism. This is always a most valuable training. I find Paul, Tertullian, and Augustine, went through it; and how much it contributed to their clear and compacted views, you can easily see. John Knox at Haddington was also a notary public, and learned his skill in drawing up the Articles of the Reformation of Scotland by drawing up deeds about a few acres in the neighborhood of his native burgh.

I can now only mark the events which proceeded from this man, the scholar, the lawyer, the Christian. I shall pass over the details of progress and change, and seize the main points of crisis and achievement.

The first great event was the publication, in 1536, in Basle, when a young man of twenty-seven, of his great Code of Doctrine and Discipline, the "Institutes of the Christian Religion." It was this book mainly that made Scaliger, the sovereign dictator of letters, say: "Calvin is alone among theologians; there is no ancient to compare with him;" and drew from Sir William Hamilton, well able to judge and little inclined to praise the Reformers, the unqualified eulogium, "Looking merely to his learning and ability, Calvin was superior to all modern, perhaps to all ancient, divines. Succeeding ages have certainly not exhibited his equal. To find his peer we must ascend at least to Aquinas or Augustine." No book of theological doctrine equal to it has been produced during the last three centuries, unless some claim is made for placing beside or near it the great work of Schleiermacher; and though, looking back, the eye is now and then caught by the massive works of Aquinas, and the small but profound and suggestive pieces of Anselm, yet it is only when the "City of God" (*De Civitate Dei*) of Augustine comes upon the horizon, that an equal, if not a superior, makes itself felt to be there. It was a little book at first of 500 pages and six chap-

ters, but it grew during twenty-three years to five times the size, till, in the last edition, in 1559, five years before he died, you have Calvin in the full height, and depth, and length, and breadth of his teaching. It is curious to watch how the best ideas, the carefully-devised phrase, the place and proportion of connecting thoughts that appear time after time in his Commentaries and occasional pieces, are laid up in store, fitted into, and grow to the increase of the whole work.

To read it through is an intellectual drill, a moral test, a sacred service. For he never relaxes the demand on attention, never descends from a lofty standard, and never ceases to stir, either to shrinking or yielding, the religious nature. I do not think there is a single kindling of imagination, even when the granite of his passionate logic is heated sevenfold. There are passages on prayer and on the glory and misery of man, in which, rising parallel to his great themes, he takes rank in sublimity as impressive and more severe than Bossuet, and becomes, if less penetrating and passionate, as mighty as Pascal. Still, he is of intellect, not imagination, all compact. Locke, in his *Essay*, has one or two famous images; Calvin, in his work, not one. In this aspect it resembles some bare granite peak like Sinai; but in another, which grows upon the reader, a new impression is added. At first, as you approach, it looks large, indeed, but not overwhelming; only the longer you travel, day by day, nearer to it, it grows the more, and when you pass away from it, it seems still to haunt the eye and command the attention. It is the unity, the comprehensiveness, that refuses to break into parts, which claims the whole mind; and so, unadorned, self-sustained, massive, it overpowers the conviction, and calls forth a kindred feeling towards a work which we gradually discover could only have been piled up by a soul that burns steadily through the whole mass with a purpose and patience that assert themselves in abiding force, and not in transient flash or flame. It is, in fact, this sheer unshrinking unity, as of some monolith, this intellectual passion, this sacrifice of all fear of consequences, this Sinai-like lonely majesty—for it becomes majestic in the end—which forms the essential character of Cal-

vin, intellectually and morally, whether for attraction or repulsion. Why, then, have Sinai wooded to the top, with its sides blossoming into flowers, or parcelled out in parterres? and why have Calvin other than he is in his bare and lonely grandeur?

By this book he did an immense service to the Reformation. In its preface, well known as the letter addressed to Francis I., he speaks as a king to a king, and as with sound of trumpet enters upon the defence of the rising and persecuted cause. Like a master builder, the "City of God" rises under his hands like Jerusalem, which was a city compactly built together. He completed the temple, with its three courts, doctrine, government, and discipline; the relation of the soul to Christ in grace; to each other Christian soul, in the Church; to the world outside, in the State. The *unity of Rome*, the charm of which can with difficulty be thrown off, was met by a *unity of Reformation* by which to this day it is balanced. The magnificent constructive power found a place for everything. It harmonised the Augustinian doctrine of grace and the Lutheran principle of justification; the Swiss leaning to the central position of the Word of God, and the German leaning to that of the living Christ in the individual soul. It moved with unhalting step straight on from the first thought of God in the creation and redemption of man, to the visible embodiment of that thought in a spiritually independent Church on earth, and an everlasting fellowship of the blessed in heaven.

And while the book is great in its internal completeness, it is great also in reference to Calvin's mind. Though it grew five-fold in bulk in the course of its many editions, it was only as the man grows out of the child. He changed nothing in the leading principles, hardly anything in the secondary details. Luther had no systematising genius; his thoughts were not like a rock, but like a river—a noble stream, indeed, changing its course, but ever bent for the ocean. Melancthon had an organising power, and his "Common Places" (*Loci Communes*) were published when he was only twenty-four. But though he formulated Luther's principles, still he did not build the walls all round, and, moreover, shifted in after years the very basis of his system,

and vacillated between divine grace and human will; while Calvin lived out the old canon of the Church. Father: "Everywhere, always, and in all things the same;" and so his work, while it grew in size and changed in arrangement, never lost the power that attends unwavering and severe consistency.

But I must pass from this book, which embodies the genius of Calvin and lays down the programme of his whole life, to another department of his labors in which he shines with almost as great—I shall not say splendor, for that is not the word to apply to Calvin, but—luminousness. Calvin's Commentaries are masterpieces in that class of Christian literature, and he ranks among its chiefs in all the essential qualities of sufficient learning, surpassing mental size in height and breadth, and, best of all, keen spiritual susceptibility. Men who differ most widely from him in the results of his judgments, agree in extolling his marvellous sagacity and tact, and above all, his transparent fairness and his want or suppression of bias. None can doubt his learning, insight, and devoutness; but to have the quality of exegetical honesty in surpassing measure, adds moral singleness to the intellectual manifoldness of Calvin. He had such an implicit trust in God's Word, that he committed himself to it whithersoever it listed: and so he dismisses, with a decisiveness a Rationalist might envy and could not surpass, so-called Messianic prophecies, texts in support of the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, texts even for predestination and particular redemption. Calvin had a faith so firm in the general system of truth in the Bible, that he was under little or no temptation to mix the hay, wood, and stubble of doubtful interpretation and disputed readings with the gold, silver, and precious stones that lay around in the rich and ample quarry.

Such, with many occasional pieces, were the works of the mind and pen of Calvin; and his were works indeed, coming from the very heart as well as head, and meant to do something to further the great aim of his life. There was another department in which he excelled. His daily work was that of an ecclesiastical and civil statesman. The little town of Geneva, in a corner of sloping land between the Alps and Jura, with its

border position between north and south Europe, was free at that moment of its old civil and ecclesiastical rulers, and so a clear space in which to build up a new community, on both sides, spiritual and civil, in Church and State; and that town, though little in size, and containing at that time only some twelve or fourteen thousand inhabitants—in fact only three thousand grown men—was the very place Providence had fitly chosen to be the cradle of a new and mighty influence. How Calvin was led to that city has all the interest of a Christian romance; how he lived, labored, and died there, has elements of keen pathos and tragedy—elements, too, of most instructive history. We cannot in the least enter upon it here. His first appearance there is noted in the archives as that Frenchman, “Iste Gallus;” now, Geneva is known principally because of the name of Calvin. It is a history which recalls in many points that of another great reformer, Moses, the first leader of the Church. Both were the building up in a place set apart by geographical position, of a new Church and State; not merely the teaching of a new doctrine, but the instant and energetic application of it to all life in the community. The Jews and the Genevese were very much the same material; both had left their past, but had nothing fixed for the present; both were partly superstitious and partly libertine. Hence the series of changes, exiles, taunts, conflicts, submissions; the loneliness of both leaders, the desertions by ancient comrades, and yet the homage, intense and unswerving, of loyal souls. Both died, catching a glimpse only of an unattained perfection, and leaving a name graven on every heart, but marking no spot where the weary brain and hand that moved and ruled all repose. The initials of J. C. and J. K., which I have read on the supposed graves of Calvin and Knox—in the public church-yard of Geneva, and the Parliament Square of Edinburgh—are all the monument of two men whose memorial belongs to the whole Church.

We have already indicated the great lines of his intellectual character, the absolute clearness of his intellect within its own range, the grasp of principles, and the manipulation of details, the assertion of every deduction from his premises, and the close

linking, as of coat of mail, of the whole system. And to these it is to be added, that he forgot nothing, but kept his mind always at the same height and pressure; that by the working of some sort of mental spectrum the ray of intellect was always and powerfully there whatever other element is wanting. Comparing him with the men who stand beside him in likeness of religious creed and conformation, Calvin is unique. Take Paul, and you never have in Calvin such chapters as his psalm of love and his argument and prophecy of the resurrection, nor such a dignified propriety and playful persuasiveness as charms you in his Epistle to Philemon. Augustine, his great master—the only one of the fathers to whom (shall I say?) he takes off his hat when he meets him—had a range of swift and creative speculation, a fiery African glow and *abandon* of soul, that never either rouses or ripples the sculpturesque fixedness of Calvin; and in Jonathan Edwards, with all his logic, there is a mingling of metaphysical reasoning and mystical yearning. Calvin, in fact, was more the pure reasoner and deducer. Neither speculative nor mystical, he syllogised—got his matter out of the Scripture, and shaped it accordingly. What he thus lost in warm attractiveness and burning force, he gains, however, in severe imperial measure and authority.

Looked at socially, Calvin does not bulk; though he could make himself feared and also loved after a fashion. I have thought it was a great loss to Calvin that he had not a Philip Melancthon, an equal in his own department, as was the privilege of Luther. But, if he had no ardours, he had no mean jealousies or envies. It was a loyal admiration, a true, though stern love, he received. He was looked up to by those around him as a feudal chief of an intellectual and spiritual sort. Yet there are times when the inner fountain of tears burst out, when wife or friends die, when controversy utterly wearies him, or the battle proves too hard for his poor body, with its constant torture of nine diseases, and for his over-laden soul, with the unlifted burden of many countries and churches. His wife and little dead children are pale, passive figures in his life. Yet, though his home lacks the portrait-like warmth and distinctiveness of Luther's, there was true joy when they were beside him, and a

deep pathos in the reformer's heart when he dwelt in his lonely rooms. Certainly, and in full consistency with the books of the man, we never hear, as in Luther's case, of alternate laughter over the cradle, and agony over the coffin, of his little ones; nor, as in Melancthon's, of being found rocking his child and reading a book at the same time; nor, as in Zwingli's, of his warm love for his heroic wife; nor of a pipe of Bordeaux, which Knox, in dying, humorously wished to be broached. All this is wanting in Calvin. Looking at the two faces, as we see them in true portraits of Luther and Calvin, explains all. In Krnach's Luther—and he never seems done painting him—you have always the same burly figure, bull-like neck, homely Bunyan-like face, with marked brows, vivid eyes looking out or up, and firm, eloquent mouth, with outstretched hands. In the portrait of Calvin all is different, and perhaps there are not more than one or two portraits of Calvin. You have the spare form; the thin fur-clad neck; the pale, shrunken cheeks; the compact, high, somewhat narrow brow of two stories—the first the perceptive, the second the reasoning; the long, pointed nose, different from that of Erasmus—his is ever sniffing at things in general, Calvin's is pointing down straight to the very object; the firm, sharp lips; and, above all, the eyes—that Beza tells us remained, after all his midnight studies, brightly and piercingly black till the end—and the long forefinger stretched out with an inevitable accuracy.

Turning from these to the moral character, there is an undisturbed harmony. Few men have ever lived such a one life of purpose and deed: he had no love of self in any shape—of gold, or pleasure, or fame. All were absorbed in the bending and blending of his will into God's. His very irritability, which he frequently and bitterly lamented, was mainly for God's sake, and his sternness was never mean. We cannot help looking on him with a pitying tenderness as well as revering awe. One would have liked in him more of the human, but then we should not have had the Calvin he is; for this was his great character—in spirit, a man of God; in system, emphatically, as Melancthon

called him, the theologian; in work, through and through, devoted to the absolute will of God and the good of his Church.

We have necessarily anticipated, in our hints on the works of Calvin, the nature of their contents; but now let us look more closely at those main points of his teaching which formed their spirit, and through which, in living power, he had, and still has, an immense influence.

The first thing which meets us is what has been called the formal principle of the Reformation—namely, the place he assigns to the authority of the divine Word, as compared with that which Luther gave to the material principle—namely, justification by faith in Christ. Calvin, through the instinct of his mind, sought for the starting-point of theology, not in an inward experience, however divine, but in an outward fact, the Word of God. In this lay the substance of all he taught as doctrine and realised as experience. Planting his foot there, he set aside the whole authority of the Church, and dismissed as vain, apart from the Bible, everything which could not directly relate itself to it or be proved thereby. The Bible to him was, in fact, the consciousness of the Church. Severing thus the rule of faith from Romanism, he severed it also from philosophy; for these two extremes have also their points of junction. Hence Calvinism moves midway between Romanism and Rationalism. Luther inclined strongly to tradition, and Zwingli to pagan philosophy. Calvin stood clear of both as fountains of truth and foundations of teaching; but the highest proof of the Bible he held to lie, not so much in its miracles or prophecies as in its native nobleness and fitness of doctrine, and in the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit. The Bible, in his eyes, was a living experience, a divinely-evidenced truth to the soul, a perpetual and prolonged revelation of God. When he advances to the doctrine of justification by faith, the living Christ in the heart, we have the same comprehensive and reconciling tendency—he links together by one stroke the faith that justifies and the faith that regenerates and renews. The inward feeling and the outward fruit are thus one life, and a holy character is laid as deep in the very being of faith as a pacified conscience. It is the one act which receives a

whole Christ. Legalism on the one side, and Antinomianism on the other, are excluded, simply by the complete statement of the truth.

But the doctrine which gives character and color to Calvin's system is that of sovereign grace. The manner of a man's conversation has a determining influence in shaping the method of his creed. It was so with Calvin. Will was his differential quality, and the great change in him was submission to an almighty and all-holy Will. This was the cell-form of doctrine out of which its whole organisation afterwards developed. Whatever are the statements of Calvin on this great theme, it is ever to be remembered that they are essentially those of Luther, Zwingli, Melanchthon in his first period, of Anselm and Augustine, and especially of Paul their master; and (as a strange and sharp proof of the existence of such a truth as a need for a revived Christianity), of Schleiermacher, though with his somewhat pantheistic rendering, in the nineteenth century.

Pelagianism deadens, never revives or strengthens, the Church. In a crisis of revival, Augustinianism—the exaltation of the divine side of salvation and grace in redemption—asserts itself in spirit and essence, however it may be expressed in words. Even the Arminianism of the Wesleyans is closer in spirit to the latter than it is to the former. Moreover, it is a side of doctrine which emerges in every statement of the essential relations of the human and the divine will. It is hard to find room for both in the forms of human thought, and harder still to verify the working of both without a sacrifice or dilution of either. And when the insoluble difficulty of the relation of the human and the divine will, of man's responsibility and God's prescience or predestination (for these are practically the same), is intensified by the additional and more painful difficulty of man's sinful will and God's saving act—then a complication ensues which forces from us the old cry of Paul, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!" It makes us turn, in the impotence of our understanding, to the beseeching of men by the mercies of God. After all, it is the

existence of sin which, as it shatters philosophy, so it perplexes theology, and makes man a contradiction. The real knot of the unloosed difficulty centres not so much in making room for both free will and omnipotence, as in making room for man's sin and God's wisdom, holiness, and, above all, love, in the same sphere. But this difficulty lies not in Calvinism nor in any Christian scheme of doctrine, but in all Theism, and especially in every phase of Christian Theism where sin is really acknowledged and the absolute need of grace admitted.

To this essential difficulty, however, it must be admitted that Calvin has added, or seems to add, some difficulties of his own making. The first touches the extension of predestination. I shall not speak of his exclusion of infants. Few modern Calvinists would follow him in the uninterrupted severity of his deductions on that point. Nor, secondly, shall I dwell on the other extension of the electing act, as including reprobation or a positive direct rejection of the sinful. I do not suppose Calvin himself believed this when put in an unmodified form. Still, in his anxiety to make room for the divine sovereign will, he falls into, and insists on, statements with which we cannot agree. Of course, even he, in the long run, is compelled to make room for a responsible human will, and a freedom in that will which follows indeed a corrupt nature, but does so as a will, freely, and from within. It was at this point that Melanchthon tried to lift off the pressure, so as to add a certain equal co-working of the human will which should act, though not by its unaided causation or in the outcome of human merit. There also, I believe, he erred. The end of all human thought on this haunting and baffling problem is always the same, that as in the original, so now in the complex position of this insoluble problem, we must admit a genuine predestination which vindicates grace; and yet, amidst all limits, whether in the creation or the corruption of man, a genuine freedom which verifies responsibility. Where the third truth lies, is beyond human knowledge and skill. Enough, the indestructible facts of divine grace in its infinite fulness, and of human responsibility in its lowest estate, remain. The speculative reconciliation is in God; the practical is ours.

There is another point—not relating to doctrine, but to tone—which I cannot pass by. No doubt, as all is from God, so all will be to his glory; yet, I confess it is a hard trial in reading Calvin to mark—even to have forced upon the attention—the unmoved, almost triumphant, tone in which he pronounces sentence upon these mysteries, not only of divine knowledge but of human misery. I had much rather have, in contemplating this awful side of truth, the feelings of John Duncan, of whom we read, “Speaking to a friend with great tenderness of the ancient philosophers, who knew no Saviour, though they almost cried for one, and pacing up and down the room he said, ‘My heart bleeds for Plato.’”

Passing by his doctrine of the sacraments; the principle which has made Calvinism vitally and lastingly powerful, as much as, if not more, than the doctrine of predestination, is his doctrine of the Church. This too, has close relations to his doctrine of sovereign grace, for it connected each member of the Church in absolute dependence upon God, and so made all independent of a clerical priesthood—all being priests in the Christian sense, and all forming a Church with a government independent of any other government. The equality of believers, their ecclesiastical office-bearers being only their ministers by their choice, for Christ’s sake, and to carry out Christ’s will and work; the union of churches with presbyterian order and authority; and the independence of believers, spiritually and ecclesiastically, of all external authority—these three principles are the greatest practical victories of Calvin, which belong to him, as to none of the reformers except John Knox, and which give the Christian Church freedom, both within and without, from priest and from prince.

Such are the main points of his system. We need not dwell on its excellences—its elevating all to a divine height and origin—its clear assurance of individual salvation through Christ—its rooting deep in the grace of God the independence of each soul from every other, and of the community of Christian souls from all external pressure—and its supreme end of personal holiness, and ecclesiastical discipline and doctrine as the means towards

this end. Nor need I detain you upon its defects, at which I have already hinted. But they are mainly two: the first, the putting of a divine secret decree in the foreground, instead of the divine declared love in Jesus Christ; putting the unscaleable mountain of mystery and power before the soul, instead of the open pastures of redeeming grace; and the second, like unto it on the other side of the system, the asserting of punishment, even to death, to enforce the discipline of the Christian Church. I mention this the more expressly, lest it should be thought that I had forgotten Servetus and his tragic end. But when I mention it, I must add that the blame thrown on Calvin is most unrighteously one-sided. There was no man of that day, Romanist or Libertine, who would not have done the same—Luther, perhaps, excepted, and that only because of his instincts and against his principles. Servetus himself would have burnt Calvin, according to his own teaching in the *Christianismi Restitutio*. As well condemn Sir Matthew Hale as a monster of injustice because he sentenced witches to be burned, as Calvin for taking part, and that a mitigating one, in the execution of Servetus.

But why plead in any wise for Calvin or Calvinism? Their works praise them in the gate, and speak for both. Never since the beginning of Christianity has any man or system produced such immense, heavenly, and heroic fruits. That great mountain has sheltered many a valley, shaped by its rise and lying at its foot. That deep digging and ploughing has made fruitful many a barren place. That fountain of divine grace has parted into a four-fold river, and made paradise on every side. Nearly all the heroisms, most of the liberties, much of the highest wisdom and character of these three hundred years, trace themselves back straight to that lonely man. The children of his home died and left him solitary; the children of his spirit grew to be a mighty nation. The last and best biographer of Calvin, Kampschulte, points out that his reformation is the only one that steps beyond the limits of its birthplace. Huss was more a political and Bohemian reformer. Luther's reformation, while deeply Christian, having its roots nourished by relations to his "dear German nation," has never struck kindly in any other soil. Calvin,

living in Geneva, a free city, put off the Frenchman as he put off the Romanist, and came forth in his system a man and a Christian. From his hands the Reformation became a movement independent of nationality, and produced a truly Christian and Catholic Church. Hence the breath and breadth of his influence has touched all orders of mind. The highest in genius and culture rise in their mien of soul and measure of praise as they look up to him; and many a peasant, with God's grace stirring mightily within amidst a poor lot and dreary toils, has felt the bracing air of his stern doctrine and noble aims. Pass out from Geneva. See how he moved through and joined together the Swiss Reformed Churches, and had all but gained over into union the German Reformation also. See how, though he never revisited his old France, yet his soul marched on at the head of the Huguenots, and, but for black St. Bartholomew, would have made France the central Christian power in Europe. See how in France, also, a hundred years after, it was his truth, indirectly felt, that roused the grand and saintly spirits of Port-Royal. These two men, Calvin and Pascal, have lifted up the French mind out of its usual charm into an unwonted sublimity. In Holland, Calvin gave a body to the meditations which had been cherished by Thomas à Kempis in the serene air of his monastery, and created its noble army of 36,000 martyrs. Calvin's voice, in his letters, was a word as from an emperor; and when about to die, they saluted him. Ten years of added life to Edward VI. and Calvin, in his reformation, would have shaped English Christianity, and saved us from a conflict which is again deepening around us at this hour. As it was, he was the teacher and inspirer of the Puritans; and men like Oliver Cromwell and John Milton, John Bunyan and John Howe, and though differing in opinion, yet like in spirit, Richard Hooker, can answer well for the nobleness and beauty of souls who surrender themselves to divine grace. Shall we forget to call Scotland to bear testimony? John Knox was, as Guizot says, no disciple of Calvin, but an equal; yet he learned much from him, and Scotland to this hour owes much of its Reformation to the sovereign intellect and example of Calvin. And was not the whole covenanting struggle

one for divine grace, spiritual independence, and human liberty? Our own old Secession and Relief Churches called no man master but Christ, yet they looked up to Calvin as one of His best scholars; and in later years, under Chalmers, and in a revived Christianity, and the Free Church, the old truth has given new tokens of its undying power. In Germany, also, the only system which has broken up rationalism is that of Schleiermacher, which asserts, though with many defects, the person of Christ and the power of grace. But time would fail to tell of all the victories of this truth. It is the great spiritual force at this moment in America; for the Pilgrim Fathers carried Calvin with them, and it still lives in strength amid thousands of churches, and has been embodied afresh, and with marvellous skill and learning, in the great book of Charles Hodge, the patriarch of Presbyterianism. And, away in far-off islands of the seas, and in continents to east and west, these principles rescue multitudes at this hour from heathenism, and bear fruit in homes of purity and churches of God.

I venture, then, to claim for Calvinism, or rather the Christianity which it in good measure represents, a power no future age can exhaust. Its difficulties, after all, lie in its high thoughts and holy living; and these, while they awe and sometimes repel, at last attract and win men. The future of the Church and the world is contended for by these three—Romanism, Rationalism, and pure Christianity. I have no fear for the issue. There may be swayings to and fro over the wide battle-field of contest; but I am sure that the army that has deep convictions of sin, and lofty views of God and his grace, has elements of intellectual truth, moral power, and divine reinforcement which shall gain the day. These elements shall emerge after every failure, and at last stand fast and for ever. These are truest to God and to man, for God's praise and for man's good; and these meet in Him who has redeemed man from his lowest sin, by that death on the cross in which He has revealed God in His highest glory.

ARTICLE IV.

THE REVIVAL IN SCOTLAND.

It is certainly not beyond the mark to say, that in point of extent, power, and wide-spreading influence, the religious movement of the last six months is unprecedented in the history of Scotland. We mean that never, within the same space of time, has so large a harvest been gathered into the Christian garner. We have but slender materials from which to judge of the more spiritual aspects of the work at the Reformation; but what we have lead us to believe that conversions, in the more profound sense of the term, were quiet and gradual rather than rapid and simultaneous. There are some interesting notices, indeed, of the brief ministry of George Wishart, that would lead us to class him with revival preachers; nothing could be more interesting than the scene near the Kirk of Mauchline, when, prevented from entering the church, he stood upon a dyke outside, and for three hours preached to the multitude with such melting power, that among others Laurence Rankin, Laird of Sheill, one of the wickedest men in the country-side, fairly broke down, and with streaming eyes, gave himself to Christ. His preaching at Dundee, too, during the prevalence of the plague, seems to have been greatly and immediately blessed. The infected or suspected, stood on one side of the gate, and the whole on the other; and from the text, "He sent his word, and healed them," the preacher pressed the message of salvation with wonderful power alike on the living and the dying. Many ministries in the end of the sixteenth century were attended with eminent blessing—such as that of Robert Bruce of Kinnaird, and that of John Welch; but simultaneous outbursts of religious interest seem as yet hardly to have occurred.

In the seventeenth century, however, the phenomenon became more marked. Livingstone at the Kirk of Shotts, David Dickson at Irvine, Robert Blair, and others, were connected with rapid and extensive spiritual movements; and "the Stewarton sick-

ness" denoted a singular work, half-spiritual, half-physical, that spread like an epidemic along the banks of a single stream. Yet no operation of a few months during all that century affected so large a number of persons as the awakening of the present year. In the eighteenth century there was a nearer approach to this movement in the great awakening at Cambuslang, Kilsyth, and other places; and as George Whitefield pursued his meteor-like course, there was something like a Pentecostal ingathering; yet, in connection with Whitefield's work in Edinburgh, singularly successful though it was, the number that seemed to get saving good was reckoned at but a few hundreds. Some of the awakenings in the Highlands at the beginning, or in the course of the present century, seem to have been very wonderful, both for extent and depth of impression; but, being in places so out of the way, and among a people so peculiar, their influence on the rest of the community was comparatively slight. Such vast and numerous evangelistic meetings as have been held in Edinburgh and Glasgow during the current season; such streams of stricken ones asking the way to Zion; such gatherings of young men, consecrating themselves to the Lord; such crowds of children singing their gospel hymns with the fresh interest and happy trust of children, and honestly trying to avouch the Lord to be their God; such regiments of Christian recruits entering Christ's army, overflowing with zeal and love in his service, and all within the brief space of half a year, no previous age has witnessed in Scotland.

It is a fact worth noticing, that as soon as controversy ceased this work began. The painful degeneration, in its latter stages, of the Union movement, especially in the Free Church, after such an auspicious beginning and hopeful progress, was a humiliating event. To many minds it suggested very painful thoughts as to the facility with which the spirit of alienation and bitterness, with all the reckless projects which it breeds, may take the place of brotherly confidence and love. All men of the quieter type were greatly distressed to see so much of passion and energy, time and treasure, given to a comparatively insignificant controversy, while, in comparison, the great work of the gospel was carried on tamely and

feebly. Many an earnest prayer arose to heaven that the zeal and fervor might be turned into a better channel; and these prayers were not long of being answered. While the din of unbrotherly strife prevailed, God's Spirit seemed afar off. When brotherly love began to reassert its claims, the Spirit began to work. The same thing was observed in previous revivals. The awakening at Cambuslang and its neighborhood took place about the time when the first Seceders left the Established Church; and it is noticed in Gillies' Collections, that those who were much implicated in the controversies connected with that event, did not receive a share of the blessing. But, even apart from controversy, there was hardly a minister or layman who did not wonder a year ago that the faithful preaching of the gospel from so many pulpits, and the diligent prosecution of Sunday-schools, Bible classes, and other forms of pastoral activity, were not attended with more success. In spite of all, it could not be denied that several members of Christian families were forsaking the old paths and choosing the world, and that hardly any conversions were taking place from the ranks of the world to the Church. It was with no small anguish that the prayer was wrung from many godly hearts, "Return, O Lord, and visit thy vine and the vineyard which thy right hand hath planted." The eyes of his people were turning most wistfully to God; and with a Pentecostal suddenness there came a sound from heaven as of a mighty rushing wind.

It is in every way a most difficult thing to estimate spiritual results, more especially in the case of a movement only a few months old. But even the characteristic caution of Scotchmen does not hesitate to acknowledge with thankfulness undeniable tokens of remarkable blessing. Christian parents thank God for touching the hearts of their children and turning them to the Lord; ministers of the gospel say that they never spent so happy a winter, and never had such pleasure in admitting young communicants, the number of whom has often been quadrupled, while their spirit has been all that could be wished; professors of divinity tell what a quickening has been enjoyed by their students, and how much the young men have been blessed in their evangel-

istic work; and Christian teachers talk of marvellous waves of blessing rolling over their schools and classes, and preëminently of the singular impression that has been made on the Training College of the Free Church in Edinburgh, where the two hundred normal students, male and female, seem all to have been impressed, and most of them converted. In Glasgow the work has been on a larger scale than in Edinburgh, especially among young men. Such a result as seventy young men in Glasgow and thirty in Edinburgh declaring themselves willing for foreign service in the Church of Christ, speaks volumes for the movement. The class among whom the work has chiefly gone on, are those who have been well brought up—the children of Christian parents, mainly in the middle walks of life. In many cases apt to be counted as conversions, the saving impression had probably been made before; but the change from timid discipleship to bold decision, and from unconscious to conscious grace, has been so great that the subjects of it have been disposed to think that only now they have begun truly to live.

It is quite possible to give to Mr. Moody and Mr. Sankey the fullest and heartiest acknowledgments of invaluable service, and yet to hold that the causes of revival lay much deeper than with them or their visit. The truth is, that in many parts of Scotland where they have never been, there has been a work of grace more extensive in proportion to the population than in any place which they have visited. In the heart of Aberdeenshire, with the secluded parish of Drumblade as a centre, and embracing half-a-dozen contiguous parishes, where the population is very scattered and purely agricultural, a work has been going on which is believed to have added to the church of the *σωζομένοι* not less than a thousand souls. In Sunderland, on which the visit of the Americans produced but little impression, a glorious harvest has been subsequently gathered in by a handful of divinity students and others. What, then, has been the service of Moody and Sankey? Great it unquestionably has been, and to them as instruments in God's hands the commencement of the work and the kindling of the flame which has spread so widely must always be ascribed. When they came to Edinburgh, there were

thousands of lamps trimmed and ready for lighting; only they remained unlit. The ministers somehow had not skill to apply the torch, or they kept waving it round and round the wick, in the hope that it would take fire, instead of bringing it right into contact with it. They seemed not to be very sure whether the wick was capable of being lit, or whether the torch was capable of lighting it. In their prayers, too, there was much of the same indirectness and uncertainty. And in singing, it seemed to be thought enough to let off superficial and easy feelings. Song did not seem to be the vehicle for the profounder emotions of the soul. When the strangers came, all this was changed. Mr. Moody's preaching was the directest, simplest, homeliest that can be conceived. His prayers were equally simple, homely, and business-like. An intense sense of reality was gendered by both. Evidently he had an intense conviction that the gospel was God's instrument for drawing men to himself, and that, when asked in Christ's name, his divine power was present to make that instrument effectual. The lamps were capable of being lit, and the gospel torch, under the silent power of the Spirit, was capable of lighting them. Instead, therefore, of waving the torch round the wicks, he brought it right down upon them, crushing them sometimes, you might almost think, by his urgency, but certainly lighting them. He claimed nothing peculiar to himself in the success vouchsafed to his method; all preachers and speakers who would do the same would be equally successful. Besides the more direct good he has done, Mr. Moody has been of eminent service in brightening the faith of the Church in these two things—the efficacy of prayer for God's blessing, and the efficacy of the gospel message when preached "in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance."

In regard to the character of the fruit that has resulted from this work, the general testimony is, that it is just like the ordinary fruit of a successful ministry, only more abundant and of richer quality. If a Christian minister were to bring together all the best cases that have occurred in his ministry within a period of twelve or fifteen years, they would form a tolerably correct counterpart of the results during the present period of awaken-

ing. It is a revival without many of the common accompaniments of a revival. As some one has expressed it, it is ordinary work with extraordinary power. The singular quietness and orderliness with which it has gone on have struck every one. There has been no sensationalism, no undue excitement, no prostrations, no screaming, no fondness for late meetings, no waiting till two in the morning for the illapse of the Spirit, no hysterics, and no ecstasies. Neither has there been any tendency to separation or anti-churchism. On the contrary, some of the ministers who have been most engaged in the work say that separatists have been coming to them and joining their churches. Though Mr. Moody claims for himself the liberty of working for Christ as a volunteer, or member of the irregular ministry, he fully and cordially concedes the necessity of a regular ministry and an organised Church. Neither has this movement revolved round any secondary truths or matters of opinion, elevated into vital questions. It has not been associated with any question about baptism, or the time of the second advent, or the metaphysical definition of faith. It has been based on the broadest of Bible truths—the great gospel message—the way of life—the atonement of Christ, and the mission of the Holy Spirit. Mr. Moody, however, has gone, unconsciously it may be, on a principle of the late Dr. Duncan's—that every man should have a large creed for himself, and a small one for other people. He has encouraged greatly the study of the Bible. He has urged his inquirers and converts to study it systematically, and try to come to clear and sound conclusions on every topic of which it treats. He has tried to bring them into closer relations than before with their ministers, and by engaging them in earnest work for their Master, and teaching them to grapple with the necessities of souls, has guarded them against the worship of crotchets, and against all unwholesome developments of spiritual earnestness.

If our view be correct, that this movement has been one of ordinary work with extraordinary power, it will go far to solve one of the most important problems in connection with the progress of Christianity. Hitherto, at least in a great many instances, there has been a contrast between revivals and the ordinary ope-

rations of the ministry. To many minds, the idea of a revival is connected with artificial excitement, loose theology, fanatical wildness, disregard of church order, and neglect of church ordinances. No doubt this idea has received some justification from revivals got up at camp-meetings, or otherwise, where there has been little or no teaching of God's truth, but simply a vehement endeavor to excite the feelings, and, by mere pressure, induce the undecided to declare for Christ. At the same time it is true, on the other hand, that many revivals have been much more like the ordinary operations of the Church, quickened and intensified. What we remark of the present movement is, that more than any which has preceded it in this country, at least in our time, it bears this character. It is revival without revivalism. Fourteen or fifteen years ago, when the last considerable movement of the kind occurred in this country, the subject was embarrassed by questionable accompaniments—physical prostrations and excitements, which were especially common in Ireland, and tendencies in some quarters to Plymouthism and erroneous teaching. Any approval of that movement was always qualified in the judgment of the sober-minded by considerable abatements; and to those to whom these abatements were specially obnoxious, the whole thing presented a repulsive aspect. If we have now got revival without artificial excitement, if the ordinary means of grace have received new power, if persons who know the truth have been urged and enabled to decide for Christ without illegitimate pressure, if the vital force of the Church has been increased without the introduction of any countervailing weakness, it is evident that we have got a most important result. For every thoughtful man admits that, under the ordinary ministry, there is a liability to tameness in dealing with souls, and that occasionally an extraordinary appeal is greatly to be desired. Men who preach from week to week, feeling that they will probably have the same chance with their hearers for an indefinite period, cannot be expected to be so direct and urgent as those who come for one brief night, or one brief week, and who feel that if they are to do any saving good, it must be "now or never." If we have now learned to combine revival power with pastoral diligence, and to makè

evangelistic fervor give a new and healthy action to the ordinary forces of the ministry, we have reached a position of great importance in connection with the spread of Christian life.

Ere we proceed further, one feature of the present movement may demand a moment's consideration, as furnishing an apparent exception to what we have said of it as exemplifying the fruit of ordinary work with extraordinary power. We refer to that part of the agency which is supplied by Mr. Sankey. In adverting to this, we place entirely out of account the circumstance of Mr. Sankey making use of an American organ. A very ridiculous importance has been attached to that circumstance in some quarters. At the recent meeting of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, the Rev. Mr. Makennal went so far as to say, that in this movement there was a *triad* of agency—Moody, Sankey, and the organ. The statement was as wide of the truth as it was unhappy in form. Mr. Sankey uses the organ merely to rest his voice, and it is simply ridiculous to ascribe to it any other or higher share in the service which he conducts. The true peculiarity of his method is expressed in the somewhat abrupt and naked phrase—singing the gospel. His object is, to present the truths of the gospel in musical tones, and lend to them whatever additional force and persuasiveness musical sound can convey. Is this an innovation? Perhaps it is, in our ordinary service. Yet surely the principle of it is at least as old as the days of David, and in New Testament times it is as old as the angel's song. Psalms and hymns are of two kinds—devotional and didactic. Why do we ever sing didactic songs? Beyond doubt that by singing them we may give to the truths which they embody a richer and more powerful expression. Singing tones are fitted to convey more of feeling than speaking tones, and are therefore a suitable vehicle for didactic songs intended to move feeling as well as intellect. If singing of this kind forms no part of our ordinary service, the sooner it began to do so the better. From its very nature, Mr. Sankey's method of solo singing is unsuitable for public worship, and the fact that but few men are endowed with a voice capable of singing as he sings, is a proof that in any public assembly such singing can only be ex-

ceptional and occasional. But surely it is time that those who conduct our psalmody were learning to make it a vehicle of deep and earnest feeling. It is time that they were learning to fill their own hearts with the truths expressed in our sacred songs—learning to pray over them, and to entreat that as they utter them, the Spirit of God would use them for impressing those in whose hearing they are uttered. Why should singing be performed more carelessly than either preaching or praying? Why should it be thought that good and well-trained voices are the only requisite for precentors and choirs, and that spiritual experience is of no moment here? We seem to be on the eve of learning two great lessons—the spiritual power of sacred song under the action of the Holy Spirit, and the need of the same exercises of preparation and prayer for the singer as for the preacher, in order that the souls of both may be filled with the truths which are to be spoken by the one and sung by the other.*

If there be truth in our theory, that the special value of the

* The wonderful popularity of Mr. Sankey's hymns is quite a phenomenon. Their popularity in Scotland is the more remarkable, that hitherto hymns have never taken a very deep hold of the Scottish mind. In one short half-year a set of hymns and tunes have sprung to a place which even the songs of Burns hardly reached in their palmyest days. You hear them in drawing-rooms, in workshops, in dressmakers'-rooms, in Sunday-schools, and at prayer-meetings; you hear them hummed by the thoughtless *gamin*, and accompanied with the concertina by the itinerant street-singer; the fisherman in his boat, the ploughman in the field, the mother lulling her infant, all resort to them; north and south, east and west, nothing is so popular as Sankey's hymns. Apart from its religious significance, this is a remarkable phenomenon in an intellectual and social point of view. There must be a remarkable power in any set of songs that acquire so wide and so sudden a popularity. Nothing can be more silly or absurd than the way in which such papers as the *Saturday Review* treat a movement presenting such features as this. In a literary and scientific point of view, such writers astonish us. It is humiliating to think that members of the literary fraternity can satisfy themselves with the merest drivel in accounting for a movement which has exercised an unprecedented influence in so many quarters. They ascribe it to what they call "comic religion." Comic religion! as if any quantity of the comic could move men's hearts as they have been moved by "Jesus of Nazareth passeth by," or by "Safe in the arms of Jesus."

present revival consists in the unusual degree in which it harmonises the ordinary and the extraordinary methods, it follows that great care ought to be taken to maintain this harmony, and not to allow the one to overlay or supersede the other.

There are two risks to which the pastor is liable. Either he may judge that his ordinary pastoral methods are sufficient without the assistance of the revivalist; or, finding how much the revivalist is blessed, he may deem it the best course for him to follow in his footsteps, and continually reiterate the same truths to his people.

Both risks need to be guarded against. The revivalist and the pastor are the complements of each other, and the wisdom of each is to supply the elements in which the other is deficient. In reference to the first risk, it is natural enough for a sober-minded, steady-going pastor, to turn with aversion from the revivalist, because he is so unlike to himself. But the thoughtful and conscientious pastor will feel that, just because he is unlike to himself, there is the more need for his help; the vigorous, clinching appeals of the revivalist being fitted to supply the very element which is most wanting in the pastor's method of presenting truth.

The other risk comes after a revival. The pastor is tempted to think that urgent invitations to sinners to come to Christ is the only class of topics with which his discourses can warrantably be occupied. We readily allow that, during the prevalence of a living interest in the way of life, and while not a few are obviously hungering and thirsting after righteousness, the offer of the gospel should be the constant topic; but in due time other topics must be introduced, otherwise an air of feebleness and monotony will be given to the whole ministrations.

The policy of the revivalist is like the policy of Napoleon—to concentrate his attack on a single point. He aims at entering the soul at a single avenue, and he presses in until, by God's blessing, his end is gained. Let us suppose that the avenue in question is that of the feelings. The revivalist preaches the love of Christ, and presses it so strongly that at last, through God's grace, the barrier is broken, and the soul is subdued by the sense

of that great love. Suppose now that the pastor, following in the footsteps of the revivalist, should continually press the feelings with this one truth; in such a case there will be produced the evil that flows from constant appeals to a single faculty. The duty of the pastor is to enter by each of that round of avenues by which a man's soul may be approached. Reason, conscience, the will, the feelings, the imagination—he must appeal to all. He must endeavor to rouse and exercise all, otherwise there is produced a stunted and one-sided religious life. If one special view of grace has been urged by the revivalist, the pastor has the more need to bring forth in due time and in the proper order the complementary truths that are needed to complete the view. The *freeness* of grace is the aspect on which the revivalist is most apt to dwell. Lest a perverted view of this freeness should be taken, let the pastor dwell in addition on the *fruitfulness* of grace. If the one has been at pains to clear away good works from the foundation laid in Zion, let the other be careful to show how they come in again as the fruit and evidence of a genuine faith. It is of the utmost importance that the pastor should see that reason and conscience are not left to lag behind the feelings and the imagination. It is so much easier to minister to the latter than to the former, that wherever the current teaching is hastily prepared, this result is almost sure to follow.* The people will have ill-balanced minds and ill-regulated consciences. The duties of common life will be regarded as hardly lying within the boundaries of the kingdom of Christ; the temper will be unguarded and the tongue unwatched, and serious detriment will begin to come from the notion that the spiritual region is so much higher than the moral, that slips in the latter ought not to be thought much of, when great regard is had to the former. No result more disastrous can follow a revival than when the conscience lags behind, and no object of a subsidiary kind should engage more earnestly

* One of the most important lessons from the older Scottish revivals bears on the value of ample scriptural instruction. Our forefathers concentrated their efforts on this, and with great success. Full, clear views of divine truth are the indispensable basis of a permanent spiritual life.

the pastor's attention than to keep conscience abreast of all the other faculties.

All the more necessary will it be to take much pains in training the conscience, if it be true that the absence of deep conviction of sin is in many cases characteristic of the present movement. What the old divines used to call "law work," does not appear to have been a conspicuous feature of the revival. In some former revivals, and particularly in Highland districts, there was much more of this, and in the view of those accustomed to it, the present movement is viewed with some suspicion as approaching to the slight method of healing the sinner's hurt, saying "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. In point of fact, however, in some of the most marked cases of conversion in the New Testament, a prolonged law-work had no place. And it seems to be the method of the Spirit in many cases to rectify the conscience after conversion, by bringing it more gradually to a sense of sin, and a perception of the need of entire conformity to the will of God. In the case, therefore, of those who have not been very much exercised with a sense of sin before conversion, there is all the greater need for careful training of the conscience afterwards. The neglect of this is apt to give rise to very perplexing and distressing instances of backsliding, more especially when, in the previous condition, the moral texture has been somewhat loosely compacted. Nothing is more to be dreaded than a susceptibility of emotional impression in union with torpidity of conscience. It is from this source that the greatest scandals have come upon revival-religion, and that all revival operations have been liable to distrust on the part of those with whom moral integrity is the backbone of all goodness, and who can hardly comprehend, far less excuse, any laxity there.

Another most important duty of the pastor after a revival, is to direct into proper channels the Christian activities that have been evoked in the course of the movement. Wherever the movement is earnest and hearty, these activities find spontaneously a certain scope for themselves. When the gospel comes to any one, "not in word, but in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance," there arises an irresistible disposition, at least

for a time, to try to influence companions and acquaintances, and get them to share the blessing. But the careful and deliberate training of this disposition is one of the most important practical duties of a revival. That which is an impulse must be formed into a habit; that which springs from feeling must be attached to conscience, in order that the due state of things may be attained. The impulse will otherwise pass away, and the whole movement come to a stand-still. And here, as it seems to us, appears to have been a great want in the working out of earlier revival movements. So far as we can see, there was little attempt at the great Cambuslang revival, for example, to get converts trained to occupy themselves systematically and constantly in doing good to others. One of the great wants of that age was the want of the missionary spirit. It is almost incredible how little the best writers of the eighteenth century recognised it, or tried to supply it. You may read volumes of Boston and the Erskines without any mention of the heathen, at home or abroad. It seems to us that at present there is no question of more pressing importance than that which concerns the training of converts to the work of the Lord. It is the want of this that has made revival movements so fitful, and has given rise to a popular impression, that in the nature of things, a revival must be followed by a reaction, and that in a few years you will find that the average amount of spiritual life has not been exceeded, through greater languor succeeding the period of greater activity. We hold that this is not the right or normal state of things. There is no good reason why revivals should not be chronic. If our view be correct, that the present movement exemplifies ordinary work with extraordinary power, there is no good reason why it should not be a permanent state of things. The efforts of earnest ministers should be specially turned in this direction. The training of converts to work for their Master is one of the most important duties that can engage their attention, and it is well worth the while of Churches to consider whether a minister might not be spared from ordinary pastoral work in some of our large towns, to superintend this training of converts. The ordinary duties of the ministry are so heavy, that without the sacrifice of some of them, it is

hardly possible for a hard-working minister to give much time to a new department. An active, earnest minister, with a faculty of organising, if set apart to the work, might be extremely useful, and might so simplify arrangements that it would be comparatively easy for the mass of the clergy to give it the attention which it requires in detail.

In these remarks we have in view the case of converts remaining in secular pursuits, but trying, at the same time, to do some work for the Lord. But there is another class of converts whose case demands more special attention. We refer to those who deem it a duty to give up all secular work, and in some capacity or other devote themselves wholly to Christian service. Two methods of doing so may present themselves. There is, first, the regular ministry; and, secondly, such forms of Christian service as are furnished by the employment of colporteurs, city missionaries, evangelists, Bible women, matrons, nurses, and the like. Now, in regard to the ministry, it is usually felt that our long curriculum in the Presbyterian Church is a fatal obstacle to many of the best and most earnest men. To married men, or men past the years of youth, it no doubt is; and it is not easy to suggest any method by which this difficulty can be overcome. But in the case of young men, it ought not to be a serious barrier. Young men have facilities for Christian service during the whole period of their studies, and if they have suitable gifts, would be gladly taken as helpers in mission work in some of the many fields where the harvest is so plenteous and the laborers so few. Their intellectual training would then go on side by side with practical work, and the risk of the life being all crushed out of them by the one, would be met by their being steadily employed in the other. We must say, that in these circumstances we have not much sympathy with earnest young men wishing to skip the curriculum. A sense of its need, and a willingness to undergo it, will rather be proof of their having in them the stuff that good, durable, ever-improving workers are made of; while, on the other hand, if they slight it as but wasted time and labor, and only think how they can avoid it, they indicate a superficiality of view that does not promise very valuable results.

With regard to the class of converts that do not contemplate the regular ministry, but are desirous to consecrate themselves to subordinate departments of the service, there is the greatest possible need for considering what course ought to be taken. It is evident that openings for such laborers exist in considerable numbers, and are increasing every day. Yet no Christian Church in Scotland has made any systematic provision for the training of such laborers for their work. We conceive that the time has come for remedying this defect. An institution for training Christian workers has become an imperative necessity. Of course we shall be met by the objection that they could only get a smattering at such a college, and that "a little learning is a dangerous thing." But the question really lies between a little training and no training at all. It is quite certain that we shall have evangelists, lay preachers, street preachers, colporteurs, and the like. As things are now, these laborers go forth with absolutely no training, except what they receive under the ordinary ministrations of their pastors. Is this the best state of things? Is it not rather the worst? Would not such men be infinitely better of a course of popular theology—a course opening up the Bible and the Shorter Catechism, and giving them some hints in the art of speaking? Is there anything worse done, as a common rule, than street preaching? The preacher seems often to think that the louder he can bawl the more will he impress, and instead of a few, short, simple, natural words, pours out torrents of rant, that roll over the heads of unimpressed hearers. Would not a course of instruction help, too, to take the conceit out of the head of many a lay laborer prone to fancy himself vastly superior to ministers, just because he is utterly ignorant of how little he knows? And would it not free these laborers from the leaven of many errors into which they are prone to fall, and thus add greatly to their value, as well as give them a status which would increase their influence with the people? And female laborers are just as much in need of this training as male. We forbear entering further into the subject; but it would not be easy to exaggerate its importance.

Other questions present themselves in connection with the fol-

lowing out and following up of a revival, on which at present we have no time to enter. For example, How to get young converts to make their confession of Christ in a way fitted to rouse others, without offending that modest instinct which cannot be violated with impunity? Another question is, How to make practical use of a convert who has been turned from scandalous wickedness, without giving such details of that wickedness as may shock the sensibilities and pollute the imagination of well-trained moral natures? These are delicate questions, in handling which we are liable to dangers, both on the right hand and on the left, and on which those who incline to one side ought to beware of fierce and uncharitable judgments on the other. Especially ought there to be tenderness of judgment towards those who are manifestly influenced by a true and fearless zeal for bringing as many souls as possible under the influence of God's grace. It is but too apparent that a problem of vast importance and difficulty remains to be solved. Even where the revival movement has been most profound and extensive, the masses of our town population have not been pervaded. Drunkenness, licentiousness, covetousness, selfishness, and ungodliness, still spread their polluted streams and poisoned atmosphere almost as extensively as ever. The great problem is to bring the revived life of the Church into contact with these. And we must not judge of the best means for that purpose by the standard that would apply to the inhabitants of boudoirs and drawing-rooms. When a boat has been upset, and scores of persons are struggling in the water, it may be necessary to extricate them more roughly than a mother would lift her babe from the cradle. The masses are the masses, and it is better they should be saved somewhat roughly than not saved at all.

ARTICLE V.

THE PASTORAL RELATION AND THE SUPPORT OF
THE MINISTRY.*

It has been made my duty by the Synod of South Carolina to discuss, on this occasion, the subject of "The Pastoral Relation and the Support of the Ministry." It would appear from this mode of stating the question which the Synod saw proper to employ, that, in the apprehension of this high Court, there is some kind of connexion between these two things, viz., the pastoral relation, and the support of the ministry. It will be my endeavor in this discourse to ascertain and hold up to view the precise nature of that connexion. Is that connexion definite or indefinite? Is it close or remote? Can every minister, *as such*, that is, can every *preacher*, claim to be supported by the Church, or does the claim of support depend in all ordinary cases on his sustaining the pastoral relation, and how far is it so dependent?

Closely connected with this question there is another, to the history of which I must allude in passing. A very eminent Princeton theologian preached before the General Assembly at

*According to previous appointment this discourse was preached before the Synod of South Carolina, in the Presbyterian church at Newberry, during its fall sessions in October, 1874. The following resolutions were adopted by the Synod:

Resolved 1. That the Synod of South Carolina has heard, with pleasure and profit, the discourse on the Pastoral Relation and the Support of the Ministry, by the Rev. J. B. Adger, D. D.

2. That Synod, without holding itself responsible for every utterance, in the sermon, requests a copy for publication in the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

3. That one thousand copies be printed in pamphlet form for distribution.

4. That when printed, these copies be distributed amongst the four Presbyteries, in the proportion of their Synodical assessments.

5. That Rev. E. H. Buist, T. H. Law, and Wm. Banks, be a committee to attend to the publication.

Also, that a copy of these resolutions be published with the sermon.

Richmond in 1846, a sermon designed to prove that the obligation of a minister's support rests, not on the individual congregation which the minister serves, but on the Church as one and as a whole. The idea was that the Board of Missions, as representing the Church, should be authorised and enabled to give an adequate support to every minister. The doctrine was received with favor by a large portion of that Assembly. The melancholy failure of the churches to fulfil their obligations to their pastors seems to have prepared the ministry thirty years ago to favor any principle, any plan not absolutely false or foolish, which gave hope to them of more just and competent support. Dr. Thornwell, however, in reviewing that Assembly, made it plain, (as may be read in the 4th Volume of his works,) that according to our standards the obligation of the minister's support rests on the party which calls him to his work, whether it be a church which calls him as a pastor, a Presbytery which calls him as an evangelist, or the General Assembly which calls him to be a missionary in frontier or foreign parts. At the same time, our system of government obviously entitles weak churches to obtain the aid of strong ones in discharging their own pastoral obligations. Upon this principle, said Dr. Thornwell, the collective action of the Church in the matter of ministerial support and the sustentation of weak congregations may be rightfully demanded, but not upon the doctrine that the whole Church is bound to support each individual pastor. You may have a central treasury, filled by contributions drawn from all the churches, and then distributed by some central agency amongst all those congregations and Presbyteries which stand in need of help. But you may not delegate to any central committee the place and the power of patrons supporting all your ministers. It is no more the right or duty of the Church, as a whole, to support her pastors than it is hers to appoint them. The right of appointment and the obligation to support go together. If the one be delegated to a central committee, how long is it likely the people can retain the other?

The cardinal principle of Dr. Hodge's sermon, it thus appears, would have given to the old Board of Missions far greater powers

than it ever presumed to claim—even the power of virtually controlling every pastoral election. On the contrary, Dr. Thornwell on this occasion clearly set forth and defended the cardinal principle on which our Church's Sustentation Committee is appointed and its work carried on—the principle of the strong helping the weak, without assuming any control of them. The two theories are the poles apart. The one would centralize all Church power—the other preserves the Church's unity, but interferes not with the free and healthy action of its parts.

The doctrines to be now set forth I find in various scriptures, as follows :

1 Tim. v. 17. "The elders that rule well are worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine."

1 Cor. ix. 14: "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."

Gal. vi. 6: "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things."

1 Thess. v. 12: "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake."

Heb. xiii. 7: "Remember them which have the rule over you who have spoken unto you the word of the Lord."

Now these passages plainly set forth the following truths :

1. Besides elders who *only* rule there are also elders who teach as well as rule, and the chiefest honors belong to this class, because their office is first and highest. These are ruling elders the same as the other class, but having also another office—the grand, the supreme office amongst men, of officially preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ.

These are that peculiar class of Church officers who both bear rule over some charge, and at the same time labor officially in the word and doctrine. They are what we now popularly signify by the term *pastors*.

2. That peculiar class of office-bearers who labor among you and are over you (that is, *rule* over you), and at the same time admonish you—that class you must esteem very highly; and you

are to do this for their work's sake, which is so grand and so useful. In other words, you must esteem very highly in love, your *pastors*, as we now technically call them. Yes! you must remember those officers whose proper description is that they have the rule over you and also speak officially to you in public the word of the Lord.

3. Respecting those elders who preach the gospel the Lord has ordained that they are to get their support thereby. They are not to live by some secular calling whilst they preach freely a free gospel. No, but they are to get their living for their preaching and by their preaching—even so the Lord hath ordained. They are not to starve; they are not to want; but they are to *live*; to be in comfort and free from worldly cares and anxieties. For he that is taught in the word is to communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things—food and raiment and a dwelling-house and fuel and lights, and books for his own adequate improvement, and the means of educating properly his children; also such a support as will enable him to exercise hospitality, and still further to make some provision for his family after his decease. There is not one good thing which you enjoy, who have a pastor that teaches you, but you are commanded by the Lord who gave you that good thing, to communicate a portion of it to your pastor.

4. Especially let it be observed that the ordinance of the Lord respecting support for office-bearers by the Church relates only to official *preachers*, and does not relate to ruling elders nor to deacons, seeing that both these, as described by Paul to Timothy and Titus, are persons finding their daily occupation and support in the market-place.

Now does it, on the other hand, relate to all preachers, or is it applicable only to those who rule as well as preach?—in other words, does the ordinance of the Lord about support relate only to *pastors*, as we now popularly style them, or does it include all preachers? This is a nice question, and it may not be easy to give it a perfectly satisfactory answer.

Let us consider the bearing of a few simple principles. The New Testament gives a full and articulate description of only

two office-bearers—the deacon and the elder or presbyter, otherwise called the bishop. The order of the bishop is, however, divided into two classes, of which one only rules, and the other both teaches and rules. Such is the organisation of the full, complete, and settled Church state. There is another state of the Church not complete and settled—her missionary state, where things are in a formative condition and unsettled, such as it was in Crete when Titus was sent to “set in order things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city.” In this unsettled condition of the Church, her courts are not yet organised; there is no classical, even no parochial presbytery; no pastorates, no ruling eldership, no complete and full and direct representative government. Converts to the truth there are, and they have occasional preaching and the sacraments, through the ministry of some man of God who comes to visit them at intervals, but Church organisation they have none yet, and the sacred and holy discipline of Christ’s house is not exercised amongst them in its full development. There is Church rule there because the Word is there, and it is the Word which rules and governs always in the kingdom of our Lord. So then the solitary missionary or evangelist proper, *because he is a preacher of the omnipotent Word*, carries all Church power in his single hand wherever he goes outside of the settled Church state, and in a just sense is *always a representative ruler*, though acting alone. Indeed, wherever and whenever a preacher stands up to proclaim the truth, he necessarily rules and governs by that very act, so that, in a certain sense, ruling is necessarily involved in teaching. But that state of the Church where there is no Church organisation, and where the preacher or missionary rules alone, whether directly or but indirectly, as just now described, is manifestly a state of pupilage, and not of the full development of the Church’s privileges. For then the Church, so far as she exists there, is under a one-man power of rule. And now, as in apostolic times, the missionary in foreign or frontier lands must always, like Paul and Barnabas, seek to substitute for the one-man rule of the evangelist the government—the representative government, of a body of elders. In other words, he must organise the

converts as soon as it is possible. While as yet not blest with the permanent ministry of the Word amongst them, he must persuade them to elect their best qualified men to be their ruling elders and deacons, and he must ordain and settle these officers over them before he passes on, for that is his calling, to establish other little churches. Only by organisation can he secure what he has already gained. It is order by which he must fortify and establish and so perpetuate the doctrine he has preached. Thus it was that Paul and Barnabas lighted up little candles in Derbe and Lystra and Iconium, and setting them in candlesticks, they made all Asia Minor to blaze for a long time with the glory of the gospel which they preached.

Keeping carefully in mind now the distinction which must be made betwixt the missionary and the settled and organised state of the Church, let us recur again to the fact that *for the latter state* our Lord has provided two offices which are to minister to the Church's edification and growth, namely, deacons and elders or bishops. The former takes care of the Church's poor and sick; the latter administers the sacred and holy discipline of the Church. The former is of two classes, one male and the other female—the one to take care of tables, the table of the Lord, the table of the minister, and the table of the poor; the other, called in Scripture the *deaconess* or the *widow*, to take care of the sick, lodge strangers, relieve the afflicted, bring up orphans, wash the saints' feet, and solace the Church's sufferers of all kinds. O sweet and blessed ministry of the diaconate! What a divine gift thou art, full of rich resources unconsidered, unemployed, by our Church! How many congregations of our people have never had any deacons at all; how few have ever thought of employing deaconesses! We have need to learn from Roman Catholics and Episcopalians, and begin to subsidise the untold wealth of female influence and usefulness lying buried amongst us. But all this by the way. Now, just as the deacon is of two classes, so also is the elder or bishop—there is the elder who only rules and the elder who rules and also teaches. But be it observed, ruling is the fundamental idea in the Presbyterate. This runs through the whole articulate description of the presbyter or

bishop, as Paul writes it down for Timothy and for Titus. That which makes a presbyter or bishop is ruling. That officer who lawfully bears rule in the Church is a presbyter and none other but such an one. He is a true and proper presbyter or bishop in the Church who is called and ordained to rule, though he be not called and ordained to preach. Preaching, therefore, is not essential to the presbyterate, much less constitutes it. Yet the Lord has ordained that a class of his presbyters shall be also preachers, and this office of the preaching elder is preëminently the first in the Church, both for dignity and usefulness. And this teaching elder is always necessarily a ruler; for being always a presbyter or bishop, he must inherently possess ruling powers. The higher office must involve and include the lower. Not every presbyter then is a teacher, but every teaching presbyter is inherently a ruler in the Church. And as the ruling function always necessarily accompanies the teaching, so it must always, in a sense, precede it; for no man may lawfully be ordained a teaching presbyter, (I speak of the settled Church state,) except when some congregation and because some congregation has chosen and called him to be its pastor, that is, *ruler*.

From a consideration of these few simple Presbyterian principles it appears, then, that in the settled Church state, a man is to be inducted into the ministry of the Word only upon the call of some congregation for him to undertake amongst them the pastoral office and work, which signifies both ruling and teaching them. Moreover, it appears that deacons and deaconesses, together with presbyters who rule and presbyters who teach as well as rule, are all the office-bearers which the King and Head gives to edify and build up His Church wherever planted and settled. Now, evidently, we have no power to make a new kind of officer in the Church. But a new office has been creeping in amongst us, viz., that of the *stated supply*, a teaching presbyter who has no power of rule over the church to which he ministers. And it is an important question whether this is a legitimate office, entitling the holder of it to ministerial support.

Let it be observed that I raise no question as to the legitimacy of the occasional or temporary supply which the churches are

frequently under the necessity of securing, with the help of Presbytery, in order that they may enjoy the Word and Sacraments. What I speak of is the *stated* supply. I speak of a *system of supplies* that is distinct from the *system of pastorates*. I speak of a new way unknown to the Scriptures, to our book, and to our fathers, by which our teaching presbyters are systematically deprived of their power of direct and formal rule over the churches to which they minister in the word and doctrine. Every teaching presbyter, I insist, possesses inherently and *ex officio* the right of ruling the church, so that he may sit in any of the higher courts of the church, although he may not sit, unless he be their pastor, in the lowest, that is, the session. But that teaching presbyter who labors constantly in a particular church, ought always to have the power of sitting and ruling in the session of that church by being made its pastor. I am warring, then, against *the disfranchisement of my brethren*, whose rights of ruling where they constantly preach, of applying as well as declaring his Word, the Lord himself has conferred upon them. and of which this new system robs and despoils them. I am contending for the parity of all ministers in the settled church state, and against the further spread or continuance of a system which prevents the exercise by some of them of that power of rule which belongs of right to their office.

You are ready to ask, What about the Professor in the theological school, or the Secretary of one of the Assembly's committees? The proper answer to your question brings in again the distinction of the formative from the settled state of the Church. Two forms of ministry of the Word, and but two, are exhibited in the Acts and Epistles—one the evangelistic, the other the pastoral; one outside the regular Church state, and called extraordinary; the other permanent and ordinary, and belonging to the organised Church. Of the extraordinary form were apostles, prophets, evangelists, and I may add those who taught schools of the prophets, as did our blessed Lord himself. None of these belonged to the Church considered as set up, but all to the Church considered as to be planted. On the other hand, the ordinary workers are those who receive under their pastoral charge the

particular churches when organised, and take the oversight of their permanent life and growth. Two kinds of service, therefore, by ministers of the Word, are contemplated in the Scriptures: one which looks towards the founding of churches, and another which builds them up when founded. Of the former sort is the work of our Foreign and Home missionaries, our teachers of theology, and our secretaries devoted to the Church's various evangelistic operations. All these are working outside of any settled Church. Their labors regard not the edification of any particular congregation, but the progress and advantage of the whole body.

Now, betwixt such general officers working for the whole body and the *stated supply*, is there not a very patent difference? Can you call him, in any sense of the word, *evangelistic*? Is it a fact that he labors for the Church in her general interests? No, he preaches statedly to one or two particular churches. Is it a fact that he labors in frontier parts? No, but in the very centre, perhaps, of the settled Church. Is it a fact that he labors in converting with a view to organising? No, but to edify a church established long ago, possibly a century old. Is it a fact that he is laboring for a little while as a missionary, with the design of shortly passing on to do the same kind of evangelistic labors in other destitute parts and in the regions beyond? No, but he supplies the very same church or churches for years together—his title is a *stated supply*. He is a permanent fixture, oftentimes more permanent and abiding than our pastors generally are. There are churches in this Synod to which the same minister has acted as their stated supply for forty years. Surely this is no evangelist. But on the other hand, can you call him a pastor? Well, is he in charge of the congregation as their pastor? Can he take any part in any act of the government of that congregation? Can he cast a vote on any question in the session? Did that congregation ever call him to be their pastor? Was he ever installed such by the Presbytery? Or did the people by their own act alone put him in the place he occupies? And if the people should wish to get rid of him, will they have to consult the Presbytery, or can they not send him adrift at their own

pleasure? Surely this is no pastor! But if he is neither of the evangelist nor of the pastoral class of ministers, then how does he come into and form a part of the New Testament system for settled churches, and that of our Form of Government, which knows only pastors and evangelists?

Now to what extent does this system actually prevail amongst us? I answer, that leaving out the Synod of Missouri, respecting which I have not the needful statistics, we have not far from six hundred ministers engaged in regularly serving particular churches, and that of these about three hundred and fifty are settled pastors, and about two hundred and fifty are stated supplies. Many, very many, of the latter class are amongst our best ministers, and it may not be their fault that they occupy this unpresbyterian position. I am not standing here to-day as the censor of individuals; but you have appointed me to discuss a system, and I would set before the Synod the facts of our case. Of six hundred of our effective preachers, little more than one-half are in the position where Scripture and our Form would put them. The Church ought to know and consider and remedy this evil. We have a Church order which we claim to find in God's word; but we have fallen into another way of arranging our ecclesiastical affairs. This new way has to a considerable extent driven out of use amongst us the good old way. And to such an extent does this new system obtain amongst us, that when the Presbytery of South Alabama overtured the Assembly at Richmond to take measures for checking its progress, that Assembly declined to do anything. It was persuaded to apologise for this new and this unpresbyterian and this unscriptural way, and to declare that in many, perhaps "it is in most cases, the only thing that can save many of our churches from extinction." Thus our Assembly was put into the attitude of declaring in substance that Christ's way of regulating his Church's government is a failure, and that an invention of human wisdom, or rather of human folly—a new officer unknown to the apostolic Church and not named amongst Christ's ascension gifts to his Bride—a preacher who is neither of the evangelistic nor of the pastoral class, must be employed to keep life in many of the Lord's own churches, or they

will be plucked out of his hand, sink down into extinction, and perish!

As against this unpresbyterian deliverance of the Richmond Assembly, I would have the Synod of South Carolina to declare:

I. That the system of stated supplies is *contrary to Scripture*, which gives us two forms of the Diaconate, two forms of the Presbyterate, and again two forms and but two forms of the ministry of the Word, namely, evangelists and other like planters of churches, and pastors to edify them when planted.

II. I would have Synod declare that this growing evil in our Church is contrary to *our Form of Government*, which would be of course a repetition, in different shape, of the former declaration, seeing that we profess to get our Church polity from the Bible. As in the Scriptures, so in our Form, but two kinds of ministry of the word are presupposed and provided for, viz., evangelists or missionaries and pastors. Not one of our formularies refers to any such minister as the stated supply. The call is to the pastoral work. Our Book says the acceptance of a call always involves, when accepted, the instalment by Presbytery.

III. I would have Synod declare that this new way is *destructive of our representative system of Church rule*. Our book says that "ruling elders are *properly* the representatives of the people;" which means that strictly, specifically, simply, solely, they are representatives, whilst ministers are not simply representatives, but teachers as well. The book adds that "ruling elders are chosen by the people, for the purpose of exercising government and discipline *in conjunction with* pastors or ministers." Both classes of elders, then, are representatives, the one being nothing more, but the other having also the higher function of teaching. I would therefore have this Synod declare that the system of stated supplies disfranchises the minister of one of these two functions, which are essential to his office as a minister. The stated supply is a mere teacher, deprived of his ruling function in his own congregation. Whoever is commissioned to preach statedly to any people, ought to have the right to apply his doctrine in the way of discipline amongst them—for doctrine being the life, discipline is the nerves of any Church. This new

system does not object to the minister sitting in Presbytery, in Synod, and in the Assembly to rule over the churches generally, (as American Presbyterianism, more scriptural here than that of Scotland allows,) but then, inconsistently, it shuts him out from all rule over that very church whose condition he best knows, and where he could rule to the greatest advantage—the church to which he ministers statedly. Thus it robs the minister of his inherent rights, and it robs the church of the full advantage of his ruling. And so it tends to overthrow Presbyterian Church government, which is government by representatives.

IV. Once more: I would have this Synod declare, in opposition to the unpresbyterian deliverance of the Richmond Assembly, that this new system, so far from being “in many, perhaps in most cases, the only thing that can save many of our churches from extinction,” is, *in fact, naked and simple Congregationalism, which never can be made to agree with Presbyterian order.* The whole Church is one body confederated together, and the parts are all under mutual control. No one church is to act apart from the others, and hence our Presbyterial and Synodical Assemblies. Especially in the matter of settling a minister, there must be mutual council and control. Hence it is for the Presbytery to license, ordain, and install. The call is to come before them, and they will present it to the man called, if they see proper. Obviously the stated supply system is the opposite of this Presbyterian way, for it allows each church to make arrangements about preaching for itself. Every church has certainly a clear right to call whom it will, and none else, to be its pastor; but every church just as certainly also has a clear right to be consulted, through its representatives, regarding every minister that is to sit in the higher courts and rule there over it. And so this congregational way of each church controlling its own pulpit, ought to be broken up amongst us, and the Presbyterian way of settled pastors put into full operation. We ought to emancipate all our brethren from their state of disfranchisement. We ought to confer on every one of our churches the full benefits of the ruling function inherently belonging to every ordained minister of the Word.

It would appear, therefore, that the connection is a very close and intimate one betwixt the two parts of the topic which the Synod appointed me to discuss: the Pastoral Relation and the Support of the Ministry. There are but two kinds of legitimate ministry known to us: that which is *evangelistic*, that which is concerned with the general work of the Church, that which looks to her spread, that which contemplates her progress in the earth as a body; and that which is *pastoral*, involving along with the teaching one or more particular flocks the administration of discipline amongst them. Both these, but none other, can claim the benefit of our Lord's ordinance, that they which preach the gospel shall live of the gospel. If, therefore, our Church would secure the blessing of the Lord, she must conform her use of the ministers whom he gives to his own appointments. She must either employ them in some sort of evangelistic work for her outside progress, or else make pastors of them in her settled estate. She has not discretion given her to invent new offices, but accepting thankfully what her Head has given, she must, in the use of what he ordains, expect his blessing. For his organised and settled churches he appoints that there be what we call the *pastorate*. This involves the idea of a teaching elder devoted to a fixed charge, and at the same time free from worldly cares and avocations, and out of this idea flows the people's duty to give that man his support.

Thus closely connected are the pastoral relation and the support of the ministry. As to the sacredness of the connection, that comes from the ordinance of Christ himself. The pastoral relation! What more holy or tender subsists amongst men? Is the parental relation sacred and sweet? Christ represents his love and care for the Church under the similitudes of both fatherly and motherly affection. Is the conjugal relation still more tender and loving? Christ calls the Church his spouse, and boasts that he cherishes for her a husband's devotion. Now Christ is indeed the chief Shepherd, but every true pastor is a shepherd under Christ, and in his measure loves the Church just as Christ does.

The pastoral work! Paul describes it by three expressions:

the first is that your pastors *labor amongst you*; the second is, they are *over you in the Lord*; the third is, they *admonish* you.

First, they *labor amongst you*—they *labor* in the word and doctrine. No light labor, no easy task is the pastor's, but what might fill an angel's heart, and filled a Saviour's hands. It is hard labor to dig in the mines of scriptural knowledge and bring forth things new as well as old. The true pastor will toil in his study, and he will do hard mental labor as he rides or walks in his rounds amongst his people. He will furrow his brow and pale his cheek with severe and protracted and deep thinking of the things of Christ, that he may provide his flock with the food of their soul, and may instruct them in the doctrines of the gospel, and may defend them from going astray into the paths of error which lead to destruction. And what he thus toilsomely gathers by research and by thought, he brings forth to his people in all the earnestness of his soul's deepest and strongest affections, and wears himself down every week in proclaiming these things in the ears of his congregation. Possibly you may not be aware how weary your minister is at the close of a week's hard study; for it has never occurred to you that it can be hard labor to read or to think. Possibly you have never conceived of the exhausting labors of Sunday to your minister, whom Saturday night found weary and worn. You may not know that very commonly your faithful pastor gets no refreshing rest on Sunday nights, and feels all day Monday his nerves unstrung. And yet this is perhaps the necessary experience of every faithful minister. We have evidence in Scripture that our Lord grew prematurely grey, for the Jews supposed from his looks that he approached fifty when not much more than half so old. And so Christ's ministers must wear themselves out laboring amongst you.

But, secondly, your pastors are *over you in the Lord*. This is the same word which is applied in 1 Timothy, v. 17, to the elders, and is there translated *ruling*. Your pastors are "over you," that is, they *rule over you*. But mark the qualifying term—"in the Lord." Their rule over you extends only to spiritual things, and is only ministerial and declarative. Their rule over you is only that of the Lord's servants speaking to you

what He bids them for your good. Their rule over you is the shepherd's careful, loving rule over his flock which he cherishes through heat and cold, in wet and dry, by day, by night, and in defence of which he would cheerfully lay down his life. Their rule over you is nothing else but an anxious watch that you go not astray. Yes, not only does your pastor labor for you in his study and in his pulpit, but in his closet and on his couch he remembers you by night as by day. This is labor indeed to bear you on his heart, and this is his constant labor and toil. He carries upon his soul continually the burden of your souls. It is the care of souls, which, in the fear of God who called him, and in the love of Christ who sent him, the pastor consented, joyfully yet tremblingly, to have bound upon his shoulders. Oh! the tremendous, awful load—the care, the anxious, sleepless care of your souls! Oh! the fearful responsibility of having to account at last for so many *souls*, immortal souls, candidates for heaven or for hell! This makes the pastor's old age begin while he is still young in years. This bows his shoulders and makes his knees totter before the time. The invisible, the eternal world, is terrible always to mortal eye and mortal heart; all men naturally shrink back from the brink which overhangs that abyss. But it is the vocation of this class of men—the calling of the pastor it is, to look all the time at judgment and eternity as his people stand related to them. It is not his own eternal future which is so dreadful—for by faith he looks exultingly forward to his joyful rest beyond this present life. But it is the eternal future of the souls committed to him, the souls for which, as a pastor, he is called to watch—it is the doubtful future of these objects of his tender, unceasing solicitude, it is this which weighs down the heart of those who rule over you in the Lord.

The third item in Paul's account of the work of your pastors is that they *admonish you*. This completes the beautiful and impressive picture. Here is one who labors to teach you the truth which saves, and one who anxiously watches for your soul's prosperity, weighed down continually with the burden your eternal interests constitute for him; but this person has yet farther the difficult task to perform of constantly *admonishing you*.

Teaching is general, admonition is particular. Caring for the soul of one person or for the souls of a congregation is also general; but admonishing one, or even many, is particular. It is bringing down doctrine to a point. It is saying to an individual, "Thou art the man," or to a class, "It is you, and not others, I am warning." What a hard duty it is to point out faults! How apt the faithful discharge of it is to give offence! How often the honest friend who admonishes is counted a foe! This was Paul's experience when he faithfully told the truth about themselves to the Galatians. A large portion of his work in writing his Epistles was the painful work of admonishing. Read, for example, the first chapters of first Corinthians, and you will see there the inspired model of the faithful pastor's duty, as the admonisher of his people. "As my beloved sons, I warn you," says Paul, "for though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers." Here is the distinction plainly drawn between the *instructing* work of the pastor as he labors in the word and doctrine, and his *warning work*, as he applies his doctrine to individual cases, and points out to particular persons their particular sins. O friendship, thou art a generous, self-sacrificing sentiment, but thy highest, noblest, most exalted embodiment is the unselfish devotion of a true Christian pastor to the spiritual and eternal good of his people!

But the people's duty to their pastor—how does Paul set that forth? He does that in two particulars: the *first* is to *know* them, that is, to recognise them in the character of men officially laboring to teach you the word, and carrying the burden of your souls' salvation, and faithfully warning you of your faults and errors. If such is their office, to which they are divinely called, and if it is an arduous work which consumes their strength and their life itself, then they are surely entitled to be recognised by you in this character. You ought to know your pastor, as he is your pastor. He should be acknowledged by you as the competent teacher, the watchful guide, the faithful reprove, which he is; your invaluable friend, the precious ascension gift of your Lord, taking, in some feeble sense, his place in his absence, and acting in the stead of the great Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.

The other particular is that you esteem them very highly in love. Your esteem is to be in proportion to their value, which you have recognised, and so it is to be *very high*. And it is to be no cold affection, but one warm and lively and practical. You ought to esteem them very highly in love. It is love that must give the measure of your practical demonstration to your pastor of the estimation you set upon his office and his work for you. Love for your Lord and this his servant and his representative—this love it is which must tell you what you ought to do for his comfort and health and happiness. He is a man like yourselves, having all your wants and necessities. Sowing unto you in spiritual things, is it a great matter for him to reap your carnal things? Love answers, “No, it is no great matter, and I will not measure out the good things of this life, which I dispense to him who without stint cares for my soul’s good!” He has a family as dear to him as your family is to you. Love will prompt you to see that he is provided freely and fully with every thing needful to their comfort, health, education, and usefulness; and the freeness and fulness in which you contribute to make his family comfortable and happy will be fully proportioned, because love prompts you to what you spend on your own family. Whatever you can afford to furnish to your individual households, you will, out of your esteem and love for your pastor, unitedly furnish to his family. He cannot do his own proper work well if he is harassed with anxious cares about their support. He cannot be a full pastor, and do the work of such, if not set free altogether from worldly cares and avocations. Love to him, love to the Church, love to the Lord, will operate to make the people free their pastor from all annoyance touching worldly maintenance. The pastoral relation involves the support of the ministry, and both esteem and love forbid that support to be stinted or meagre. It is for their work’s sake you are to render them a full and competent support. It is their office you are to honor, where possibly the person of the individual may not command, in every particular, your highest respect. It is *in the Lord* they rule over you—it is *in the Lord* you accept their ministrations of spiritual things, and make return therefor in carnal things. Christ

says to them, "Whoso receiveth you receiveth me." As you value and honor your Lord, you will value and honor his ministers. For their work's sake you will not suffer them to lack, but communicate to them in every good thing. And no cup of cold water which you furnish them out of love to them for their work's sake will your Lord forget to reward out of his sovereign grace according to his blessed promise at the last.

The apostle impresses the duty which the Church owes to her pastors by the consideration that the Lord has ordained their support by the Church. Will the Church not observe the ordinance of her Head? The apostle is urgent. He says, "We beseech you to know and esteem and love your pastors." Well may this duty be urged upon Zion. Her vital interests are concerned. She cannot prosper if her pastors are secularised. They cannot but be secularised if not set free by her from worldly cares and avocations. If there be one reform which more than any other in the practical arrangements of the Church calls aloud to be accomplished, it is this one of setting every minister of our Church to his covenanted work. We are suffering great loss as a Church by the necessary devotion of so many good and true men to measures for supplementing the meagre support afforded by their churches. We are suffering great loss by the subtraction of so many of their thoughts and so much of their power from their proper work in the study, in the pastorate, and in the pulpit—a subtraction which their conjugal and parental sympathies force on them, but which the Church cannot afford to endure. We are suffering great loss, because if we do not honor the ordinance of the Lord, he will not honor us in our undertakings for his glory. Oh! that our Church might awake to this great reform! Oh! for a lively sense in every one of our congregations of the value of the pastorate and a strong desire to secure all its benefits, and a cheerful readiness to do, out of reverence to the Master, and esteem and love for his servants and their work, whatever he has ordained and whatever their comfort and usefulness require!

ARTICLE VI.

THE VATICAN DECREES IN THEIR BEARING ON
CIVIL ALLEGIANCE.

In the prosecution of a purpose not polemical but pacific, I have been led to employ words which belong, more or less, to the region of religious controversy; and which, though they were themselves few, seem to require, from the various feelings they have aroused, that I should carefully define, elucidate, and defend them. The task is not of a kind agreeable to me; but I proceed to perform it. Among the causes which have tended to disturb and perplex the public mind in the consideration of our own religious difficulties, one has been a certain alarm at the aggressive activity and imagined growth of the Roman Catholic Church in this country. All are aware of our susceptibility on this side; and it was not, I think, improper for one who desires to remove everything that can interfere with a calm and judicial temper, and who believes the alarm to be groundless, to state pointedly, though briefly, some reasons for that belief.

Accordingly I did not scruple to use the following language in a paper inserted in the number of the *Contemporary Review* for the month of October. I was speaking of "the question whether a handful of the clergy are or are not engaged in an utterly hopeless and visionary effort to Romanise the Church and people of England."

At no time since the bloody reign of Mary has such a scheme been possible. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth: when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith; when she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.*

* *Contemporary Review*, October, 1874, p. 674.

Had I been, when I wrote this passage, as I now am, addressing myself in considerable measure to my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, I should have striven to avoid the seeming roughness of some of these expressions; but as the question is now about their substance, from which I am not in any particular disposed to recede, any attempt to recast their general form would probably mislead. I proceed, then, to deal with them on their merits.

More than one friend of mine among those who have been led to join the Roman Catholic communion has made this passage the subject, more or less, of expostulation. Now, in my opinion, the assertions which it makes, are, as coming from a layman who has spent most and the best years of his life in the observation and practice of politics, not aggressive, but defensive.

It is neither the abettors of the Papal Chair, nor any one who, however far from being an abettor of the Papal Chair, actually writes from a Papal point of view, that has a right to remonstrate with the world at large; but it is the world at large, on the contrary, that has the fullest right to remonstrate, first with his Holiness, secondly, with those who share his proceedings, thirdly, even with such as passively allow and accept them.

I, therefore, as one of the world at large, propose to expostulate in my turn. I shall strive to show to such of my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects as may kindly give me a hearing, that, after the singular steps which the authorities of their Church have in these last years thought fit to take, the people of this country, who fully believe in their loyalty, are entitled on purely civil grounds to expect from them some declaration or manifestation of opinion in reply to that ecclesiastical party in their Church who have laid down, in their name, principles adverse to the purity and integrity of civil allegiance.

Undoubtedly my allegations are of great breadth. Such broad allegations require a broad and a deep foundation. The first question which they raise is, Are they, as to the material part of them, true? But even their truth might not suffice to show that their publication was opportune. The second question, then, which they raise is, Are they, for any practical purpose,

material? And there is yet a third, though a minor, question, which arises out of the propositions in connection with their authorship, Were they suitable to be set forth by the present writer?

To these three questions I will now set myself to reply. And the matter of my reply will, as I conceive, constitute and convey an appeal to the understandings of my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, which I trust that, at the least, some among them may deem not altogether unworthy of their consideration.

From the language used by some of the organs of Roman Catholic opinion, it is, I am afraid, plain that in some quarters they have given deep offence. Displeasure, indignation, even fury, might be said to mark the language which in the heat of the moment has been expressed here and there. They have been hastily treated as an attack made upon Roman Catholics generally, nay, as an insult offered them. It is obvious to reply that of Roman Catholics generally they state nothing. Together with a reference to "converts," of which I shall say more, they constitute generally a free and strong animadversion on the conduct of the Papal Chair, and of its advisers and abettors. If I am told that he who animadverts upon these assails thereby, or insults, Roman Catholics at large, who do not choose their ecclesiastical rulers, and are not recognised as having any voice in the government of their Church, I cannot be bound by or accept a proposition which seems to me to be so little in accordance with reason.

Before all things, however, I should desire it to be understood that, in the remarks now offered, I desire to eschew not only religious bigotry, but likewise theological controversy. Indeed, with theology, except in its civil bearing, with theology as such, I have here nothing whatever to do. But it is the peculiarity of Roman theology, that, by thrusting itself into the temporal domain, it naturally and even necessarily comes to be a frequent theme of political discussion. To quiet-minded Roman Catholics it must be a subject of infinite annoyance that their religion is, on this ground more than any other, the subject of criticism; more than any other, the occasion of conflicts with the State and

of civil disquietude. I feel sincerely how much hardship their case entails. But this hardship is brought upon them altogether by the conduct of the authorities of their own Church. Why did theology enter so largely into the debates of Parliament on Roman Catholic Emancipation? Certainly not because our statesmen and debaters of fifty years ago had an abstract love of such controversies, but because it was extensively believed that the Pope of Rome had been and was a trespasser upon ground which belonged to the civil authority, and that he affected to determine by spiritual prerogative questions of the civil sphere. This fact, if fact it be, and not the truth or falsehood, the reasonableness or unreasonableness, of any article of purely religious belief, is the whole and sole cause of the mischief. To this fact, and to this fact alone, my language is referable; but for this fact it would have been neither my duty nor my desire to use it. All other Christian bodies are content with freedom in their own religious domain. Orientals, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Nonconformists, one and all, in the present day, contentedly and thankfully accept the benefits of civil order; never pretend that the State is not its own master; make no religious claims to temporal possessions or advantages; and, consequently, never are in perilous collision with the State. Nay more, even so I believe it is with the mass of Roman Catholics individually. But not so with the leaders of their Church, or with those who take pride in following the leaders. Indeed, this has been made matter of boast:

There is not another Church so called (than the Roman), nor any community professing to be a Church, which does not submit, or obey, or hold its peace, when the civil governors of the world command.—“The Present Crisis of the Holy See,” by H. E. Manning, D. D. London, 1861. p. 75.

The Rome of the middle ages claimed universal monarchy. The modern Church of Rome has abandoned nothing, retracted nothing. Is that all? Far from it. By condemning (as will be seen) those who, like Bishop Doyle in 1826,* charge the mediæval Popes with aggression, she unconditionally, though covertly,

* Lords' Committee, March 18, 1826: Report, p. 190.

maintains what the mediæval Popes maintained. But even this is not the worst. The worst by far is that whereas, in the national churches and communities in the middle ages, there was a brisk, vigorous, and constant opposition to these outrageous claims, an opposition which stoutly asserted its own orthodoxy, which always caused itself to be respected, and which even sometimes gained the upper hand; now, in this nineteenth century of ours, and while it is growing old, this same opposition has been put out of court and judicially extinguished within the Papal Church, by the recent decrees of the Vatican. And it is impossible for persons accepting those decrees justly to complain, when such documents are subjected in good faith to a strict examination as respects their compatibility with civil right and the obedience of subjects.

In defending my language, I shall carefully mark its limits. But all defence is reassertion, which properly requires a deliberate reconsideration; and no man who thus reconsiders should scruple, if he find so much as a word that may convey a false impression, to amend it. Exactness in stating truth according to the measure of our intelligence, is an indispensable condition of justice, and of a title to be heard.

My propositions, then, as they stood, are these :

1. That "Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem*, a policy of violence and change in faith."

2. That "she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused."

3. That "no one can now become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another."

4. That "she (Rome) has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history."

Of the first and fourth of these propositions I shall dispose rather summarily, as they appear to belong to the theological domain. They refer to a fact, and they record an opinion. One fact to which they refer is this: that, in days within my memory, the constant, favorite, and imposing argument of Roman controversialists was the unbroken and absolute identity in belief of the

Roman Church from the days of our Saviour until now. No one, who has at all followed the course of this literature during the last forty years, can fail to be sensible of the change in its present tenor. More and more have the assertions of continuous uniformity of doctrine receded into scarcely penetrable shadow. More and more have another series of assertions, of a living authority, ever ready to open, adopt, and shape Christian doctrine according to the times, taken their place. Without discussing the abstract compatibility of these lines of argument, I note two of the immense practical differences between them. In the first, the office claimed by the Church is principally that of a witness to facts; in the second, principally that of a judge, if not a revealer, of doctrine. In the first, the processes which the Church undertakes are subject to a constant challenge and appeal to history; in the second, no amount of historical testimony can avail against the unmeasured power of the theory of development. Most important, most pregnant considerations these, at least for two classes of persons: for those who think that exaggerated doctrines of Church power are among the real and serious dangers of the age; and for those who think that against all forms, both of superstition and of unbelief, one main preservative is to be found in maintaining the truth and authority of history, and the inestimable value of the historic spirit.

So much for the fact; as for the opinion, that the recent Papal decrees are at war with modern thought, and that, purporting to enlarge the necessary creed of Christendom, they involve a violent breach with history, this is a matter unfit for me to discuss, as it is a question of divinity, but not unfit for me to have mentioned in my article, since the opinion given there is the opinion of those with whom I was endeavoring to reason—namely, the great majority of the British public.

If it is thought that the word violence was open to exception, I regret I cannot give it up. The justification of the ancient definitions of the Church, which have endured the storms of 1,500 years, was to be found in this, that they were not arbitrary or wilful, but that they wholly sprang from, and related to theories rampant at the time, and regarded as menacing to Chris-

tian belief. Even the canons of the Council of Trent have in the main this amount, apart from their matter, of presumptive warrant. But the decrees of the present perilous Pontificate have been passed to favor and precipitate prevailing currents of opinion in the ecclesiastical world of Rome. The growth of what is often termed among Protestants Mariolatry, and of belief in Papal Infallibility, was notoriously advancing, but it seems not fast enough to satisfy the dominant party. To aim the deadly blows of 1854* and 1870 at the old historic, scientific, and modern school, was surely an act of violence; and with this censure the proceeding of 1870 has actually been visited by the first living theologian now within the Roman Communion. I mean Dr. John Henry Newman, who has used these significant words, among others, "Why should an aggressive and insolent faction be allowed to make the heart of the just sad whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful?" †

I take next my second proposition: that Rome has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused.

Is this then a fact, or is it not?

I must assume that it is denied; and therefore I cannot wholly pass by the work of proof. But I will state in the fewest possible words, and with references, a few propositions, all the holders of which have been condemned by the See of Rome during my own generation, and especially within the last twelve or fifteen years. And, in order that I may do nothing toward importing passion into what is matter of pure argument, I will avoid citing any of the fearfully energetic epithets in which the condemnations are sometimes clothed.

1. Those who maintain the liberty of the Press. Encyclical Letter of Pope Gregory XVI. in 1831; and of Pope Pius IX. in 1864.

2. Or the liberty of conscience and of worship. Encyclical of Pius IX., December 8, 1864.

* Decree of the Immaculate Conception.

† See the remarkable letter of Dr. Newman to Bishop Ullathorne, in *The Guardian* of April 6, 1870.

3. Or the liberty of speech. "Syllabus" of March 18, 1861. Prop. lxxix. Encyclical of Pope Pius IX., December 8, 1864.

4. Or who contend that Papal judgments and decrees may, without sin, be disobeyed, or differed from, unless they treat of the rules (*dogmata*) of faith or morals. *Ibid.*

5. Or who assign to the State the power of defining the civil rights (*jura*) and province of the Church. "Syllabus" of Pope Pius IX., March 8, 1861. *Ibid.* Prop. xix.

6. Or who hold that Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical Councils have transgressed the limits of their power, and usurped the rights of princes. *Ibid.* Prop. xxiii.

(It must be borne in mind that Œcumenical Councils here mean Roman Councils not recognised by the rest of the Church. The Councils of the early Church did not interfere with the jurisdiction of the civil power.)

7. Or that the Church may not employ force. (*Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet.*) "Syllabus," Prop. xxiv.

8. Or that power, not inherent in the office of the Episcopate, but granted to it by the civil authority, may be withdrawn from it at the discretion of that authority. *Ibid.* Prop. xxv.

9. Or that the (*immunitas*) civil immunity of the Church and its ministers depends upon civil right. *Ibid.* Prop. xxx.

10. Or that in the conflict of laws, civil and ecclesiastical, the civil law should prevail. *Ibid.* Prop. xlii.

11. Or that any method of instruction of youth, solely secular, may be approved. *Ibid.* Prop. xlvi.

12. Or that knowledge of things philosophical and civil may and should decline to be guided by divine and ecclesiastical authority. *Ibid.* Prop. lvii.

13. Or that marriage is not in its essence a sacrament. *Ibid.* Prop. lxvi.

14. Or that marriage not sacramentally contracted (*si sacramentum excludatur*) has a binding force. *Ibid.* Prop. lxxiii.

15. Or that the abolition of the temporal power of the Pope would be highly advantageous to the Church. *Ibid.* Prop. lxxvi. Also lxx.

16. Or that any other religion than the Roman religion may be established by a State. *Ibid.* Prop. lxxvii.

17. Or that in "countries called Catholic," the free exercise of other religions may laudably be allowed. "Syllabus." Prop. lxxviii.

18. Or that the Roman Pontiff ought to come to terms with progress, liberalism, and modern civilisation. *Ibid.* Prop. lxxx. (For the original passages from the Encyclical and Syllabus of Pius IX., see Appendix A.)

This list is now, perhaps, sufficiently extended, although I have as yet not touched the decrees of 1870. But, before quitting it, I must offer three observations on what it contains.

Firstly: I do not place all the propositions in one and the same category; for there are a portion of them which, as far as I can judge, might, by the combined aid of favorable construction and vigorous explanation, be brought within bounds. And I hold that favorable construction of the terms used in controversies is the right general rule. But this can only be so when construction is an open question. When the author of certain propositions claims, as in the case before us, a sole and unlimited power to interpret them in such manner and by such rules as he may from time to time think fit, the only defence for all others concerned is at once to judge for themselves, how much of unreason or of mischief the words, naturally understood, may contain.

Secondly: It may appear upon a hasty perusal that neither the infliction of penalty in life, limb, liberty, or goods, on disobedient members of the Christian Church, nor the title to depose sovereigns and release subjects from their allegiance, with all its revolting consequences, has been here reaffirmed. In terms, there is no mention of them; but in the substance of the propositions, I grieve to say, they are beyond doubt included. For it is notorious that they have been declared and decreed by "Rome"—that is to say, by Popes and Papal Councils; and the stringent condemnations of the Syllabus include all those who hold that Popes and Papal Councils (declared œcumenical) have transgressed the just limits of their power, or usurped the rights of princes. What have been their opinions and decrees about persecution I

need hardly say, and indeed the right to employ physical force is even here undisguisedly claimed (No. 7).

Even while I am writing I am reminded, from an unquestionable source, of the words of Pope Pius IX. himself on the deposing power. I add only a few italics; the words appear as given in a translation, without the original:

The present Pontiff used these words in replying to the address from the Academia of the Catholic Religion (July 21, 1873):

“There are many errors regarding the Infallibility; but the most malicious of all is that which includes, in that dogma, the *right* of deposing sovereigns, and declaring the people no longer bound by the obligation of fidelity. This *right* has now and again, in critical circumstances, been exercised by the Pontiffs; but it has nothing to do with Papal Infallibility. Its origin was not the infallibility, but the authority of the Pope. This authority, in accordance with public right, which was then vigorous, and with the acquiescence of all Christian nations, who revered in the Pope the supreme Judge of the Christian Commonwealth, extended so far as to pass judgment, even in civil affairs, on the acts of princes and of nations.”*

Lastly, I must observe that these are not mere opinions of the Pope himself, nor even are they opinions which he might paternally recommend to the pious consideration of the faithful. With the promulgation of his opinions is unhappily combined, in the Encyclical Letter, which virtually, though not expressly, includes the whole, a command to all his spiritual children (from which command we the disobedient children are in no way excluded) to hold them.

(A) Itaque omnes et singulas pravas opiniones et doctrinas singillatim hisce literis commemoratas auctoritate nostra Apostolica reprobamus, proscribimus atque damnamus; easque ab omnibus Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filiis veluti reprobatas, prosriptas, atque damnatas omnino haberi volumus et mandamus. Encycl. Dec. 8, 1864.

And the decrees of 1870 will presently show us what they established as the binding force of the mandate thus conveyed to the Christian world.

*“Civilisation and the See of Rome.” By Lord Robert Montagu. Dublin. 1874. A lecture delivered under the auspices of the Catholic Union of Ireland. I have a little misgiving about the version, but not of a nature to affect the substance.

I now pass to the operation of these extraordinary declarations on personal or private duty.

When the cup of endurance which had so long been filling, began, with the Council of the Vatican in 1870, to overflow, the most learned living theologian of the Roman communion, Dr. von Döllinger, long the foremost champion of his Church, refused compliance, and submitted, with his temper undisturbed and his freedom unimpaired, to the extreme and most painful penalty of excommunication. With him many of the most learned and respected theologians of the Roman communion in Germany underwent the same sentence. The very few, who elsewhere (I do not speak of Switzerland) suffered in like manner, deserve an admiration rising in proportion to their fewness. It seems as though Germany, from which Luther blew the mighty trumpet that even now echoes through the land, still retained her primacy in the domain of conscience, still supplied the *centuria prerogativa* of the great *comitia* of the world.

But let no man wonder or complain. Without imputing to any one the moral murder—for such it is—of stifling conscience and conviction, I for one cannot be surprised that the fermentation, which is working through the mind of the Latin Church, has as yet (elsewhere than in Germany) but in few instances come to the surface. By the mass of mankind, it is morally impossible that questions such as these can be adequately examined; so it ever has been, and so in the main will it continue, until the principles of manufacturing machinery shall have been applied, and with analogous results, to intellectual and moral processes. Followers they are and must be, and in a certain sense ought to be. But what as to the leaders of society, the men of education and of leisure? I will try to suggest some answer in few words. A change of religious profession is under all circumstances a great and awful thing. Much more is the question, however, between conflicting, or apparently conflicting duties, arduous, when the religion of a man has been changed for him, over his head, and without the very least of his participation. Far be it then from me to make any Roman Catholic, except the great hierarchic Power, and those who have egged it on, responsible for the por-

tentious proceedings which we have witnessed. My conviction is that, even of those who may not shake off the yoke, multitudes will vindicate at any rate their loyalty at the expense of the consistency, which perhaps in difficult matters of religion few among us perfectly maintain. But this belongs to the future; for the present nothing could, in my opinion, be more unjust than to hold the members of the Roman Church in general already responsible for the recent innovations. The duty of observers, who think the claims involved in these decrees arrogant and false, and such as not even impotence, real or supposed, ought to shield from criticism, is frankly to state the case, and, by way of friendly challenge, to entreat their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen to replace themselves in the position which, five-and-forty years ago, this nation, by the voice and action of its Parliament, declared its belief that they held.

Upon a strict reëxamination of the language as apart from the substance of my fourth proposition, I find it faulty, inasmuch as it seems to imply that a "convert" now joining the Papal Church, not only gives up certain rights and duties of freedom, but surrenders them by a conscious and deliberate act. What I have less accurately said that he renounced, I might have more accurately said that he forfeited. To speak strictly, the claim now made upon him by the authority which he solemnly and with the highest responsibility acknowledges, requires him to surrender his mental and moral freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another. There may have been and may be persons who in their sanguine trust will not shrink from this result, and will console themselves with the notion that their loyalty and civil duty are to be committed to the custody of one much wiser than themselves. But I am sure that there are also "converts" who, when they perceive, will by word and act reject the consequences which relentless logic draws for them. If, however, my proposition be true, there is no escape from the dilemma. Is it then true, or is it not true, that Rome requires a convert, who now joins her, to forfeit his moral and mental freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another?

In order to place this matter in as clear a light as I can, it will be necessary to go back a little upon our recent history.

A century ago we began to relax that system of penal laws against Roman Catholics, at once pettifogging, base, and cruel, which Mr. Burke has scathed and blasted with his immortal eloquence.

When this process had reached the point at which the question was whether they should be admitted into Parliament, there arose a great and prolonged national controversy; and some men, who at no time of their lives were narrow-minded, such as Sir Robert Peel, the Minister, resisted the concession. The arguments in its favor were obvious and strong, and they ultimately prevailed. But the strength of the opposing party had lain in the allegation that, from the nature and claims of the Papal power, it was not possible for the consistent Roman Catholic to pay to the Crown of this country an entire allegiance, and that the admission of persons thus self-disabled to Parliament was inconsistent with the safety of the State and nation, which had not very long before, it may be observed, emerged from a struggle for existence.

An answer to this argument was indispensable; and it was supplied mainly from two sources. The Josephine laws,* then still subsisting in the Austrian Empire, and the arrangements which had been made after the peace of 1815 by Prussia and the German States with Pius VII. and Gonsalvi, proved that the Papal Court could submit to circumstances, and could allow material restraints even upon the exercise of its ecclesiastical prerogatives. Here, then, was a reply in the sense of the phrase *solvitur ambulando*. Much information of this class was collected for the information of Parliament and the country.† But there were also

* See the work of Count dal Pozzo on the "Austrian Ecclesiastical Law." London: Murray, 1827. The Leopoldine Laws in Tuscany may also be mentioned.

† See "Report from the Select Committee appointed to report the nature and substance of the Laws and Ordinances existing in Foreign States respecting the regulation of their Roman Catholic subjects in Ecclesiastical Matters, and their intercourse with the See of Rome, or any other Foreign Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction." Printed for the House of Commons in 1816 and 1817. Reprinted 1851.

measures taken to learn, from the highest Roman Catholic authorities of this country, what was the exact situation of the members of that communion with respect to some of the better known exorbitances of Papal assumption. Did the Pope claim any temporal jurisdiction? Did he still pretend to the exercise of a power to depose kings, release subjects from their allegiance, and incite them to revolt? Was faith to be kept with heretics? Did the Church still teach the doctrines of persecution? Now, to no one of these questions could the answer really be of the smallest immediate moment to this powerful and solidly compacted kingdom. They were topics selected by way of sample; and the intention was to elicit declarations showing generally that the fangs of the mediæval Popedom had been drawn, and its claws torn away; that the Roman system, however strict in its dogma, was perfectly compatible with civil liberty, and with the institutions of a free State moulded on a different religious basis from its own.

Answers in abundance were obtained, tending to show that the doctrines of deposition and persecution, of keeping no faith with heretics, and of universal dominion, were obsolete beyond revival; that every assurance could be given respecting them, except such as require the shame of a formal retraction; that they were in effect mere bunglers, unworthy to be taken into account by a nation which prided itself on being made up of practical men.

But it was unquestionably felt that something more than the renunciation of these particular opinions was necessary in order to secure the full concession of civil rights to Roman Catholics. As to their individual loyalty, a State disposed to generous or candid interpretation had no reason to be uneasy. It was only with regard to requisitions which might be made on them from another quarter, that apprehension could exist. It was reasonable that England should desire to know not only what the Pope*

* At that period the eminent and able Bishop Doyle did not scruple to write as follows: "We are taunted with the proceedings of Popes. What, my Lord, have we Catholics to do with the proceedings of Popes, or why should we be made accountable for them?" *Essay on the Catholic Claims.* To Lord Liverpool, 1826. p. 111.

might do for himself, but to what demands, by the constitution of their Church, they were liable; and how far it was possible that such demands could touch their civil duty. The theory which placed every human being in things spiritual, and things temporal, at the feet of the Roman Pontiff, had not been an *idolum specus*, a mere theory of the chamber. Brain-power never surpassed in the political history of the world had been devoted for centuries to the single purpose of working it into the practice of Christendom; had in the West achieved for an impossible problem a partial success; and had in the East punished the obstinate independence of the Church by the Latin conquest of Constantinople, which effectually prepared the way for the downfall of the Eastern Empire, and the establishment of the Turks in Europe. What was really material, therefore, was, not whether the Papal Chair laid claim to this or that particular power, but whether it laid claim to some power that included them all, and whether that claim had received such sanction from the authorities of the Latin Church, that there remained within her borders absolutely no tenable standing-ground from which war against it could be maintained. Did the Pope then claim infallibility? Or did he, either without infallibility or with it, (and, if with it, so much the worse,) claim an universal obedience from his flock? And were these claims, either or both, affirmed in his Church by authority which even the least Papal of the members of that Church must admit to be binding upon conscience?

The first two of these questions were covered by the third; and well it was that they were so covered, for to them no satisfactory answer could even then be given. The Popes had kept up, with comparatively little intermission, for well nigh a thousand years their claim to dogmatic infallibility; and had, at periods within the same tract of time, often enough made, and never retracted, that other claim which is theoretically less but practically larger: their claim to an obedience virtually universal from the baptized members of the Church. To the third question it was fortunately more practicable to prescribe a satisfactory reply. It was well known that, in the days of its glory and intellectual power, the great Gallican Church had not only not admitted, but

had denied, Papal infallibility, and had declared that the local laws and usages of the Church could not be set aside by the will of the Pontiff. Nay, further, it was believed that in the main these had been, down to the close of the last century, the prevailing opinions of the Cisalpine Churches in communion with Rome. The Council of Constance had in act as well as word shown that the Pope's judgments, and the Pope himself, were triable by the assembled representatives of the Christian world. And the Council of Trent, notwithstanding the predominance in it of Italian and Roman influences, if it had not denied, yet had not affirmed either proposition.

All that remained was to know what were the sentiments entertained on these vital points by the leaders and guides of Roman Catholic opinion nearest to our own doors. And here testimony was offered, which must not and cannot be forgotten. In part this was the testimony of witnesses before the Committee of the House of Lords in 1825. I need quote two answers only, given by the prelate, who more than any other represented his Church, and influenced the mind of this country in favor of concession at the time, namely, Bishop Doyle. He was asked : *

In what and how far does the Roman Catholic profess to obey the Pope?

He replied :

The Catholic professes to obey the Pope in matters which regard his religious faith, and in those matters of ecclesiastical discipline which have already been defined by the competent authorities.

And again :

Does that justify the objection that is made to Catholics, that their allegiance is divided?

I do not think it does in any way. We are bound to obey the Pope in those things that I have already mentioned. But our obedience to the law, and the allegiance which we owe the sovereign, are complete, and full,

* Committees of both Lords and Commons sat; the former in 1825, the latter in 1824-5. The References were identical, and ran as follows: "To inquire into the state of Ireland, more particularly with reference to the circumstances which may have led to disturbances in that part of the United Kingdom." Bishop Doyle was examined March 21, 1825, and April 21, 1825, before the Lords.

and perfect, and undivided, inasmuch as they extend to all political legal, and civil rights of the King or of his subjects. I think the allegiance due to the King and the allegiance due to the Pope are as distinct and as divided in their nature as any two things can possibly be.

Such is the opinion of the dead prelate. We shall presently hear the opinion of a living one. But the sentiments of the dead man powerfully operated on the open and trustful temper of this people to induce them to grant, and at the cost of so much popular feeling and national traditions, the great and just concession of 1829. That concession, without such declarations, it would, to say the least, have been far more difficult to obtain.

Now, bodies are usually held to be bound by the evidence of their own selected and typical witnesses. But in this instance the colleagues of those witnesses thought fit also to speak collectively.

First let us quote from the collective "Declaration," in the year 1826, of the Vicars Apostolic, who, with Episcopal authority, governed the Roman Catholics of Great Britain :

The allegiance which Catholics hold to be due, and are bound to pay, to their Sovereign, and to the civil authority of the State, is perfect and undivided.

They declare that neither the Pope nor any other prelate or ecclesiastical person of the Roman Catholic Church . . . has any right to interfere, directly or indirectly, in the civil government, nor to oppose in any manner the performance of the civil duties which are due to the King.

Not less explicit was the Hierarchy of the Roman Communion in its "Pastoral Address to the Clergy and Laity of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland," dated January 25, 1823. This address contains a declaration, from which I extract the following words :

It is a duty which they owe to themselves, as well as to their Protestant fellow-subjects, whose good opinion they value, to endeavor once more to remove the false imputations that have been frequently cast upon the faith and discipline of that Church which is intrusted to their care, that all may be enabled to know with accuracy their genuine principles.

In Article II. :

They declare on oath their belief that it is not an article of the

Catholic Faith, neither are they thereby required to believe that the Pope is infallible.

And, after various recitals, they set forth :

After this full, explicit, and sworn declaration, we are utterly at a loss to conceive on what possible ground we could be justly charged with bearing toward our most gracious Sovereign only a divided allegiance.

Thus, besides much else which I will not stop to quote, Papal infallibility was most solemnly declared to be a matter on which each man might think as he pleased; the Pope's power to claim obedience was strictly and narrowly limited: it was expressly denied that he had any title, direct or indirect, to interfere in civil government. Of the right of the Pope to define the limits which divide the civil from the spiritual by his own authority, not one word is said by the prelates of either country.

Since that time, all these propositions have been reversed! The Pope's infallibility, when he speaks *ex cathedra* on faith and morals, has been declared, with the assent of the bishops of the Roman Church, to be an article of faith, binding on the conscience of every Christian; his claim to the obedience of his spiritual subjects has been declared in like manner without any practical limit or reserve; and his supremacy, without any reserve of civil rights, has been similarly affirmed to include everything which relates to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world. And these doctrines, we now know on the highest authority, it is of necessity for salvation to believe.

Independently, however, of the Vatican Decrees themselves, it is necessary for all who wish to understand what has been the amount of the wonderful change now consummated in the constitution of the Latin Church, and what is the present degradation of its episcopal order, to observe also the change, amounting to revolution, of form in the present, as compared with other conciliatory decrees. Indeed, that spirit of centralization, the excesses of which are as fatal to vigorous life in the Church as in the State, seems now nearly to have reached the last and furthest point of possible advancement and exaltation.

When, in fact, we speak of the Decrees of the Council of the Vatican, we use a phrase which will not bear strict examination. The Canons of the Council of Trent were, at least, the real canons of a real council; and the strain in which they are promulgated is this: *Hæc sacrosancta, ecumenica, et generalis Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, in ea præsidentibus eisdem tribus apostolicis Legatis, hortatur, or docet, or statuit, or decernit,* and the like; and its canons, as published in Rome, are "*Canones et decreta Sacrosancti ecumenici Concilii Tridentini,*" ("Romæ: in Collegio urbano de Propagandâ Fide." 1833), and so forth. But what we have now to do with is the *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesia Christi, edita in Sessione tertia* of the Vatican Council. It is not a constitution made by the Council, but one promulgated in the Council.* And who is it that legislates and decrees? It is *Pius Episcopus, servus servorum Dei*: and the seductive plural of his *docemus et declaramus* is simply the dignified and ceremonious "We" of royal declarations. The document is dated *Pontificatus nostri Anno XXV.*: and the humble share of the assembled episcopate in the transaction is represented by *sacro approbante concilio*. And now for the propositions themselves.

First comes the Pope's infallibility:

(B) "*Docemus, et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus, Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum, omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in Beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere, qua Divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit: ideoque ejus Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese non autem ex consensu Ecclesia irreformabiles esse.*" (Constitutio de Ecclesia, c. iv.)

Will it, then, be said that the infallibility of the Pope accrues only when he speaks *ex cathedra*? No doubt this is a very material consideration for those who have been told that the

* I am aware that, as some hold, this was the case with the Council of the Lateran in A. D. 1215. But, first, this has not been established; secondly, the very gist of the evil we are dealing with consists in following (and enforcing) precedents from the age of Pope Innocent III.

private conscience is to derive comfort and assurance from the emanations of the Papal chair: for there is no established or accepted definition of the phrase *ex cathedra*, and he has no power to obtain and no guide to direct him in his choice among some twelve theories on the subject, which, it is said, are bandied to and fro among Roman theologians, except the despised and discarded agency of his private judgment. But while thus sorely tantalized, he is not one whit protected. For there is still one person, and one only, who can unquestionably declare *ex cathedra* what is *ex cathedra* and what is not, and who can declare it when and as he pleases. That person is the Pope himself. The provision is, that no document he issues shall be valid without a seal, but the seal remains under his own sole lock and key.

Again, it may be sought to plead, that the Pope is, after all, only operating by sanctions which unquestionably belong to the religious domain. He does not propose to invade the country, to seize Woolwich, or burn Portsmouth. He will only, at the worst, excommunicate opponents, as he has excommunicated Dr. von Döllinger and others. Is this a good answer? After all, even in the Middle Ages, it was not by the direct action of fleets and armies of their own that the Popes contended with kings who were refractory: it was mainly by interdicts, and by the refusal, which they entailed when the bishops were not brave enough to refuse their publication, of religious offices to the people. It was thus that England suffered under John, France under Philip Augustus, Leon under Alphonso the Noble, and every country in its turn. But the inference may be drawn that they who, while using spiritual weapons for such an end, do not employ temporal means, only fail to employ them because they have them not. A religious society, which delivers volleys of spiritual censure in order to impede the performance of civil duties, does all the mischief that is in its power to do, and brings into question, in the face of the State, its title to civil protection.

Will it be said, finally, that the Infallibility touches only matter of faith and morals? Only matter of morals! Will any of the Roman casuists kindly acquaint us what are the departments and functions of human life which do not and cannot fall within

the domain of morals? If they will not tell us, we must look elsewhere. In his work entitled "Literature and Dogma," (pages 15, 44,) Mr. M. Arnold quaintly informs us—as they tell us nowadays how many parts of our poor bodies are solid and how many aqueous—that about 75 per cent. of all we do belongs to the department of "conduct." Conduct and morals, we may suppose, are nearly coextensive. Three-fourths, then, of life are thus handed over. But who will guarantee to us the other fourth? Certainly not St. Paul, who says, "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." And, "Whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." (1 Cor., x. 31; Col., iii. 7.) No! Such a distinction would be the unworthy device of a shallow policy, vainly used to hide the daring of that wild ambition which at Rome, not from the throne but from behind the throne, prompts the movements of the Vatican. I care not to ask if there be dregs or tatters of human life, such as can escape from the description and boundary of morals. I submit that duty is a power which rises with us in the morning, and goes to rest with us at night. It is coextensive with the action of our intelligence. It is the shadow which cleaves to us go where we will, and which only leaves us when we leave the light of life. So, then, it is the supreme direction of us in respect to all duty, which the Pontiff declares to belong to him, *sacro approbante concilio*; and this declaration he makes, not as an otiose opinion of the schools, but *cunctis fidelibus credendam et tenendam*.

But we shall now see that even if a loophole had at this point been left unclosed, the void is supplied by another provision of the Decrees. While the reach of the Infallibility is as wide as it may please the Pope, or those who may prompt the Pope, to make it, there is something wider still, and that is the claim to an absolute and entire obedience. This obedience is to be rendered to his orders in the cases I shall proceed to point out, without any qualifying condition, such as the *ex cathedra*. The sounding name of Infallibility has so fascinated the public mind, and riveted it on the fourth chapter of the Constitution *de Ecclesia*,

that its near neighbor, the third chapter, has, at least in my opinion, received very much less than justice. Let us turn to it:

(C) Cujuscunque ritus et dignitatis pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchicæ subordinationis veræque obedientiæ obstringuntur, non solum in rebus quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent. . . . Hæc est Catholicæ veritatis doctrina, a qua deviare, salva fide atque salute, nemo potest. . . .

Docemus etiam et declaramus eum esse judicem supremum fidelium, et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius iudicium posse recurri: Sedis vero Apostolicæ, cuius autoritate major non est, iudicium a nemine fore retractandum. Neque cuiquam de ejus iudicio licere iudicare.*

Even, therefore, where the judgments of the Pope do not present the credentials of infallibility, they are unappealable and irreversible, no person may pass judgment upon them, and all men, clerical and lay, dispersedly or in the aggregate, are bound truly to obey them; and from this rule of Catholic truth no man can depart, save at the peril of his salvation. Surely, it is allowable to say that this third chapter on universal obedience is a formidable rival to the fourth chapter on Infallibility. Indeed, to an observer from without, it seems to leave the dignity to the other, but to reserve the stringency and efficiency to itself. The third chapter is the Merovingian Monarch; the fourth is the Carolingian Mayor of the Palace. The third has an overawing splendor; the fourth, an iron gripe. Little does it matter to me whether my superior claims infallibility, so long as he is entitled to demand and exact conformity. This, it will be observed, he demands even in cases not covered by his infallibility: cases, therefore, in which he admits it to be possible that he may be wrong, but finds it intolerable to be told so. As he must be obeyed in all his judgments, though not *ex cathedra*, it seems a pity he could not likewise give the comforting assurance that they are all certain to be right.

But why this ostensible reduplication, this apparent surplussage? Why did the astute contrivers of this tangled scheme conclude that they could not afford to rest content with pledging the

* Dogmatic Constitutions, etc., c. iii. Dublin. 1870, pp. 30-32.

Council to infallibility in terms which are not only wide to a high degree, but elastic beyond all measure ?

Though they must have known perfectly well that "faith and morals" carried everything, or everything worth having, in the purely individual sphere, they also knew just as well, that even where the individual was subjugated, they might and would still have to deal with the State.

In mediæval history this distinction is not only clear, but glaring. Outside the borders of some narrow and proscribed sect, now and then emerging, we never, or scarcely ever, hear of private and personal resistance to the Pope. The manful "Protestantism" of mediæval times had its activity almost entirely in the sphere of public, national, and state rights. Too much attention, in my opinion, cannot be fastened on this point. It is the very root and kernel of the matter. Individual servitude, however abject, will not satisfy the party now dominant in the Latin Church—the State must also be a slave.

Our Saviour had recognised as distinct the two provinces of the civil rule and the Church ; had nowhere intimated that the spiritual authority was to claim the disposal of physical force, and to control in its own domain the authority which is alone responsible for external peace, order, and safety among civilised communities of men. It has been alike the peculiarity, the pride, and the misfortune of the Roman Church, among Christian communities, to allow to itself an unbounded use, as far as its power would go, of earthly instruments for spiritual ends. We have seen with what ample assurances (see further, Appendix B) this nation and Parliament were fed in 1826 ; how well and roundly the full and undivided rights of the civil power and the separation of the two jurisdictions were affirmed. All this had at length been undone, as far as Popes could undo it, in the Syllabus and the Encyclical. It remained to complete the undoing through the subserviency or pliability of the Council.

And the work is now truly complete. Lest it should be said that supremacy in faith and morals, full dominion over personal belief and conduct, did not cover the collective action of men in states, a third province was opened, not indeed to the abstract as-

sersion of infallibility, but to the far more practical and decisive demand of absolute obedience. And this is the proper work of the third chapter, to which I am endeavoring to do a tardy justice. Let us listen again to its few but pregnant words on the point :

Non solum in rebus, quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent.

Absolute obedience, it is boldly declared, is due to the Pope, at the peril of salvation, not alone in faith, in morals, but in all things which concern the discipline and government of the Church. Thus are swept into the Papal net whole multitudes of facts, whole systems of government, prevailing, though in different degrees, in every country of the world. Even in the United States, where the severance between Church and State is supposed to be complete, a long catalogue might be drawn of subjects belonging to the domain and competency of the State, but also undeniably affecting the government of the Church ; such as, by way of example, marriage, burial, education, prison discipline, blasphemy, poor relief, incorporation, mortmain, religious endowments, vows of celibacy and obedience. In Europe the circle is far wider, the points of contact and of interlacing almost innumerable. But on all matters, respecting which any Pope may think proper to declare that they concern either faith, or morals, or the government or discipline of the Church, he claims, with the approval of a Council undoubtedly Œcumenical in the Roman sense, the absolute obedience, at the peril of salvation, of every member of his communion.

It seems not as yet to have been thought wise to pledge the Council in terms to the Syllabus and the Encyclical. That achievement is probably reserved for some one of its sittings yet to come. In the mean time it is well to remember that this claim in respect of all things affecting the discipline and government of the Church, as well as faith and conduct, is lodged in open day by and in the reign of a Pontiff who has condemned free speech, free writing, a free press, toleration of non-conformity, liberty of conscience, the study of civil and philosophical matters in independence of the ecclesiastical authority, marriage unless sacra-

mentally contracted, and the definition by the State of the civil rights (*jura*) of the Church ; who has demanded for the Church, therefore, the title to define its own civil rights, together with a divine right to civil immunities, and a right to use physical force ; and who has also proudly asserted that the Popes of the middle ages, with their councils, did not invade the rights of princes ; as for example, Gregory VII., of the Emperor Henry IV. ; Innocent III., of Raymond of Toulouse ; Paul III., in deposing Henry VIII. ; or Pius V., in performing the like paternal office for Elizabeth.

I submit, then, that my fourth proposition is true : and that England is entitled to ask, and to know, in what way the obedience required by the Pope and the Council of the Vatican is to be reconciled with the integrity of civil allegiance.

It has been shown that the head of their Church, so supported as undoubtedly to speak with its highest authority, claims from Roman Catholics a plenary obedience to whatever he may desire in relation, not to faith but to morals, and not only to these, but to all that concerns the government and discipline of the Church ; that of this much lies within the domain of the State ; that, to obviate all misapprehension, the Pope demands for himself the right to determine the province of his own rights, and has so defined it in formal documents as to warrant any and every invasion of the civil sphere ; and that this new version of the principles of the Papal Church inexorably binds its members to the admission of these exorbitant claims, without any refuge or reservation on behalf of their duty to the Crown.

Under circumstances such as these, it seems not too much to ask of them to confirm the opinion which we, as fellow-countrymen, entertain of them, by sweeping away, in such manner and terms as they may think best, the presumptive imputations which their ecclesiastical rulers at Rome, acting autocratically, appear to have brought upon their capacity to pay a solid and undivided allegiance ; and to fulfil the engagement which their bishops, as political sponsors, promised and declared for them in 1825.

It would be impertinent, as well as needless, to suggest what should be said. All that is requisite is to indicate in substance

that which (if the foregoing argument be sound) is not wanted and that which is. What is not wanted is vague and general assertion, of whatever kind and however sincere. What is wanted, and that in the most specific form and clearest terms, I take to be one of two things—that is to say, either :

I. A demonstration that neither in the name of faith, nor in the name of morals, nor in the name of the government or discipline of the Church, is the Pope of Rome able, by virtue of the powers asserted for him by the Vatican decree, to make any claim upon those who adhere to his communion of such a nature as can impair the integrity of their civil allegiance; or else,

II. That, if and when such claim is made, it will, even although resting on the definitions of the Vatican, be repelled and rejected, just as Bishop Doyle, when he was asked what the Roman Catholic clergy would do if the Pope intermeddled with their religion, replied frankly, “The consequence would be that we should oppose him by every means in our power, even by the exercise of our spiritual authority.”—Report, March 18, 1826, p. 191.

In the absence of explicit assurances to this effect, we should appear to be led, nay, driven, by just reasoning upon that documentary evidence, to the conclusions :

1. That the Pope, authorised by his Council, claims for himself the domain (*a*) of faith, (*b*) of morals, (*c*) of all that concerns the government and discipline of the Church.

2. That he in like manner claims the power of determining the limits of these domains.

3. That he does not sever them, by any acknowledged or intelligible line, from the domains of civil duty and allegiance.

4. That he therefore claims, and claims from the month of July, 1870, onward, with plenary authority, from every convert and member of his Church, that he shall “place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another”—that other being himself.

But next, if these propositions be true, are they also material? The claims cannot, as I much fear, be denied to have been made. It cannot be denied that the Bishops, who govern in things spiritual more than five millions (or nearly one-sixth) of the inhab-

itants of the United Kingdom, have in some cases promoted, in all cases accepted, these claims. It has been a favorite purpose of my life not to conjure up, but to conjure down, public alarms. I am not now going to pretend that either foreign foe or domestic treason can, at the bidding of the Court of Rome, disturb these peaceful shores. But though such fears may be visionary, it is more visionary still to suppose for one moment that the claims of Gregory VII., of Innocent III., and of Boniface VIII., have been disinterred, in the nineteenth century, like hideous mummies picked out of Egyptian sarcophagi, in the interests of archæology, or without a definite and practical aim. As rational beings, we must rest assured that only with a very clearly conceived and foregone purpose have these astonishing reassertions been paraded before the world. What is that purpose?

I can well believe that it is in part theological. There have always been, and there still are, no small proportion of our race, and those by no means in all respects the worst, who are sorely open to the temptation, especially in times of religious disturbance, to discharge their spiritual responsibilities by power of attorney. As advertising houses find custom in proportion not so much to the solidity of their resources as to the magniloquence of their promises and assurances, so theological boldness in the extension of such claims is sure to pay, by widening certain circles of devoted adherents, however it may repel the mass of mankind. There were two special encouragements to this enterprise at the present day: one of them the perhaps unconscious but manifest leaning of some, outside the Roman precinct, to undue exaltation of Church power; the other the reaction which is and must be brought about in favor of superstition by the levity of the destructive speculations so widely current, and the notable hardihood of the anti-Christian writing of the day.

But it is impossible to account sufficiently in this manner for the particular course which has been actually pursued by the Roman Court. All morbid spiritual appetites would have been amply satisfied by claims to infallibility in creed, to the prerogative of miracle, to dominion over the unseen world. In truth there

was occasion, in this view, for nothing except a liberal supply of Salmonean thunder—

Dum flammæ Jovis et sonitus imitatur Olympi.—(*Æn.* vi. 586.)

All this could have been managed by a few Tetzels judiciously distributed over Europe. Therefore the question still remains, why did that court, with policy forever in its eye, lodge such formidable demands for power of the vulgar kind in that sphere which is visible, and where hard knocks can undoubtedly be given as well as received?

It must be for some political object of a very tangible kind that the risks of so daring a raid upon the civil sphere have been deliberately run.

A daring raid it is. For it is most evident that the very assertion of principles which establish an exemption from allegiance, or which impair its completeness, goes, in many other countries of Europe far more directly than with us, to the creation of political strife and to dangers of the most material and tangible kind. The struggle now proceeding in Germany at once occurs to the mind as a palmary instance. I am not competent to give any opinion upon the particulars of that struggle. The institutions of Germany and the relative estimate of State power and individual freedom are materially different from ours. But I must say as much as this: Firstly, it is not Prussia alone that is touched; elsewhere, too, the bone lies ready, though the contention may be delayed. In other States, in Austria particularly, there are recent laws in force raising much the same issues as the Falk laws have raised. But the Roman Court possesses in perfection one art, the art of waiting; and it is her wise maxim to fight but one enemy at a time. Secondly, if I have truly represented the claims promulgated from the Vatican, it is difficult to deny that those claims, and the power which has made them, are primarily responsible for the pains and perils, whatever they may be, of the present conflict between German and Roman enactments. And that which was once truly said of France, may now also be said with not less truth of Germany: when Germany is disquieted, Europe cannot be at rest.

I should feel less anxiety on this subject, had the Supreme Pon-

tiff frankly recognised his altered position since the events of 1870; and, in language as clear, if not as emphatic, as that in which he has proscribed modern civilisation, given to Europe the assurance that he would be no party to the reëstablishment by blood and violence of the Temporal Power of the Church. It is easy to conceive that his personal benevolence, no less than his feelings as an Italian, must have inclined him individually toward a course so humane; and I should add, if I might do it without presumption, so prudent. With what appears to an English eye a lavish prodigality, successive Italian Governments have made over the ecclesiastical powers and privileges of the monarchy, not to the Church of the country for the revival of the ancient, popular, and self-governing elements of its constitution, but to the Papal Chair, for the establishment of ecclesiastical despotism and the suppression of the last vestiges of independence. This course, so difficult for a foreigner to appreciate or even to justify, has been met, not by reciprocal conciliation, but by a constant fire of denunciations and complaints. When the tone of these denunciations and complaints is compared with the language of the authorised and favored Papal organs in the press, and of the Ultramontane party (now the sole legitimate party of the Latin Church) throughout Europe, it leads many to the painful and revolting conclusion that there is a fixed purpose among the secret inspirers of Roman policy to pursue, by the road of force, upon the arrival of any favorable opportunity, the favorite project of reërecting the terrestrial throne of the Pope, even if it can only be reërected on the ashes of the city, and amid the whitening bones of the people. (Appendix C.)

It is difficult to conceive or contemplate the effects of such an endeavor. But the existence at this day of the policy, even in bare idea, is itself a portentous evil. I do not hesitate to say that it is an incentive to general disturbance—a premium upon European wars. It is, in my opinion, not sanguine only, but almost ridiculous to imagine that such a project could eventually succeed; but it is difficult to overestimate the effect which it might produce in generating and exasperating strife. It might even to some extent disturb and paralyse the action of such Gov-

ernments as might interpose for no separate purpose of their own, but only with a view to the maintenance or restoration of the general peace. If the baleful power which is expressed by the phrase *Curia Romana*, and not at all adequately rendered in its historic force by the usual English equivalent, "Court of Rome," really entertains the scheme, it doubtless counts on the support in every country of an organised and devoted party, which, when it can command the scales of political power, will promote interference, and when it is in a minority, will work for securing neutrality. As the peace of Europe may be in jeopardy, and as the duties of England, as one (so to speak) of its constabulary authorities, might come to be in question, it would be most interesting to know the mental attitude of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen in England and Ireland with reference to the subject; and it seems to be one on which we are entitled to solicit information.

For there cannot be the smallest doubt that the temporal power of the Popedom comes within the true meaning of the words used at the Vatican to describe the subjects on which the Pope is authorised to claim, under awful sanctions, the obedience of the "faithful." It is even possible that we have here the key to the enlargement of the province of Obedience beyond the limits of Infallibility, and to the introduction of the remarkable phrase *ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ*. No impartial person can deny that the question of the temporal power very evidently concerns the discipline and government of the Church—concerns it, and most mischievously, as I should venture to think; but in the opinion, up to a late date, of many Roman Catholics, not only most beneficially, but even essentially. Let it be remembered that such a man as the late Count Montalembert, who, in his general politics, was of the Liberal party, did not scruple to hold that the millions of Roman Catholics throughout the world were co-partners with the inhabitants of the States of the Church in regard to their civil government; and as constituting the vast majority, were, of course, entitled to override them. It was also rather commonly held, a quarter of a century ago, that the question of the States of the Church was one with which none but

Roman Catholic powers could have anything to do. This doctrine, I must own, was to me at all times unintelligible. It is now, to say the least, hopelessly and irrecoverably obsolete.

Archbishop Manning, who is the head of the Papal Church in England, and whose ecclesiastical tone is supposed to be in the closest accordance with that of his headquarters, has not thought it too much to say that the civil order of all Christendom is the offspring of the Temporal Power, and has the Temporal Power for its keystone; that on the destruction of the Temporal Power "the laws of nations would at once fall in ruins;" that (our old friend) the deposing power, "taught subjects obedience and princes clemency."—["Three Lectures on the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes." 1860, pp. 34, 46, 47, 58–9, 63.] Nay, this high authority has proceeded further, and has elevated the Temporal Power to the rank of necessary doctrine:

The Catholic Church cannot be silent, it cannot hold its peace; it cannot cease to preach the doctrines of Revelation, not only of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, but likewise of the Seven Sacraments, and of the Infallibility of the Church of God, and of the necessity of Unity, and of the Sovereignty, both spiritual and temporal, of the Holy See.*

I never, for my own part, heard that the work containing this remarkable passage was placed in the "Index Prohibitorum Librorum." On the contrary, its distinguished author was elevated, on the first opportunity, to the headship of the Roman Episcopacy in England, and to the guidance of the million or thereabouts of souls in its communion. And the more recent utterances of the oracle have not descended from the high level of those already cited. They have, indeed, the recommendation of a comment, not without fair claims to authority, on the recent declarations of the Pope and the Council, and of one which goes to prove how far I am from having exaggerated or strained in the foregoing pages the meaning of those declarations. Especially does this hold good on the one point, the most vital of the whole—the title to define the border line of the two provinces, which the Archbishop not unfairly takes to be the true criterion of supremacy, as between rival powers like the Church and the State.

*The Present Crisis of the Holy See.—[By H. E. Manning, D. D. London. 1861, p. 73.]

If, then, the civil power be not competent to decide the limits of the spiritual power, and if the spiritual power can define, with a divine certainty, its own limits, it is evidently supreme. Or, in other words, the spiritual power knows, therefore, the limits and the competence of the civil power. It is thereby, in matters of religion and conscience, supreme. I do not see how this can be denied without denying Christianity. And if this be so, this is the doctrine of the Bull *Unam Sanctam*,* and of the Syllabus, and of the Vatican Council. It is, in fact, Ultramontanism, for this term means neither less nor more. The Church, therefore, is separate and supreme.

Let us then ascertain, somewhat further, what is the meaning of supreme. Any power which is independent, and can alone fix the limits of its own jurisdiction, and can therefore fix the limits of all other jurisdictions is, *ipso facto*, supreme. But the Church of Jesus Christ, within the sphere of revelation, of faith, and morals, is all this, or is nothing, or worse than nothing, an imposture and a usurpation—that is, it is Christ or Antichrist.†

But the whole pamphlet should be read by those who desire to know the true sense of the Papal declaration and Vatican decrees, as they are understood by the most favored ecclesiastics; understood, I am bound to own, so far as I can see, in their natural, legitimate, and inevitable sense. Such readers will be assisted by the treatise in seeing clearly and in admitting frankly, that, whatever demands may hereafter, and in whatever circumstances, be made upon us, we shall be unable to advance with any fairness the plea that it has been done without due notice.

There are millions upon millions of the Protestants of this country who would agree with Archbishop Manning, if he were simply telling us that divine truth is not to be sought from the lips of the State, nor to be sacrificed at its command. But those millions would tell him in return that the State, as the power which is alone responsible for the external order of the world, can alone conclusively and finally be competent to determine what is to take place in the sphere of that external order.

I have shown, then, that the propositions, especially that

* On the Bull *Unam Sanctam*—"of a most odious kind"—see Bishop Doyle's Essay, already cited. He thus describes it.

† "Cæsarism and Ultramontanism." By Archbishop Manning. 1874, pp. 35-6.

which has been felt to be the chief one among them, being true, are also material; material to be generally known, and clearly understood, and well considered, on civil grounds, inasmuch as they invade at a multitude of points the civil sphere, and seem even to have no very remote or shadowy connexion with the future peace and security of Christendom.

There remains yet before us only the shortest and least significant portion of the inquiry, namely, whether these things, being true, and being material to be said, were also proper to be said by me. I must ask pardon if a tone of egotism be detected in this necessarily subordinate portion of my remarks.

For thirty years, and in a great variety of circumstances, in office and as an independent member of Parliament, in majorities and in small minorities, and during the larger portion of the time* as the representative of a great constituency, mainly clerical, I have, with others, labored to maintain and extend the civil rights of my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. The Liberal party of this country, with which I have been commonly associated, has suffered, and sometimes suffered heavily, in public favor and in influence, from the belief that it was too ardent in the pursuit of that policy; while at the same time it has always been in the worst odor with the Court of Rome in consequence of its (I hope) unalterable attachment to Italian liberty and independence. I have sometimes been the spokesman of that party in recommendations which have tended to foster in fact the imputation I have mentioned, though not to warrant it as a matter of reason. But it has existed in fact. So that while (as I think) general justice to society required that these things which I have now set forth should be written, special justice, as toward the party to which I am loyally attached, and which I may have had a share in thus placing at a disadvantage before our countrymen, made it, to say the least, becoming that I should not shrink from writing them.

In discharging that office, I have sought to perform the part not of a theological partisan, but simply of a good citizen; of one hopeful that many of his Roman Catholic friends and fellow-

* From 1847 to 1865 I sat for the University of Oxford.

countrymen, who are, to say the least of it, as good citizens as himself, may perceive that the case is not a frivolous case, but one that merits their attention.

I will next proceed to give the reason why, up to a recent date, I have thought it right in the main to leave to any others who might feel it the duty of dealing in detail with this question.

The great change which seems to me to have been brought about in the position of Roman Catholic Christians as citizens, reached its consummation and came into full operation in July, 1870, by the proceedings or so-called Decrees of the Vatican Council.

Up to that time, opinion in the Roman Church on all matters involving civil liberty, though partially and sometimes widely intimidated, was free wherever it was resolute. During the middle ages, heresy was often extinguished in blood; but in every Cisalpine country a principle of liberty to a great extent held its own, and national life refused to be put down. Nay more, these precious and inestimable gifts had not infrequently for their champions a local prelacy and clergy. The Constitutions of Clarendon, cursed from the Papal throne, were the work of the English bishops. Stephen Langton, appointed directly, through an extraordinary stretch of power, by Innocent III., to the See of Canterbury, headed the Barons of England in extorting from the Papal minion John, the worst and basest of all our sovereigns, that Magna Charta which the Pope at once visited with his anathemas. In the reign of Henry VIII., it was Tunstal, bishop of Durham, who first wrote against the Papal domination. Tunstal was followed by Gardiner; and even the recognition of the Royal Headship was voted by the clergy, not under Cranmer, but under his unsuspected predecessor Warham. Strong and domineering as was the high Papal party in those centuries, the resistance was manful. Thrice in history it seemed as if what we may call the constitutional party in the Church was about to triumph: first, at the epoch of the Council of Constance; secondly, when the French Episcopate was in conflict with Pope Innocent XI.; thirdly, when Clement XIV. levelled with the dust the deadliest foes that mental and moral liberty have ever

known. But from July, 1870, this state of things has passed away, and the death-warrant of that constitutional party has been signed and sealed, and promulgated in form.

Before that time arrived, although I had used expressions sufficiently indicative as to the tendency of things in the great Latin Communion, yet I had for very many years felt it to be the first and paramount duty of the British legislature, whatever Rome might say or do, to give to Ireland all that justice could demand in regard to matters of conscience and of civil equality, and thus to set herself right in the opinion of the civilised world. So far from seeing, what some believed they saw, a spirit of unworthy compliance in such a course, it appeared to me the only one which suited either the dignity or the duty of my country. While this debt remained unpaid, both before and after 1870, I did not think it my province to open formally a line of argument on a question of prospective rather than immediate moment, which might have prejudiced the matter of duty lying nearest our hand, and morally injured Great Britain not less than Ireland, Churchmen and Nonconformists, not less than adherents of the Papal communion, by slackening the disposition to pay the debt of justice. When Parliament had passed the Church Act of 1869, and the Land Act of 1870, there remained only, under the great head of imperial equity, one serious question to be dealt with—that of the higher education. I consider that the Liberal majority in the House of Commons and the Government to which I had the honor and satisfaction to belong, formally tendered payment in full of this portion of the debt by the Irish University Bill of February, 1873. Some, indeed, think that it was overpaid—a question into which this is manifestly not the place to enter. But the Roman Catholic prelacy of Ireland thought fit to procure the rejection of that measure, by the direct influence which they exercised over a certain number of Irish members of Parliament, and by the temptation which they thus offered—the bid, in effect, which (to use a homely phrase) they made to attract the support of the Tory opposition. Their efforts were crowned with a complete success. From that time forward I have felt that the situation was changed, and that im-

portant matters would have to be cleared by suitable explanations. The debt to Ireland has been paid : a debt to the country at large had still to be disposed of, and this has come to be the duty of the hour. So long, indeed, as I continued to be Prime Minister, I should not have considered a broad political discussion on a general question suitable to proceed from me ; while neither I nor (I am certain) my colleagues would have been disposed to run the risk of stirring popular passions in a vulgar and unexplained appeal. But every difficulty arising from the necessary limitations of an official position has now been removed.

I could not, however, conclude these observations without anticipating and answering an inquiry they suggest. "Are they, then," it will be asked, "a recantation and a regret; and what are they meant to recommend as the policy of the future?" My reply shall be succinct and plain. Of what the Liberal party has accomplished, by word or deed, in establishing the full civil equality of Roman Catholics, I regret nothing and I recant nothing.

It is certainly a political misfortune that, during the last thirty years, a Church so tainted in its views of civil obedience, and so unduly capable of changing its front and language after emancipation from what it had been before, like an actor who has to perform several characters in one piece, should have acquired an extension of its hold upon the highest classes of this country. The conquests have been chiefly, as might have been expected, among women ; but the number of male converts or captives (as I might prefer to call them) has not been inconsiderable. There is no doubt that every one of these secessions is in the nature of a considerable moral and social severance. The breadth of this gap varies according to varieties of individual character. But it is too commonly a wide one. Too commonly the spirit of the neophyte is expressed by the words, which have become notorious: "A Catholic first, an Englishman afterwards." Words which properly convey no more than a truism ; for every Christian must seek to place his religion even before his country in his inner heart. But very far from a truism in the sense in

which we have been led to construe them. We take them to mean that the "convert" intends, in case of any conflict between the Queen and the Pope, to follow the Pope, and let the Queen shift for herself, which, happily, she can well do.

Usually in this country a movement in the highest class would raise a presumption of a similar movement in the mass. It is not so here. Rumors have gone about that the proportion of members of the Papal Church to the population has increased, especially in England. But these rumors would seem to be confuted by authentic figures. The Roman Catholic marriages, which supply a competent test, and which were 4.89 per cent. of the whole in 1854, and 4.62 per cent. in 1859, were 4.09 per cent. in 1869, and 4.02 per cent. in 1871.

There is something at the least abnormal in such a partial growth, taking effect as it does among the wealthy and noble, while the people cannot be charmed, by any incantation, into the Roman camp. The original gospel was supposed to be meant especially for the poor; but the gospel of the nineteenth century from Rome courts another and less modest destination. If the Pope does not control more souls among us, he certainly controls more acres.

The severance, however, of a certain number of lords of the soil from those who till it can be borne. And so I trust will in like manner be endured the new and very real "aggression" of the principles promulgated by Papal authority, whether they are or are not loyally disclaimed. In this matter each man is his own judge and his own guide: I can speak for myself. I am no longer able to say, as I would have said before 1870, "There is nothing in the necessary belief of the Roman Catholic which can appear to impeach his full civil title; for whatsoever be the follies of ecclesiastical power in his Church, his Church itself has not required of him, with binding authority, a consent to any principles inconsistent with his civil duty." That ground is now, for the present at least, cut from under my feet. What, then, is to be our course of policy hereafter? First, let me say, that as regards the great Imperial settlement, achieved by slow degrees, which has admitted men of all creeds subsisting among us to

Parliament, that I conceive to be so determined beyond all doubt or question as to have become one of the deep foundation-stones of the existing Constitution. But, inasmuch as, short of this great charter of public liberty, and independently of all that has been done, there are pending matters of comparatively minor moment, which have been, or may be, subjects of discussion, not without interest attaching to them, I can suppose a question to arise in the minds of some. My own views and intentions in the future are of the smallest significance. But if the arguments I have here offered make it my duty to declare them, I say at once, the future will be exactly as the past: in the little that depends on me I shall be guided hereafter, as heretofore, by the rule of maintaining equal civil rights, irrespective of religious differences, and shall resist all attempts to exclude the members of the Roman Church from the benefit of that rule. Indeed, I may say that I have already given conclusive indications of this view by supporting in Parliament, as a Minister, since 1870, the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, for what I think ample reasons. Not only because the time has not yet come when we can assume the consequences of the revolutionary measures of 1870 to have been thoroughly weighed and digested by all capable men in the Roman communion. Not only because so great a numerical proportion are, as I have before observed, necessarily incapable of mastering and forming their personal judgment upon the case. Quite irrespectively even of these considerations, I hold that our onward even course should not be changed by follies, the consequences of which, if the worst come to the worst, this country will have alike the power, and, in case of need, the will, to control. The State will, I trust, be ever careful to leave the domain of religious conscience free, and yet to keep it to its own domain; and to allow neither private caprice, nor, above all, foreign arrogance to dictate to it in the discharge of its proper office. "England expects every man to do his duty;" and none can be so well prepared under all circumstances to exact its performance as that Liberal party which has done the work of justice alike for Nonconformists and for Papal dissidents, and whose members have so often, for the sake of that work, hazarded their

credit with the markedly Protestant constituencies of the country. Strong the state of the United Kingdom has always been in material strength, and its moral panoply is now, we may hope, pretty complete.

It is not, then, for the dignity of the Crown and people of the United Kingdom to be diverted from a path which they have deliberately chosen, and which it does not rest with all the myrmidons of the Apostolic Chamber either openly to obstruct or secretly to undermine. It is rightfully to be expected, it is greatly to be desired, that the Roman Catholics of this country should do in the nineteenth century what their forefathers of England, except a handful of emissaries, did in the sixteenth, when they were marshalled in resistance to the Armada, and in the seventeenth, when, in despite of the Papal Chair, they sat in the House of Lords, under the oath of allegiance. That which we are entitled to desire, we are entitled also to expect. Indeed, to say we did not expect it would, in my judgment, be the true way of conveying an "insult" to those concerned. In this expectation we may be partially disappointed. Should those to whom I appeal thus unhappily come to bear witness in their own persons to the decay of sound, manly, true life in their Church, it will be their loss more than ours. The inhabitants of these islands, as a whole, are stable, though sometimes credulous and excitable; resolute, though sometimes boastful; and a strong-headed and sound-hearted race will not be hindered either by latent or by avowed dissents, due to the foreign influence of a caste, from the accomplishment of its mission in the world.

(D) APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

The numbers here given correspond with those of the Eighteen Propositions given in the text, where it would have been less convenient to cite the originals.

1, 2, 3. "Ex qua omnino falsa societatis regiminis idea haud timent erroneam illam fovere opinionem, Catholicæ Ecclesiæ, animarumque saluti maxime exitialem, a rec. mem. Gregorio XVI., predecessore Nostro, *deli-*

ramentum appellatam, (eadem Encycl. mirari,) nimirum, libertatem conscientiae et cultuum esse proprium cujuscunque hominis jus, quod lege proclamari et asserti debet in omni recte constituta societate, et jus civibus inesse ad omnimodam libertatem, nulla vel ecclesiastica vel civili auctoritate coarctandum, quo suos conceptus quoscumque sive voce sive typis, sive alia ratione palam publiceque manifestare ac declarare valeant." Encyclical Letter.

4. "Atque silentio præterire non possumus eorum audaciam, qui sanam non sustinentes doctrinam 'illis Apostolicæ Sedis judiciis, et decretis, quorum objectum ad bonum generale Ecclesiæ, ejusdemque jura, ac disciplinam spectare declaratur, dummodo fidei morumque dogmata non attingat, posse assensum et obedientiam detractam absque peccato, et absque ulla Catholicæ professionis jactura.'"—*Ibid.*

5. "Ecclesia non est vera perfecta que societas plane libera nec pollet suis propriis et constantibus juribus sibi a divino suo Fundatore collatis, sed civilis potestatis est definire quæ sint Ecclesiæ jura, ac limites, intra quos eadem jura exercere queat."—*Syllabus v.*

6. "Romani Pontifices et Concilia œcumenica a limitibus suæ potestatis recesserunt, jura Principum usurparunt, atque etiam in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errarunt."—*Ibid. xxiii.*

7. "Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet, neque potestatem ullam temporalem directam vel indirectam."—*Ibid. xxiv.*

8. "Præter potestatem episcopatus inhærentem, alia est attributa temporalis potestas a civili imperio vel expresse vel tacite concessa, revocanda propterea, cum libuerit, a civili imperio."—*Ibid. xxv.*

9. "Ecclesiæ et personarum ecclesiasticarum immunitas a jure civili ortum habuit."—*Ibid. xxx.*

10. "In conflictu legum utriusque potestatis, jus civile prævalet."—*Ibid. xlii.*

11. "Catholicis viris probari potest ea juventutis instituendæ ratio, quæ sit a Catholica fide et ab Ecclesiæ potestate sejuncta, quæque rerum dumtaxat naturalium scientiam ac terrenæ socialis vitæ fides tantummodo vel saltem primarium spectet."—*Ibid. xlvi.*

12. "Philosophicarum rerum morumque scientia, itemque civiles leges possunt et debent a divina et ecclesiastica auctoritate declinare."—*Ibid. lvii.*

13. "Matrimonii sacramentum non est nisi contractui accessorium ab eoque separabile, ipsumque sacramentum in una tantum nuptiali benedictione situm est."—*Ibid. lxvi.*

"Vi contractus, mere civilis potest inter Christianos constare veri nominis matrimonium: falsumque est, aut contractum matrimonii inter Christianos semper esse sacramentum, aut nullum esse contractum, sacramentum excludatur."—*Ibid. lxxii.*

14. "De temporalis regni cum spirituali compatibilitate disputant inter se Christianæ et Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filii."—Syllabus lxxv.

15. "Abrogatio civilis imperii, quo Apostolica Sedes potitur, ad Ecclesiæ libertatem felicitatemque vel maxime conduceret."—Ibid. lxxvi.

16. "Ætate hac nostra non amplius expedit religionem Catholicam haberi tanquam unicam status religionem, cæteris quibuscumque cultibus exclusis."—Ibid. lxxvii.

17. "Hinc laudabiliter in quibusdam Catholici nominis regionibus lege tantum est, ut hominibus illuc immigrantibus liceat publicum proprii cuiusque cultus exercitium habere."—Ibid. lxxviii.

18. "Romanus Pontifex potest ac debet cum progressu, cum liberalismo et cum recenti civilitate sese reconciliare et componere."—Ibid. lxxx.

APPENDIX B.

I have contented myself with a minimum of citation from the documents of the period before Emancipation. Their full effect can only be gathered by such as are acquainted with, or will take the trouble to refer largely to the originals. It is worth while, however, to cite the following passage from Bishop Doyle, as it may convey, through the indignation it expresses, an idea of the amplitude of the assurances which had been (as I believe, most honestly and sincerely) given :

"There is no justice, my Lord, in thus condemning us. Such conduct on the part of our opponents creates in our bosoms a sense of wrong being done to us ; it exhausts our patience, it provokes our indignation, and prevents us from reiterating our efforts to obtain a more impartial hearing. We are tempted, in such cases as these, to attribute unfair motives to those who differ from us, as we cannot conceive how men gifted with intelligence can fail to discover truths so plainly demonstrated as—

"That our faith or our allegiance is not regulated by any such doctrines as those imputed to us :

"That our duties to the Government of our country are not influenced nor affected by any Bulls or practices of Popes :

"That these duties are to be learned by us, as by every other class of his Majesty's subjects, from the gospel, from the reason given to us by God, from that love of country which nature has implanted in our hearts, and from those constitutional maxims which are as well understood and as highly appreciated by Catholics of the present day as by their ancestors, who founded them with Alfred, or secured them at Runnymede."—Doyle's "Essay on the Catholic Claims." London, 1826, p. 38.

The same general tone, as in 1826, was maintained in the answers of the witnesses from Maynooth College before the Commission of 1855. See, for example, pp. 132, 161-4, 272-3, 275, 361, 370-5, 381-2, 394-6, 405. The Commission reported, (p. 64,) "We see no reason to believe that there has been any disloyalty in the teaching of the College, or any

disposition to impair the obligations of an unreserved allegiance to your Majesty."

APPENDIX C.

Compare the recent and ominous forecasting of the future European policy of the British Crown, in an article from a Romish periodical for the current month, which has direct relation to these matters, and which has every appearance of proceeding from authority :

"Surely in an European complication, such as may any day arise, nay, such as must ere long arise, from the natural gravitation of the forces which are for the moment kept in check and truce by the necessity of preparation for their inevitable collision, it may very well be that the future prosperity of England may be staked in the struggle, and that the side which she may take may be determined, not either by justice or interest, but by a passionate resolve to keep up the Italian kingdom at any hazard."—*The Month*, for November, 1874: "Mr. Gladstone's Durham Letter," p. 265.

This is a remarkable disclosure. With whom could England be brought into conflict by any disposition she might feel to keep up the Italian kingdom? Considered as States, both Austria and France are in complete harmony with Italy. But it is plain that Italy has some enemy; and the writers of *The Month* appear to know who it is.

APPENDIX D.

Notice has been taken, both in this country and abroad, of the apparent inertness of public men, and of at least one British Administration, with respect to the subject of these pages. See Friedberg, "Grenzen zwischen Staat und Kirche," Abtheilung iii., pp. 755-6; and the preface to the fifth volume of Mr. Greenwood's elaborate, able, and judicial work, entitled "Cathedra Petri," p. 4.

If there be any chance of such a revival, it would become our political leaders to look more closely into the peculiarities of a system which denies the right of the subject to freedom of thought and action upon matters most material to his civil and religious welfare. There is no mode of ascertaining the spirit and tendency of great institutions but in a careful study of their history. The writer is profoundly impressed with the conviction that our political instructors have wholly neglected this important duty; or, which is perhaps worse, left in the hands of a class of persons whose zeal has outrun their discretion, and who have sought rather to engage the prejudices than the judgment of their hearers in the cause they have, no doubt, sincerely at heart.

TRANSLATIONS.

FROM THE VATICAN DECREES.

(A.) Therefore do we by our Apostolic Authority reprove, denounce and condemn generally and particularly all the evil opinions and doc

trines specially mentioned in this letter, and we wish that they may be held as disapproved, denounced, and condemned by all children of the Catholic Church.

(B.) We teach and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed: that when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when, in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolical authority, he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church, he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed in defining a doctrine of faith or morals: and therefore that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves and not by force of the consent of the Church thereto.

(C.) The pastors and faithful, of whatever rite and dignity, are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and of true obedience, not only in things which appertain to faith and morals, but likewise in those things which concern the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world. . . . This is the doctrine of Catholic truth, from which no one can depart without loss of faith and salvation.

We also teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all causes calling for ecclesiastical trial recourse may be had to his judgment; but the decision of the Apostolic See, above which there is no higher authority, cannot be reconsidered by any one; nor is it lawful for any one to judge his judgment.

(D.) PROPOSITIONS OF THE ENCYCLICAL AND SYLLABUS.

1, 2, 3. From this totally false notion of social government, they fear not to uphold that erroneous opinion, most pernicious to the Catholic Church and to the salvation of souls, which was called by our predecessor of recent memory, Gregory XVI., a *delirium*, (see the same Ency.,) namely, that liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man, which ought to be proclaimed and asserted by law in every rightly constituted society, and that citizens possess the right to all manner of liberty, unrestrained by either ecclesiastical or civil authority, in publicly putting forth and declaring all their opinions whatsoever, either by speech, or by types, or by any other method.

4. And we cannot pass over in silence the audacity of those who, not sustaining sound doctrine, assert that without sin and without any loss of the Catholic profession, assent and obedience can be withheld from those judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See whose object is declared to be the general good of the Church, and its laws and discipline; so long as they do not touch dogmas of faith and morals.

5. The Church is not a true, perfect, and entirely free society, nor does she enjoy her own peculiar and perpetual rights conferred by her Divine Founder, but it belongs to the civil power to define what are the

rights of the Church, and the limits within which those rights may be exercised.

6. The Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical Councils have exceeded the limits of their power, usurped the rights of princes, and erred even in defining matters of faith and morals.

7. The Church has not the power of using force, nor any temporal power, direct or indirect.

8. Besides the power inherent to the episcopacy, there is another temporal power granted it by the civil government, either expressly or tacitly, revocable therefore at the pleasure of the civil government.

9. The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons originates from the civil law.

10. In a conflict between the laws of the two powers, the civil law prevails.

11. Catholics may approve that system of instructing youth which is separated from Catholic faith and the power of the Church, and which teaches exclusively or at least principally the knowledge of natural things and the ends of worldly social life.

12. The knowledge of philosophical things and morals and also civil laws can and ought to be independent of divine and ecclesiastical authority.

13. The sacrament of matrimony is only an accessory of the contract, and can be separated from it, and the sacrament itself consists in the nuptial benediction only.

Marriage truly so called can be constituted between Christians by virtue of a mere civil contract; and it is false either that the matrimonial contract between Christians is always a sacrament, or that there is no contract if the sacrament be excluded.

14. The children of the Christian and Catholic Church disagree as to the compatibility of the temporal with the spiritual power.

15. The abrogation of the civil power which the Apostolic See possesses would greatly conduce to the liberty and happiness of the Church.

16. In this our age it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be recognised as the only religion of the State, all other religions being excluded.

17. Hence it has been wisely provided by law in certain countries called Catholic, that immigrants coming there should be allowed the public exercise of their own form of worship.

18. The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile and accommodate himself to progress, liberalism, and modern civilisation.

ARTICLE VII.

PROPHETS AND PROPHECY.

Our Creator has placed us in this world, endowed with powers of understanding and capacities for obtaining knowledge. We arrive at this knowledge both through the perceptions of sense, and by self-consciousness, by which means we come to know the world without, and the world of thought within. These furnish us with the elements of that reasoning process by which we arrive at those ultimate conclusions that form the basis of intelligent action. Our reason and understanding carry, as it were, all natural truth engraven upon themselves, and this forms the ground on which we act in most of the ordinary matters of this life.

But we gain knowledge by our intercourse with others. We add the materials of their observation and experience to ours, and widen thus and correct by theirs what we ourselves have come to know. But there is a positive knowledge which lies beyond the realm of creature observation, which can only come by the influx of the divine mind upon ours. And it is hardly to be supposed that our Creator would make and leave us so that we should be incapable of receiving impressions directly from himself. We know not the way in which he has access now, in the ordinary operations of his Spirit, to the souls of men for their illumination, regeneration, and sanctification, the reality of which neither the Scriptures nor experience allow us to doubt.

But there were men whom God in ancient times called into peculiar intimacy with himself, that he might, through them, in an extraordinary way, communicate his will to mankind, and comfort and establish his Church upon the earth. He usually called and delegated those to this office who excelled in intellectual endowments and genius, which endowments were quickened into extraordinary action by his Holy Spirit, that they might clearly, warmly, copiously, and promptly express, under the Spirit's impulse, his messages to their fellow-men. These men were known in the Sacred Scriptures by the name, Prophets.

SIGNIFICATION OF THE NAME.

It is first used of the patriarch Abraham, Gen. xx. 7, where Abimelech, the Philistine king, is rebuked, and is ordered to restore Sarah to Abraham, "for he is a prophet, and he will pray for thee." He stood in the most intimate relations with God, and was under his peculiar protection. "He reproveth kings for their sakes; saying, Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm." Ps. cv. 14, 15. The word which is here used is *Nabhi*, נְבִיא and its plural *Nebhiyim*, נְבִיאִים. The original meaning of the verb נָבֵא *nabha*, Gesenius makes to be *protulit verba, nunciavit*, and compares it with the נָבַע *nabha* of similar sound, which signifies to *bubble up, to gush out*, so that *Nabhi* is one who announces, or pours freely forth the declarations or revelations of God. As the noun has a passive form, Hengstenberg, Koester, Bunsen, Davidson, and others, contend that it refers rather to the prophet as *receiving* revelations from God,* and this *may have been* its original meaning; but as he received them that he might utter them, and *spoke* as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, usage easily gave the word an active sense, which it manifestly has in the Sacred Scriptures.

The classic passage, which of itself explains the meaning of the word, and in some measure the office of the prophet, is Exod. iv. 1-17, where the Lord says to Moses, "Aaron shall be thy *Nabhi* (prophet) unto the people, and thou shalt be to him instead of God." As Aaron stood to Moses, receiving from him what he should say to the people, so the prophet stands to God, an *internuntius* between him and those to whom he is sent.

The version of the LXX. uses as its translation the word *προφήτης*, prophet. In the earlier and classical Greek this term is used of *one who speaks for another*, and especially of one who speaks in the name and at the suggestion of a being regarded as divine. Thus poets were so called, as interpreters of the muses, and even those attached to the heathen temples, who interpreted the oracles uttered by the mouths of those who claimed to be un-

*This name, says Hengstenberg, refers to divine inspiration; the other name, *seer*, to the form in which this was communicated to the prophet.

der the inspiration of a god, were called by the name prophets. From the usage of the middle ages, when another meaning, not inconsistent with its etymology, was attached to the word, it came to be spoken in the sense of *prediction*, which is its current meaning in the English and other modern languages.

Another name which was used for the prophet, was *Roeh*, (רֹאֵה) "*Seer*," 1 Sam. ix. 9. "Beforetime in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, thus he spake, Come, and let us go to the seer; for he that is now called a prophet was beforetime called a seer." This word occurs but ten times, and in seven of these is applied to Samuel, twice it is used of Hanani, and once by Isaiah, not referring to any particular person. Another word of nearly equivalent import is *Hhozeh*, (חֹזֵה) also translated "*seer*." It is first found in 2 Sam. xxiv. 11, and seems to have come into vogue when *Roeh* had been discontinued, or was more rarely used. Dr. Lee suggests that it may have been the special designation of the prophet who was connected with the royal household. Thus 2 Sam. xxiv. 11, "the prophet Gad, David's *seer*." 1 Chron. xxi. 9; xxix. 29; 2 Chron. xxix. 30, (in Hezekiah's reign,) "Asaph, the *seer*." 1 Chron. xxv. 5: "Heman, the king's *seer*." 2 Chron. xxxv. 15: "Jeduthun the king's *seer*." It is found in 2 Kings xvii. 13. Amos is so designated by Amaziah. Amos vii. 12. The word occurs Is. xxix. 10; Micah iii. 7. In 1 Chron. xxix. 29, we have the three terms occurring in connexion each with different names. : "Samuel the seer," (*Roeh*), "Nathan the prophet," (*Nabhi*), and "Gad the seer," (*Hhozeh*.) Cocceius supposes that Samuel was so designated from the peculiar call which he received from God in the temple, while yet a child; that one was called *Hhozeh* who received revelations either through ordinary study and meditation, or extraordinary inspiration, and that this was the more general term; that *Roeh* was the more special term, and indicated one to whom God had revealed secret things in prophetic vision. Hävernäck again, considers *Nabhi* as indicating those who belonged officially to the prophetic order, and *Roeh* and *Hhozeh*, those who, though not of that order, received a prophetic revelation. The most that can safely be said is, that

Nabhi is the name designating the prophets as receiving and promulgating divine revelations, while the other terms are names which refer to the visions which they saw either with their bodily or their mental eye, and by which divine communications were made known to them. Languages are changing; one name is current for a season, and at another time another name for a thing precisely the same. Of the immediate reasons of these changes, we must be content to be ignorant. The same verbal roots which furnish the titles of the prophets, furnish also the names for prophecy: *Nebhiah*, (נְבִיאָה) or *προφητεία*, *Marah*, (מַרְאָה) and *Mahhazeh* and *Hhizzayon*, (מַחֲזָה and חֲזִיוֹן) the first referring primarily to the utterance in God's name of the communication which came from him, and the others to the state of immediate vision in which that which was revealed was often objectively set before them. "If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a *vision*, and will speak unto him in a *dream*"—בַּמְרְאָה. "I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne," said Isaiah. "Balaam, the son of Beor hath said, and the man *whose eyes are open* hath said, he hath said, which heard the words of God, which *saw* the vision of the Almighty, falling into a trance, but having his eyes open." "I see him, but not now; I shall *behold* him, but not nigh." And Micaiah said, "I *saw* all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd." Numb. xii. 6; xxiv. 3, 4, 17; Is. vi. 1; 1 Kings xxii. 17.

THE PROPHETIC ORDER.

The first man, before the fall, and probably afterwards, had that intercourse with God which the prophets afterwards enjoyed, only in a more eminent degree, and possessed a knowledge, adult man that he was, at his first creation, which must have come by some peculiar inspiration from God, since it could not be the result of experience; and which made him the teacher of his descendants through his long life upon the earth. Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, says the apostle Jude, 14, 15, and the prophecy there quoted is that final advent of the Lord, so often and emphatically mentioned in the New Testament.

Him, Noah, the preacher of righteousness, 2 Pet. ii. 5, and the illustrious example of that faith through which righteousness is obtained, and the second father of the human race, followed, with that remarkable prophecy which touches the destiny of his descendants through future ages. To the patriarchal age belong Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and beyond that line Melchizedek and perhaps Job. The whole body of the patriarchs are called by this name. Ps. cv. 15: "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm." Hengstenberg conjectures that they were so called because God communicated with them by dreams and visions, one of the ordinary methods of prophetic revelation. Still it was for the same reason that he spake through the subsequent prophets, that he might have a seed to serve him and perpetuate a knowledge of true religion in the world.

The prophets of the succeeding dispensation, were, first, in the wilderness, Moses, preëminent over all others, as the first who was expressly and publicly commissioned to write down divine revelations which had probably heretofore been intrusted to oral communications, unless we admit the not impossible theory of Vitringa, *Observ.*, 1 c. iv., that men of the patriarchal ages left behind them writings of which Moses availed himself, the substance of which is contained in the book of Genesis. With this came in the more formal organisation of the visible Church, with its priestly order, and its imposing and instructive ritual. Moses was the great and typical prophet, who left behind him the books of the Law, the written basis of all future revelations. He was succeeded by Joshua, in some of his functions; for though *he* was chiefly a military leader, yet he wrote "in the book of the law of God." The priests and Levites now became the great teachers of the Church of God, both by the acted rites of the ceremonial service, which were instructive and prophetic both, of the coming redemption, and by their teaching by word of mouth, out of the law of Moses, what was there written. During the period of the Judges, the priests became remiss in their official duties. The worship of the tabernacle was neglected, though this tabernacle was the ideal residence of the theocratic King of the chosen people, Jehovah himself. There was a great decadence, not only in

outward prosperity, but in private virtue. Under these circumstances, Judges were raised up from time to time as regents, who represented the divine yet invisible King, and were efficient instruments in maintaining a knowledge of the true God. This covers a period of from 450 to 472 years, but was interrupted by seven different seasons of servitude to neighboring heathen tribes, which amounted to about 131 years of foreign oppression. In the latter part of this period, the prophetic order again appears in the person of Samuel. He was the first of that series of prophets, which was continued in an almost unbroken line till the close of the Old Testament canon. He was a Levite, of the family of Kohath—1 Chron. vi. 28—though this has been questioned by Stanley. He was chosen judge or regent, but took up his abode at Ramah, where religious worship was established after the patriarchal form. He instituted companies or colleges of prophets, over which he presided. One of these was at Ramah—1 Sam. xix. 19—another at Gibeah; another at Naioth, near Ramah. The name Naioth signifies *habitations*, probably of the disciples of the prophets, and in the Targum of Jonathan is always interpreted by the Chaldee *בֵּית אִוְלָפְנָא* *the house of instruction*. They seem to have been much like theological colleges or seminaries, and yet probably with differences from those of our own day. After a lapse of 170 or more years, we find similar schools under the presidency of Elijah, and subsequently of Elisha, at Bethel; 2 K. ii. 3, 5; at Gilgal, 2 K. iv. 38. Under his administration the schools of the prophets increased in numbers: the place “where they dwelt with him became too strait for them.” Accompanied by their master, a party of the students came to the Jordan, where in felling timber to erect for themselves additional quarters, the axe-head of a borrowed axe fell into the water, and the miracle of making the iron swim to relieve the student’s distress, was wrought by the agency of Elisha. 2 K. vi. 1–7. The inmates of these schools were often numerous, as the number of the prophets occasionally mentioned shows. 1 K. xviii. 4, Obadiah hid a hundred prophets and supported them, to protect them from Ahab; four hundred are spoken of, ch. xxii. 6; and the sons of the prophets who witnessed the translation

of Elijah were fifty in number, strong men, in the vigor of their youth. These schools were dependent, at least in the kingdom of Israel, in part, on such contributions as were ordinarily made to the Levites. 1 K. xiv. 3. The man of Baal-shalisha, in a season of famine, brought to Elisha, at the school in Gilgal, "bread of the first fruits, twenty loaves of barley, and full ears of corn," which the prophet ordered his servant to set before the sons of the prophets, that they might eat. From the exclamation of the servant we learn that there were at that time a hundred members of that school. 2 K. iv. 43. Inadequate as the supply was, it seems to have been miraculously augmented, as at the miracles of the loaves and the fishes. At other times they gathered herbs, or supplied themselves as they could. The prophet who presided over these schools was addressed by the name "father," and the scholars were called the sons of the prophets, an idiom not unknown to the Greeks, among whom medical students were called *ιατρῶν υἱοί*, "sons of the physicians," and students of rhetoric *ρητόρων υἱοί*, "sons of the orators." Thus Elisha, the pupil of Elijah, called his former and revered instructor, at the moment when he was snatched away from him, "My father! My father! The chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" Thou wast Israel's phalanx and mighty bulwark, its glittering legion and its invincible host. It was from these sons of the prophets that the Lord ordinarily called men to the prophetic office. When the call fell upon other persons not so educated, it is mentioned as something out of the ordinary course of the divine administration. Amos was so called. He says: "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son;" *i. e.*, was not educated in the prophetic schools; "but I was a husbandman and a gatherer of sycamore fruits; and the Lord took me as I followed the flock; and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy to my people Israel." Amos, vii. 14, 15. And in Zechariah xiii. 2-5, the false prophets, being in danger of a signal retribution, disclaim utterly the prophetic office. They had not, they say, even enjoyed a prophetic education. "I am a husbandman; for man taught *me* to keep cattle from my youth." From those taught in the schools, God *ordinarily* called men, as we have said, to the prophetic office. Yet

not always, for the cases of Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah, as well as that of Anna in the New Testament, show that women were sometimes prophetesses, endowed with the prophetic spirit.

Although these schools or communities of the prophets began apparently with Samuel, the last of the Judges, we see them more fully organised in the kingdom of Israel, after the separation of the ten tribes from those of Judah and Benjamin. In Judah the priests and Levites were the authorised teachers of the people. There the temple and its rites were still maintained, and the prophets were fewer in number. In the times of David, before the division, David and his captains had separated for the service of the Lord, of the sons of Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, two hundred four score and eight men, who should prophesy with harps, with psalteries, and cymbals, for the service of the house of God. These were instructed in the songs of the Lord, and were divided into four and twenty companies, the teacher and the scholar, for the service of song in the temple. See 1 Chron. xxv. It was probably the duty of these prophetic students, or the more distinguished of them, to compose psalms for the temple service. Twelve of the existing collection of psalms are ascribed to Asaph—the 50th, and from the 73d to the 83d; twelve to the sons of Korah, from the 42d to the 49th, and from the 84th to the 88th; two are particularised as composed, one by Heman the Ezrahite, and one, the 89th, by Ethan the Ezrahite. These seem to have been written in the days of David and Solomon. These sacred lyrics were a part of the Levitical services of the sanctuary. But in the kingdom of Israel, where Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, had made Israel to sin, and had set up at Dan and Bethel, the extremities of his kingdom, the worship of the golden calves, in an effort to combine the idolatry of Egypt with the worship of Jehovah, and where Ahab, the sixth in succession of the Israelitish kings, influenced by Jezebel, his wife, introduced the Phœnician worship of the sun-god, Baal, with his numerous retinue of priests, who ate from Jezebel's tables, these schools of the prophets were not only training schools of the future prophets, but seats of worship and missionary stations, from which an influence might go forth to counteract

the prevalent idolatry. It appears that weekly and monthly meetings for worship were held at them. "Wherefore," says the husband of the Shunamite to his wife, "wilt thou go to him (Elisha) to-day? It is neither new moon nor Sabbath." 2 K. iv. 23. And when the king sent to slay him, he was found sitting in his house, "and the elders sat with him." 2 K. vi. 32. A similar resort was had to Ezekiel, on the banks of the river Chebar, years after, in the days of the Babylonish captivity, for the purposes of instruction and inquiry. Ezek. viii. 1; xiv. 1; xx. 1. The prophets were bold and daring in their opposition to false religion. Bethel was one of the centres of idolatry, and yet there, at its very seat, was one of those prophetic schools established. Indeed they seem to have been located always where they were most needed.

In the kingdom of Judah the worship and regular religious instruction of the people was conducted by the priests and Levites, the prophets filling up what might be wanting in this service. They roused the people where they had sunk into a lethargic sleep, or they interfered on special occasions when the interests of the theocracy were endangered.

It was not prediction and songs of praise alone that the inmates, or their teachers, in these somewhat cloistral schools gave forth. Their retirement was favorable to studious occupations; and in the northern kingdom especially, and also in Judah, they were employed, from Samuel downwards, in recording the history of their own times.

In the schools of the prophets, the basis of instruction is believed to have been the law and its interpretation; but to this was added sacred poesy, the voice of song and instrumental music, the harp, psaltery, and cymbal accompanying their vocal worship.

True conversion was a prerequisite to the prophetic office, although in a few instances, as in the case of Balaam, Saul, and Caiaphas, the prophetic spirit descended temporarily upon men who were not the subjects of renewing grace.

THE PROPHETIC GIFT.

This (*χάρισμα*) was conferred sometimes on men who were not

of the prophetic order. Amos had been endowed with it, without the preceding training which seems to have been usual. He may be regarded as called into the prophetic order even as Elisha was, through the intervention of Elijah. David was endued with the prophetic spirit, though not of the prophetic order. And so Daniel, who was a courtier and statesman under the heathen monarchy of Babylonia, and afterwards at the Medo-Persian court, was endowed with the prophetic gift, though not of the prophetic order. And thus, though the book he wrote is eminently prophetic, it occupies the third rank in the Hebrew canon, being found in the Hagiographa, and not in the Prophets, neither the earlier nor the later.

THEIR MANNER OF LIFE.

We have already spoken of the fact of their living in schools or communities. Even after their marriage, at one period of their history, they seem to have retained some bond of connexion with these *cœnobia*. 2 K. iv. 12. But they were distinguished in some manner by their dress. Thus Elijah the Tishbite, 2 K. i. 8; Isaiah, the son of Amoz, Is. xx. 2; and John the Baptist, who came in the spirit and power of Elias. That this was their ordinary garb seems to be indicated by the fact that at the period of the Restoration, the false prophets are represented as "wearing a rough garment to deceive." Zech. xiii. 4. "They wandered about in sheep skins and goat skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented," Heb. xi. 37, spoken of the true prophets by Paul. Compare Matt. vii. 13, where false prophets are spoken of as coming in sheep's clothing. Their diet, too, was simple and inexpensive. In all these particulars they shadowed forth the humiliation of that great Prophet who was to come, who emptied himself of his divine glory and condescended to our estate.

THE PROPHETIC INSPIRATION.

There is a threefold province in which the Spirit of God is known to operate: in the department of nature, in which he imparts all physical and intellectual life; in the department of grace, in which he illuminates the understanding with a knowledge of divine things, renews the moral nature and imparts that life which is known as spiritual, and which is common to all true

believers; in the department of the supernatural, exhibiting itself in miracle and inspiration, in which extraordinary gifts are bestowed upon particular persons, as evangelists and prophets, selected by God to receive from him extraordinary revelations, to attest their character as divine messengers, if need be, by miracles, and to communicate what is to be made known by oral or written discourse infallibly to others. It implies an objective revelation made to the mind of the inspired man at the time he is inspired to speak or write, or before, or made to others from whom he has obtained it; as in the case of Luke. These holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, not as mere machines, but as intelligent moral agents, exhibiting in their style all those mental characteristics of thought which were natural to them, and all that culture or absence of culture which they would, under other impulses, have exhibited. In much that the prophets wrote, there is no difference perceptible between what they have left on record and what proceeded from the pens of other inspired men, not of their order. They were the sacred poets, the annalists and historians, the religious teachers of the ancient Church; they spoke for God in maintaining the authority of his law; they held a pastoral office over the whole people, and were a power in the state, that hesitated not to reprove kings; and in all these things spake in God's name and by divine aid, in all those forms and varieties of speech demanded by such duties and relations.

The twentieth chapter of Isaiah, and from the thirty-sixth chapter to the thirty-ninth inclusive, are in the narrative style of plain history. He wrote the life of King Hezekiah, 2 Chron. xxxii., 32, and the "acts of Uzziah first and last," xxvi. 22. There are occasional strains of lyric poetry, chap. xii., and the triumphal ode, chap. xiv. The prevailing style varies from the books which are strictly poetical, though often equalling, if not surpassing, them in sublimity. There are portions which bear the character of direct address to the people, chap. i., ii. The form of divine communication to the prophet was by immediate direct address to himself, either in words spoken to the ear, or by immediate communication to

the understanding. Or this communication came in dreams of the night, or in visions addressed to the outward senses, or to the inward thought of men fully awake.

These latter methods seem to have been regarded as inferior to the former. Numb. xii. 6-8. "If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known to him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches, (בְּחִידוֹת, in enigmas,) and the similitude (the appearance,) the vision of the Lord shall he behold."*

It is evident from this passage, as Maimonides and other Jewish Rabbis have generally understood, that to Moses was assigned a higher position than to ordinary prophets, clearer revelations, and a more intimate and unreserved intercourse with God than they ever enjoyed, surpassed only in the case of Jesus Christ, the prophet whom the Lord would raise up like unto Moses, to whom "the Father showeth all things that himself doeth." John v. 20.

This is that higher degree of inspiration which Maimonides, in his *Moreh Nevochim*, ascribes to Moses, which has been called the "*gradus Mosaicus*," and which the Jewish Rabbis distinguish from the רִּיחַ הַקְּדוֹשׁ, "*the Holy Spirit*," which moved the minds of the prophets and apostles. These "holy men of God" of the old economy, and of the new, no less, "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

DREAMS.

Another of the methods by which communications were made to the prophets was by dreams. It is evident that the activity

* This word, translated in our version "similitude," is found also in Deut. iv. 12, where it is used in a different sense from that in which it occurs above. It cannot denote here the divine essence, but some adumbration of it, such as is to human eyes perceptible: such a glimpse of its retiring splendor as Moses saw when hid in the cleft of the rock. Exod. xxxiii. 20, 23; or that more than human glory beheld by the apostles, "as of the only begotten of the Father," in the person of Christ. John i. 14. See Maimon. *Mor. Nev.*, I., iii.

of the mind is continued, while the senses are torpid and the body sleeps; and that we are at all times under the general and special providence of God. Whatever be the physiological laws, not yet well defined, which give rise to the phenomena of dreaming, there may be supernatural interpositions, from a higher power, by which communications are made to the minds of men. And God may choose the silent hours of the night, when there is nothing to distract the thoughts, and no purpose to resist him, to communicate to us his will. He can thus show his constant care for us, when neither we nor our friends are spending a thought upon ourselves. Thus in ancient times he communicated with Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph while yet a youth, in dreams. Nor was this confined to the old economy. In the New Testament times he appeared, more than once, to Joseph, who had betrothed Mary, in a dream—Matt. i. 20.; ii. 12, 19, 22; and so to Claudia Procula, the wife of Pilate, who “suffered many things in a dream because of Christ,” then a prisoner at his tribunal. Matt. xxvii. 19. These communications by dreams were sometimes made to unsanctified men, as to Abimelech, to Laban, to the chief butler and baker, to Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar. As to these last, Maimonides justly remarks, “When it is said that God came to Nebuchadnezzar in a dream by night, that cannot at all be called a *prophecy*, nor such a man a *prophet*. For the meaning is that some admonition was given to such a man, and that it was done in a dream.” Moreh Nevochim, P. ii., c. 41. Sometimes the warning seemed to come through an angel, sometimes the voice of God himself to be heard; sometimes the communication was made by symbols, as in Joseph’s dream of the sheaves, and the sun, moon, and eleven stars making obeisance to him. As in the case of the chief butler, the chief baker, Nebuchadnezzar’s image, and Pharaoh’s dream, a deep impression was made upon the mind of the sleeper that the dream was sent from God, and was of the deepest import. Nebuchadnezzar had forgotten his dream, as we often forget ours. It required in this case a divine revelation to him who was called upon, to restore it to his memory, as well as to interpret it, and in the other cases inspiration was needed for their explanation.

These dreams were distinguishable from those which are ordinary among men, by their greater clearness, the deeper impression they made upon the mind, and the clear conviction that they were sent from God. When Jacob awaked out of his sleep, he said, "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not." "This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." The suitableness of the symbols to convey the extraordinary warning, was an additional evidence, and their entire freedom from anything trivial and unworthy of God.

THE VISION.

Here those terms are used of prophetic revelations which are ordinarily spoken of objects addressed to the senses, (especially to that of sight,) of men that are awake: thus Isaiah says, chap. vi. "I *saw* the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up." "Also I *heard* the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send?" So Zechariah, "I lifted mine eyes, and behold, a man with a measuring-line in his hand." ii. 1. "And he *showed* me Joshua the high priest." iii. 1. So Peter, Acts xi. 5, *saw* a great vessel, as a sheet, descending out of heaven; and John, in the island of Patmos, saw various scenes, which he there describes. These visions may have been presented to the natural eye, but it is far more probable that they were presented to the internal senses, but with the vividness of external realities. The beast, with seven heads and ten horns, presented to the view of Daniel, was a symbolic or parabolic representation, like nothing seen in the natural world, but well suited to represent, by analogy, those powers which should arise and act their part in the future history of the Church and the world. And so the candlestick of gold, with its bowl upon its top, and its seven lamps with their seven pipes which supplied them; and then the two olive trees on the right and left, which, by two of their olive branches, through two golden pipes, emptied the golden oil into the reservoir, and kept the lamps ever burning, was a combination of nature and art which never, in visible form, existed, but which, being pointed out by the angelic interpreter, was an expressive symbol of the two offices of ruler and priest, then held by Zerubbabel and Joshua, and typical of the offices of our great High Priest

and mediatorial King, through which the oil of grace is supplied to the Church which is appointed to shed light over this benighted world.*

It is, perhaps, useless to attempt an explanation of that which is supernatural, by those powers and forces which exist in man's nature as it proceeded from his Creator's hand. The phenomena hitherto spoken of arrange themselves under the representative faculty, as the philosophers speak, or, in popular language, under the imaginative power in the human understanding. The mind was kept awake and active by the divine agency, so that it set forth before, and within itself, those images which the Spirit chose to symbolise spiritual truth or future vicissitudes in the Redeemer's kingdom. The rational powers might or might not be awakened and assisted to understand the whole import which these representations were intended to intimate.

THE PROPHETIC ECSTASY.

The cases which are mentioned under this head are those of Abraham, Gen. xv. 12, when "a deep sleep [*ἐκστασις*, Sept.] and a horror of great darkness fell upon him;" of Balaam, Numb. xxiv. 4, "which saw the vision of the Almighty, falling down, but having his eyes open;" of Ezekiel, i. 28, when he fell upon his face, and "heard a voice of one that spake;" of Daniel, x. 8, 9, 10, 18, where he "retained no strength, yet heard the voice of words, and was in a deep sleep on his face, and his face towards the ground;" and was restored by a touch to his usual strength; and so, viii. 18, 27, when he fainted and

* We find the echo, and awkward imitation of divine things, in the superstitions of heathen nations; of which the second sight of the Scotch, supposed by some to have been derived from the Scandinavians, may be an example. It is imitated in "Lochiel's Warning," by Campbell:

"Lochiel! Lochiel! beware of the day
When the Lowlands shall meet thee in battle array!
For a field of the dead rushes red on my sight,
And the clans of Culloden are scattered in flight."

Compare the prophecy of Micaiah, "I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd." 1 Kings xxii. 17.

was sick many days. So an ecstasy fell upon Peter, and in that ecstasy, ἐν ἐκστάσει, he beheld a vision as of a great sheet let down. Acts x. 10, xi. 5. So Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 1-7, when he was caught up into the third heaven, and received visions and revelations, whether in the body or out of the body he could not tell, God only knew. And John, "when in the Spirit," on the isle of Patmos—where, in a divine theophany, Jesus appeared to him in human form but invested with divine glory—fell at his feet as dead, but was reassured by the touch of his hand and the kind but stupendous words, "Fear not, I am the first and the last." And Saul, too, was strangely affected, when he came to the prophetic school of Naioth. 1 Saml. xix. 22-24. So that the proverbial saying came into vogue, "Is Saul also among the prophets?"

The word ἐκστασις, *ecstasy*, was used by the Greeks of various mental states, from ordinary wonder and surprise up to the highest species of trance. It is analogous in its etymology to the English phrase, "to be beside one's self," which is used of any unusual state of the mind, from that of mistake persisted in, up to that of madness; the vernacular phrase, in its extremest sense, by usage, surpassing, perhaps, the ecstasy of the Greeks.

Montanus, a heresiarch of the second century, with his female adherents Priscilla and Maximilla, claimed that the prophetic spirit had descended upon them, and by their pretended vaticinations, obtained in Phrygia and other parts of Asia Minor, and North Africa, numerous adherents, in which last region they gained an important advocate in Tertullian, of Carthage, a man who possessed rich stores of knowledge, but an unbridled imagination, which refused to submit to the laws of logical and sober thought. Montanus claimed to be a prophet, and to be subject to the prophetic ecstasy, in which his own soul was only a passive organ of the divine Spirit, like the lyre, which discourses music only as the plectrum sweeps over it. It is on record that at that time Christian females were thrown into ecstatic trances during public worship, and were afterwards applied to for remedies against bodily diseases, and plied with questions concerning

the invisible world. The Church fathers, therefore, contended against this fanaticism. Miltiades wrote a book to show that no prophet could speak in such a state. Jerome, in his prefaces to Isaiah and Habakkuk, and in his Proem to Nahum, declares that the prophets did not *so* speak in an ecstasy as not to know what they uttered, but that they understood what they spoke and what they saw. Chrysostom, too, declares that a prophet utters his communications with sober intelligence, in a sound state of mind, knowing what he says. Therefore, learn hereafter to know the distinction between a diviner (τὸν μάντιν,) and a prophet. Homily 29, in Ep. ad Cor. So Hippolytus, *de Antichristo*, c. xi., to the same effect: "For not by their own power did they speak, nor what they chose did they proclaim, but they were first rightly instructed by the Word, then taught by visions, and, thus persuaded, spake those things which had been revealed by God to them alone." St. Basil too: "How did those pure and transparent souls prophesy? As mirrors of the divine energy, they exhibited a reflexion of it, pure, unmixed, and unsoiled by the passions of the flesh, for the Holy Spirit was with them all." *Comm. in Esai. Proem.*

There was *need* that the early Church, and indeed, the Church in all ages, should be put on its guard. For "there were false prophets among them, even as there shall be false teachers among you." "And many shall follow their pernicious ways." 2 Pet. ii. 1, 2.

This has been fulfilled at different times and in different countries; *e. g.*, among the French prophets in the war of the Cevennes in France, especially in Dauphiny and Vivarrais, some of whom emigrated to England and its colonies here. They were agitated with convulsions, and predicted, like the ancient Montanists, the speedy approach of the millennial kingdom.

It has always been the favorite resort of sceptics to represent the Hebrew prophets as affected in the same way as Cassandra, or the priestess of Apollo, with a kind of sacred madness, *furor divinus*. So the Greeks called their prophets by the name μάντις, from μάλνομαι, to *rave*, and spoke of divination and prophecy as τέχνη μαντική, the prophetic art. But far removed from all this was

the state of the true prophet. A man can by the act of his own mind withdraw himself from the outward world, and live amid the scenes of his own imagination. Much more could the Spirit of God lift a man into a high and elevated frame of thought, and lead his mind to the contemplation of scenes remote and future, clothed under typical and symbolic forms, such as, perhaps, were never realised by anything that has existed in fact upon earth, but which could intimate, with that measure of obscurity in which God has chosen to invest the future, what was to take place hereafter. These may have produced states of excitement and of exhaustion, and temporary bewilderment, as the effects of the astonishing visions presented to the mind, without being in any measure the state necessary to their first perception. We should specially guard against any representation which would imply the dethronement of the reason, or suspension, even temporarily, of any of the powers of the understanding. The physical effect was the natural result of powerful mental excitement, of revelations to the mind of stupendous or fearful thoughts, an effect analogous to what takes place now, from the communication of exciting truth, for which the mind is unprepared. The prophets were not divested of consciousness, even if the disclosures made to them did sometimes take away their strength. They went about from place to place, now speaking intelligently to kings, and now boldly rebuking rulers and people. Everything showed that they were in their sober senses, and that, as Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 32, said, "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." "Inspiration," to use the words of Bp. Lowth, "may be regarded not as suppressing or extinguishing for a time the faculties of the mind, but of purifying, and strengthening, and elevating them above what they would otherwise reach."

Of all the so-called vaticinations of mere men, Lord Bacon says, "My judgment is, that they ought all to be despised. That that hath given them grace, and some credit, consisteth in three things. First, that men mark when they hit, and never mark when they miss; as they do, generally, also of dreams, The second is, that probable conjectures, or obscure traditions, many times turn themselves into prophecies. The third and

last (which is the great one) is, that almost all of them, being infinite in number, have been impostures, and by idle and crafty brains merely contrived and feigned after the event past." Essay, No. XXXV.

But while these prophets were in full possession of their own faculties, and their words were their *own* words, they were also God's words; and as private individuals, they "enquired and searched diligently what, or what manner of time, the Spirit which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." 1 Pet. i. 11.

AS TO THE MODE OF PROPHETIC COMMUNICATION.

It was various. The prophets were often consulted by the people. This was called *inquiring of the Lord*, and the answer given was regarded not as the private opinion of the prophet, but a divine revelation. Prophecies were often orally delivered, and sometimes with great earnestness of manner. Is. lviii. 1. Hos. viii. 1. Sometimes in the form of parable, as in the case of Nathan, 2 Sam. xii., and the woman of Tekoah, 2 Sam. xiv., or with didactic signs and emblematic representations, as when Abijah divides Jeroboam's mantle into twelve pieces, giving ten into his hand as a symbol of the rending of the ten tribes out of the hand of Solomon. 1 K. xi. 29, 31.

Few notices of written prophecies occur between the times of Moses and Joshua, and some 800 years before Christ. Samuel, Gad, and Nathan, are mentioned as having composed a history of David, and an epistle of Elijah came to Jehoram after Elijah's death, though written, it may be supposed, before he died, which is on record, 2 Chron. xxi. 12, *et seq.* From about 870 to about 410 years before Christ, through those four or five centuries, the sixteen prophetic books of the later prophets, including those known as the larger and minor prophets, were written, as the Messianic age drew on, and assumed greater prominence before the Church.

THE CRITERIA OF PROPHECY.

As many lying spirits had gone abroad in the earth, how

should the prophet himself know, and how should others be assured that he spake and acted as he was moved by the Holy Ghost? That there was need of this, such intimations and warnings as we find in 1 John iv. 1, and 2 Pet. ii. 1, "Try the spirits whether they are of God," abundantly show. The Saviour, too, predicted that false prophets should arise, and show signs and wonders to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect.

1. As to the first, he might know from the mode or form of revelation. If the revelation were made in words, he might inquire whether they could come from any but a supernatural source, and this a divine author. If in a state of ecstasy, whether this state were one of mere nervous excitement, or one caused by a divine and intelligent agent acting upon him, by which he was made to see and hear those things which are not brought to us by our bodily senses from any outward objects. If it were by dream, it might be more difficult to distinguish the prophetic from that which was merely natural. The suitability and coherence of the emblems and symbolic representations presented to the imagination and our powers of inward perception, to the doctrines and precepts of God, and his purposes respecting the future, all tended to produce on the mind the conviction of their divine origin.

2. And as to the second, when the matter or subject of the revelation was considered, he could think whether it were worthy of God; whether it led to God or from God; whether it advanced religion, or destroyed it; whether it confirmed the earlier, the patriarchal and Mosaic revelations, and whether the symbols and images presented to the mind were worthy of a divine revelation, or the reverse. To the prophet himself, the divine impulse also was real and tangible. He had, apparently, no doubt that the Lord spake by him. The traces of a divine and supernatural power exerted upon him were so clear and certain, that no room for doubt was left. This influence prevailed often over what otherwise would have been the prophet's own will. "O Lord," says Jeremiah, xx. 7, "thou hast persuaded me, and I was persuaded; thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed." "Then I said, I will not make mention of him,

nor speak any more in his name: but his word was in mine heart, as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay." Verse 9. The words, (1 Cor. vii. 40,) "I think also I have the Spirit of the Lord," often quoted to show that this was but a surmise or conjecture of Paul, in which he might be deceived, are, in reality, the strongest expression of his inward conviction that he had that Spirit. Others pretended to be teachers at Corinth, and the apostle says, perhaps with a measure of irony, or, at least, in the spirit of modesty, "I think I also have the Spirit of the Lord." It expresses the full consciousness of his own inspiration.

But it was also needful that there should be criteria by which others should distinguish true prophets from false pretenders to the prophetic gift. In trying the spirits "whether they be of God," in "proving all things and holding fast that which is good," 1 John iv. 1; 1 Thess. v. 21, they might avail themselves—

1. Of those who had the divine gift of the discerning of spirits; 1 Cor. xii. 10; a power which those who received the prophetic gift also had; chap. xiv. 29.

2. The fulfilment of a prediction touching a near event, would show that he who uttered it, if it could not be known by human foresight, was a prophet in truth. This was the test Micaiah gave of his prophetic commission; 2 Chron. xviii. 27: "If thou certainly return in peace, then hath not the Lord spoken by me. And he said, Hearken, all ye people." So Jeremiah, xxviii. 9: "When the word of the Lord shall come to pass, then shall the prophet be known that the Lord hath truly sent him." And so, *per contra*, "When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously; thou shalt not be afraid of him." Deut. xviii. 22. Of Samuel these words were spoken: "The Lord was with him and let none of his words fall to the ground, and all Israel knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord." 1 Sam. iii. 19. During the lifetime of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, sundry of their predictions were fulfilled.

3. Divine miracles were occasionally performed, as in the case

of Moses, Elijah, and Elisha. Miracles can only be wrought by God. *Mirabilia*, wondrous deeds, may be done by men. "Knowledge is power." A philosopher may perform what shall seem a miracle to a barbarian. On the same principle, and on this only, Satan, the prince of the power of the air, with his experience and knowledge, by his use of the powers which belong to the natural world, can perform wondrous deeds, which may seem miracles to the unenlightened, but are the product only of the powers which inhere in that world of nature which God has made. "His" (lying) "sign or wonder may come to pass;" but if the prophet say, "Let us go after other gods," he "shall be put to death." Deut. xiii. 1-5.

4. And finally, the weight, vigor, and wisdom exhibited in the discourses of the true prophet; his pure life, his fortitude, courage, and zeal; the absence of all self-seeking and ambition, as contrasted with those false prophets characterised by Ezek. xiii. 10-18, who plaister the rotten wall the people have built, with deceitful mortar; or those prophetesses who sew soft pillows or cushions for all armholes and heads of any stature to recline upon; "seeing visions of peace and there is no peace, and all to hunt souls for handfuls of barley and for pieces of bread; to slay the souls that should not die, and to save the souls alive that should not live"—those noble virtues, those disclosures of the surpassing grandeur of the Church, belonging to its distant future on earth and its heavenly glory, distinctly separate them from those "false prophets which come in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves."

ARTICLE VIII.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE COLUMBIA SEMINARY.

It is with no little hesitancy, and we might say reluctance, that we approach this subject. Nothing is more difficult than to divest one's self entirely of prejudice, in discussing this unhappy affair, and to look at the issues involved without allowing a personal element to enter into the decisions of the judgment. It is only because we are confident that we cherish none but the kindest feelings and entertain the sincerest respect for all concerned, that we venture to say one word. There can, of course, be nothing improper in expressing honest differences of opinion, while the views we hold are presented in respectful language and supported by legitimate arguments.

Having premised thus much in general, we desire to make several preliminary statements, lest, in the course of the discussion which is to follow, we be understood as advocating all that has been associated in the public mind with the positions which we shall undertake to defend.

In the first place, then, we think that nothing is clearer than that the Faculty of the Seminary had a right, under the Constitution, to appoint a Sabbath service in the chapel, and to make attendance upon that service obligatory.

In the second place, after mature consideration, we feel constrained to endorse the following language of the protestants in regard to the conduct of the students who did not attend the chapel service: "Whilst freely and fully conceding that these young brethren, concerning whom we have from the Faculty accounts in all other particulars favorable, pursued a course which at the time they thought right, they labored under a grave mistake as to the duty which an enlightened conscience would have dictated. That duty was to have promptly, quietly, and respectfully withdrawn from the Seminary when they discovered that they could not conscientiously obey a regulation made by the Faculty; not to remain there in a position of open defiance

of authority, and compel the Faculty to sterner measures of discipline." (Minutes of General Assembly, p. 525.) These young brethren, without seeing the bearings of their conduct, were really acting upon a principle at war with all sound ethics. And whatever views upon this subject may have been entertained during the period of excitement and agitation, we believe that all men of sober judgment and sound principles must come to admit as much as has here been asserted.

In the third place, we would say, with all due deference to the Assembly, that in our humble opinion its deliverance would have been improved had there been inserted in the first of the two resolutions which were added by way of amendment to the majority report, a statement to the effect that it approved the action of the Faculty in disciplining those of the students who had refused to attend chapel service. It is true that as much is implied in the reply to the protest. It is there plainly stated that "the discipline deemed proper by the Faculty, in connexion with the subject, was administered, and now remains in force. The Assembly does not propose to interfere with that discipline." (Minutes, p. 526.) It is simply extravagance to insist that this is not impliedly an indorsement of that discipline. We, however, in common with many others, think that it would have been better had there been a clear deliverance upon this point in connexion with the more general expression of confidence in the Faculty.

In the fourth place, we would add that we heartily agree with a writer in the October No. of this REVIEW, in his round condemnation of the doctrine that "the OBLIGATION [on the part of the students] to obey this Seminary regulation, which was neither *unscriptural* nor *unconstitutional*, was incompatible with their Christian liberty." (SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Vol. XXV., p. 461.) If it be said that in such a case conscience may release one from any obligation he may have otherwise been under to obey, we utterly repudiate the teaching. Conscience has no office here, except to instruct him who feels oppressed to submit quietly while he remains, or to withdraw promptly, quietly, and respectfully. We trust that there are none within the folds of our Southern Church who deliberately teach that conscience

may absolve the subject of a government from obedience to any requirement of that government which is neither anti-scriptural nor unconstitutional. If there be such, they are "fully abreast with the spirit of the age," and ought at once to "avow their allegiance to the *higher* law of conscience." We fully agree with our brother, that this principle would hinder all discipline on the part of any Church court. If our Church ever endorse it, she will thereby declare for "Broad Churchism," and we shall be under the necessity of departing in sorrow from her fold, or of giving the right hand of fellowship to Prof. Swing or any other heretic who may choose to become one of us. While we are upon this point, we would say that if there be any persons in our Church who hold such a doctrine and deliberately promulgate it, it is the *duty* of those who have evidence of the same, to prefer charges in the regular way, and bring the offenders to a speedy trial. We live most assuredly in a "slack time," and delay is dangerous. We honor the noble conduct of Dr. Patton, of Chicago, in standing up in the face of all opposition, to protest against heresy. He finally came off victorious, and we firmly believe that the truth is mighty and will always prevail. Surely we have some among us who will not hesitate to come boldly to the front and institute measures at once by which the spread of this noxious heresy may be arrested.

With these preliminary statements we trust that we shall not be suspected of sympathy with the doctrine of "Higher Law;" and we would fain believe that, on that account, we are not out of sympathy with any considerable portion of our beloved Southern Church. It is for this reason that we feel unable to accept several of the main conclusions which the respected author of the article entitled "*General Assembly versus Government*" seems to have reached in his own mind.

The first point upon which we feel constrained to take issue is the declaration that the General Assembly "has really committed itself to the principle, that *obligation* to obey any lawful regulation under any government, is or may be inconsistent with Christian liberty" (p. 461). The main argument by which he endeavors to establish this proposition is briefly this: The As-

sembly, in granting what the students desired, viz., that attendance upon the chapel service on Sabbath be made optional, admitted the force of their plea, and endorsed it as a good one. That plea we have already quoted, to condemn it, but it may be repeated here, and was this: "The OBLIGATION to obey this Seminary regulation, which was neither *unscriptural* nor *unconstitutional*, was incompatible with their Christian liberty."

Now it cannot be denied that, had the students formally petitioned the Assembly to interfere, and *upon this ground*; and had the Assembly done so without stating that it interfered on *other* grounds, and not on this, it would be a proper inference that it intended to endorse the plea. But no such formal overture was presented. This matter did not come up as an appeal from the students, but was brought before the Assembly by the minority report of the Committee on Theological Seminaries. This particular "plea," we are informed, was brought forward in debate by one of the speakers, and was urged as a reason, *which he regarded as valid*, why the students should not be obliged to attend the chapel service. Of course, it is not denied that the students also justified their course by this plea. Whether they did or did not, however, is of no importance, so far as the point under discussion is concerned.

It may be urged that the author of this plea was the confidential friend of the students in this entire matter, and that he was therefore their representative. All we need to affirm in reply is, that he was not acknowledged by the Assembly as their representative in any sense different from that in which all who advocated the views which finally prevailed were their representatives. Every member of the Assembly who advocated the minority report, and afterwards Mr. Collier's resolutions, stood upon precisely the same plane. The utterances of no one more than another can, in any fairness, be taken as an indication of the real significance of the Assembly's action.

This is a principle so plain that we should not have thought one word necessary to insure its universal adoption, had not so much stress been laid upon the utterance which is transformed into this plea, as really determining the meaning of the resolution

passed by the Assembly. Nor would we regard the recurrence of the argument under discussion as so very strange indeed, had the Assembly not said in reply to this very interpretation of its action, as well as other statements, that "many, perhaps most, of the statements made by the protestants seem, in the judgment of the Assembly, to concern utterances of members in debate rather than the utterance of the Assembly in the resolution adopted." (Minutes, p. 526.) Nothing can be clearer than that the Assembly intended to draw a broad distinction between "the utterances of members in debate" and its own utterance in the resolution complained of. Will any one undertake to say that the utterances of some members are here referred to, and not the utterances of all who spoke to the points complained of by the protestants? Surely this particular utterance was most strongly condemned by the protestants; and did the Assembly mean to draw a distinction between its own utterance and those of speakers less complained of, and not this one?

But again, the author of the article on "*General Assembly versus Government*," cannot consistently claim that the Assembly is responsible for the utterances of members in debate, inasmuch as he very earnestly and very cogently argues, that the Assembly could not have intended to declare the action of the Faculty in appointing the service unconstitutional, notwithstanding the fact that one of the ablest men in the body laid out his strength to prove that it was unconstitutional. The truth is, that for the argument of the article, it was very important to show that the Assembly regarded the appointment of the chapel service as neither unscriptural nor unconstitutional. The author seems to have felt that were it left uncertain whether the Assembly regarded that action as unconstitutional or not, it could be affirmed with little show of reason that it had "really committed itself to the principle that obligation to obey any LAWFUL regulation under any government, is or may be inconsistent with Christian liberty." No regulation can be "*lawful*" which is unconstitutional. The Assembly might, then, have freed the students from obligation to attend, and have left it doubtful whether they did not release them on the ground of the unconstitutionality of the

requirement. Of course there would have been no "Higher Law" in that. Our brother would get the Assembly into the clutches of one of those seemingly inexorable disjunctive syllogisms, and hence he must remove the possibility of its pleading ever afterwards that it regarded the action of the Faculty as unconstitutional. The alternatives, however, seem to be these: Either admit that the Assembly intended to declare the action of the Faculty unconstitutional, or that its deliverance is not to be interpreted as endorsing the pleas of those who spoke in favor of the action finally adopted. If the first be admitted, then the Assembly is not committed to "Higher Law." If the second be admitted, then the plea which winks at "Higher Law" is not to be taken as indicating the meaning of the Assembly. In either case the Assembly is not committed to the doctrine of the "Higher Law." This, of course, is an *argumentum ad hominem*; yet we feel confident that no other argument than that so well put by our brother, can be framed to prove that the Assembly is committed to the doctrine that conscience can free a man from obligation to obey a lawful regulation of a "*de facto*" government. There is no shadow of evidence, except that which has been drawn from the utterances of members in debate, which, before it is sufficient for the purpose, must have the help of an argument which proceeds upon the principle that utterances of members in debate do not commit the Assembly.

In concluding our remarks upon this head, we would refer to the declaration of a judicious writer in the July No. of this periodical, who, in reviewing the action of the Assembly, and the debate which preceded it, says: "But the public discussion did not turn upon the propriety of the appointment, but on the obligation of the students to attend. One would naturally think these to be correlative—and surely, if the pledge of the students to observe all the lawful regulations of the Faculty, and attend all the exercises they appoint, and the current language of the articles of the constitution, mean anything, they mean that a solemn obligation binds them to attend all these exercises while they remain in the Seminary—that to refuse is rebellion against lawful authority, and that if they cannot

conscientiously obey, they should not have entered; and if they had done so in ignorance, they should at once retire. *So apparent were these views made in the discussion, that the effort to justify the students gradually lost ground, and the question became, not what is the law, but what the law OUGHT to be, and forthwith the majority voted to change the law.*" (Italics ours.) SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Vol. XXV., pp. 394-5.

The writer of this article was, as we understand, present during the discussion. He was, therefore, acquainted with the facts. He was also very far from sympathising with the action of the Assembly. He here explicitly declares that the effort to justify the students so lost ground before the vote was taken, that the vote was upon an entirely different issue. This seems to us an explicit declaration that whatever might have been the sympathies of individual members, no plea of the students was endorsed. The doctrine of "Higher Law" must also have lost ground, if it at any time received favor. It seems to us, therefore, that the proposition that the Assembly "really committed itself to the principle that *obligation* to obey any lawful regulation under any government, is or may be inconsistent with Christian liberty," has not been proved. The Assembly yielded to no "demand of conscience," and cannot by any fair inference be condemned as going over to the doctrine of "Higher Law."

The second proposition to which we find ourselves unable to assent, is, that the Assembly's "decision is a palpable contradiction of the essential and primary idea of *Government* itself," in that it "grants to the students the liberty of optional obedience to a constitutional regulation [or law.]" (SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Vol. XXV., pp. 462 and 464.) We fully agree that "optional obedience" to a law is an absurdity. So far as there is option to do or not do, there can, from the very nature of the case, be no law. Therefore, to declare that a man is not under obligation to do any particular thing; or, what is the same thing, that he may do it or not as he chooses, is equivalent to declaring that there is no law which commands him to do that thing. Had the General Assembly undertaken to grant to the students the liberty to obey or not, as they chose, a *law*, it would have been

guilty, not so much of the wickedness of overturning government, as of the folly of talking absolute nonsense. Law and obligation to obey are correlatives. They cannot be separated.

Now admitting, for the sake of argument, that the Assembly intended to grant to the students the liberty of attending or not attending, as they chose, the chapel service, we are bound, upon the hypothesis that these brethren had the most elementary notions of what a law is, to conclude that the meaning was that there should be *no LAW as to chapel service*. It is a *necessary* inference, that in making attendance optional, they intended to abolish the law. This interpretation, we beg to submit, is no new thing. The reviewer of the Assembly's action, to whose article in the July No. we have before referred, says explicitly that "the question became, not what is law, but what *ought* the law to be? and forthwith *the majority voted to change the law.*" (Italics ours.) (SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Vol. XXV., p. 395.)

If the question be asked, whether, upon the supposition that the Assembly intended to change the law, its action was constitutional, we do not hesitate to answer that it was not. For, first of all, we lay it down as a fundamental principle, that no government, which has under it a subordinate government with a duly appointed Constitution, has any right to annul directly laws which are made by the subordinate government in accordance with its Constitution. It may have the right to amend the Constitution. Then the only legitimate way to get rid of enactments of the inferior government is to annul the provision or provisions of the Constitution which give the right to make them. This virtually annuls the law; and only thus can the superior annul it, without striking at the very roots of constitutional government. The General Assembly can, by a two-thirds vote, amend the Constitution of the Seminary. Did it undertake, in any other way, to annul any law made by the Faculty in accordance with the Constitution, it would transcend its sphere, and we might write with perfect fairness, "*General Assembly VERSUS Government.*"

It may be said that to restrict the General Assembly thus, is

equivalent to hindering it, in great measure, in its supervision of the Seminary. We answer, that it hinders it from acting with undue haste, inasmuch as it requires that two-thirds of the body regard the law as oppressive, or upon some other account inexpedient. Moreover, it still has the right of advising those intrusted with authority, and may thus be able to accomplish what is sought for, without going to the length of making amendments.

But it has been urged that the Assembly, in changing the law, did really change the Constitution. The method taken was of course not the usual one. Yet it amounts to this: It was only a blundering way of removing that provision which says that the Faculty shall, when it is deemed desirable, supply the students with preaching.

But there was no two-thirds vote. The Assembly, therefore, *only made an effort to change* the Constitution. For our part, we cannot see why there should have been so much said about the Assembly's changing the Constitution, simply because a majority of that body *tried* to change it and failed. This effort may foretoken another effort, which should arouse those who are anxious that the Constitution should not be amended. But for the present, nothing is plainer than that the Constitution remains as it was before the meeting of the Assembly. The Assembly, therefore, has violated no laws nor constitutions. The only thing is that it has done absolutely nothing in relation to the chapel service. Now this is the very thing, as it has been time and again asserted, that the Assembly ought to have done. We do not see the occasion for so much excitement.

Passing on from this, however, we desire now to recall the admission which was made merely for the sake of argument, to wit, that the Assembly's action could be fairly construed as granting to the students the liberty to attend or not attend the chapel service. We are utterly unable to see that the Assembly granted anything whatever to the students. We have already noted its implied approval of the discipline which the Faculty saw fit to visit upon those who did not obey the law. It thus showed clearly that it did not regard the students as justified in their course. But in relation to the law which these students had dis-

obeyed, they *recommended to the Faculty* that, for prudential reasons, *they change the law*. It seemed clear to the majority that this law, under the circumstances, was inexpedient, and in consequence they *advised* the Faculty to so modify their action as to the Sabbath service in the chapel, that there should no longer be a law obliging the students to attend. This, we think, is the only proper interpretation of the Assembly's recommendation that attendance be not obligatory. We are aware that it has not been affirmed that this action of the Assembly was *formally* a command. But it has been earnestly maintained that it was *virtually* more than advice: that though couched in "soft words," it meant you *shall* release the students from this obligation.

The only arguments for this interpretation, which we have been able to find, either expressly put or hinted at, are the following:

1. It has been intimated that the Assembly, in undertaking to *advise*, would depart from the proper character of a Presbyterian Church court, and would really take the position of Congregationalism. But since we ought to assume that it intended to act upon the principles of Presbyterianism, and not on those of Congregationalism, we may fairly infer that in all cases of "*recommendation*," the language is only euphemistic, the real intention being to *enjoin* or *command*. We do not present this confidently as the argument of the article in the last number of the REVIEW. We are not certain whether the brother intended by his remarks concerning the impropriety of Presbyterian courts' recommending, to intimate that the General Assembly, in the particular instance under discussion, went over to the principles of Congregationalism, in that it became an *advisory* body, or that it used "soft words" to express what would have been more appropriately expressed in "governmental phraseology." When we take his remarks upon this point out of their connexion, they seem to mean the first, viz., that the Assembly has allied itself with Congregationalism. But inasmuch as, in the immediate context, he is laboring to prove that the distinction between a "*decision*" and a "*recommendation*" can avail nothing towards freeing the Assem-

bly from the charge of *enacting a law* that attendance upon chapel service shall be voluntary, we feel compelled, in justice to him, to conclude that he intended to strengthen his main argument by these remarks.

Whatever may have been the use which our brother intended to make of it, he clearly intimates his opinion that no Presbyterian Church court can properly *advise*. "We think," says he, "recommendation belongs to an *advisory* rather than a governmental polity—to Congregationalism rather than Presbyterianism—and so, when we hear of any of our Church courts recommending, we always think that it is for one of two reasons: either the court is not sure of its *power* to enjoin, which is fatal to real government; or else of its *rights* in the premises; in which case the accused is justly entitled to the benefit of the doubt." (P. 472.) In our humble opinion, it is a great mistake to infer that because it is distinctive of Congregationalism, that its Conventions or Associations *can do no more than advise*, that therefore Presbyterian courts can *never* advise without surrendering what is distinctive of Presbyterianism. The specific difference of Congregationalism, defined from this point of view, is not that it *advises*, but that it *can only advise*. Presbyterianism differs from it in that it can also command. To argue, then, that when any organisation recommends, in the proper sense of that term, it thereby ceases to be a real government, and is to be classed with those whose polity is advisory rather than governmental, seems to us altogether unwarranted. Let us take the case of the State Governments which levy a tax and establish public schools, and then simply recommend to parents to send their children to these schools. Do those States which pursue this course cease to be governments? No more does a Presbyterian court abdicate the "governmental polity" when it recommends. It may simply recommend, not because it is not sure of its *power* to enjoin, or of its *rights* in the premises, but because it regards the action recommended as *expedient* merely. It does not deem that it is a case where there ought to be an obligation. It may be *lawful* not to do it, but in the judgment of the court it is more or less inexpedient not to do it. There is not a gov-

ernment upon the face of the earth, from that of the family up to the Empire, which does not sometimes refrain from commanding and merely advise. And we feel sure that very few will claim that Presbyterian courts cannot properly advise as well as command.

There is no presumption, therefore, against regarding the deliverance of the Assembly as a *bona fide* recommendation, inasmuch as it clearly has that form, and the court could properly give advice.

2. But again : It has been definitely argued that the Assembly must have intended to command, notwithstanding the fact that it used the "soft words," "*respectfully recommend*," because, in the reply to the protestants, the following language occurs : "We beg to remind all concerned that the action complained of is the action of this Assembly, to be respected and observed as such." (Minutes, p. 526.) We presume that the stress is to be laid upon the fact that the Assembly says that its action is to be "*observed*." The other word, "*respected*," can in no way be made to imply a command. But on the other hand, *to observe* does mean *to obey*. And if it can be proved that the Assembly must have intended to remind all concerned that they must *obey*, the necessary implication is that the original action was regarded as a command. But no one will maintain that *observe* always means *obey*—nor that its connexion here is such that it must signify as much. The truth is that it is a very vague word, and we may confidently affirm that far less violence would be done by making it mean less than *obey*, than by making the phrase, "*respectfully recommend*," signify more than *advise*.

Let us notice that, even though this argument failed us, it is plain that the reply to the protest, not being intended as an interpretation of the action of the Assembly, ought to be considered as of less value to that end than the resolution adopted by the Assembly for the express purpose of interpreting its action. That resolution is in these words :

"*Resolved*, That the resolution touching the attendance on services that may be held in the chapel of the Seminary at Columbia, on the Sabbath day, is not intended to reflect on the Faculty or Board of Trustees

of the Seminary, in any way, but simply to express the judgment of this Assembly as to the expediency of the compulsory feature of such services."—(Minutes, p. 494.)

A "*judgment as to expediency*" is not *usually* expressed by a command. And therefore, were there no qualifying word, we should be straining language very much to make this interpretation consistent with the hypothesis that the Assembly meant to do more than advise. But notice that it is declared that the Assembly intended "*simply* to express a judgment." It meant to *do no more than* express a judgment. We cannot see how the Assembly could possibly have done more to render it plain that its action was to be regarded as no more than advice. The majority seem to have been clear as to the inexpediency of a law obliging the students to attend preaching in the chapel. They, however, did not feel called upon to lay an injunction upon the Faculty, and therefore simply expressed their judgment in the form of advice.

But it may be said that even upon this ground the Assembly, by its advice, encouraged an unlawful action; and so its action tends, notwithstanding all these admissions, to undermine government. The ground upon which this claim has been made, is that the Faculty had no authority to annul this law. It is indeed a serious charge that the Assembly has advised the Faculty of the Seminary to act unconstitutionally. If it can be substantiated, we feel bound to say that we have not one word more to utter in defence of its action. He who advises another to do wrong is *particeps criminis* if the advice be taken, and is just as guilty if the advice be rejected.

In proof of the proposition that the Faculty could not lawfully take the advice to annul the law as to chapel service, it may be urged—

1. That the Faculty is a purely executive body. Their only duty is to cause the laws to be executed. According to this view of the matter, the laws are made by the Assembly in giving the Seminary a Constitution. Hence the particular law as to attendance upon chapel service was created by the Assembly, in

making it a provision of the Constitution, that "when desirable, the Faculty shall furnish the students with preaching."

We think that it cannot be claimed that the Assembly made the laws in any other sense than virtually. Let us take the particular law just referred to. If the Assembly may be said to have made that law at all, it did not make it an *actual* law. It expressly provided that it should become such upon a certain condition. And of the fulfilment of that condition the Faculty claimed to be the judges. The interpretation of the provision of the Constitution, which certainly will not be objected to by those with whom we are now at issue, is that the Faculty is the sole judge as to whether this law should go into effect, *i. e.*, become actual. It was left to their judgment to determine when it should become an actual law, just as really and truly as if they had been a purely legislative body. The only proper sense in which any man or body of men can have discretion, is to have matters left to his or their judgment. And we maintain that, according to the supposition that the Faculty alone were to judge of the desirableness of having preaching, that it was entirely discretionary with them as to when the law should be made actual and when it should be annulled as an actual law. It is to no purpose to say that they had no option when it became desirable to have preaching. They were the judges of the desirableness. They had the same discretion that any legislature has when the question comes up whether a certain enactment is not necessary for the welfare of the people for whom they legislate. They judge of the necessity of this law just as the Faculty judged of the desirableness of the preaching. And when once they see that it is necessary to conserve the interests of those whose interests they have sworn to conserve, they would violate their oath of office in not making the law, just as truly as the Faculty would violate their solemn engagements, did they not make the law actual when they judged it desirable that there should be preaching. We contend, therefore, that the Faculty had as much discretion as to whether the law should go into effect, as if they were legislative. We do not care to contend about words. If the Faculty had no discretionary power, they cer-

tainly should never have undertaken to judge whether or not the time had come to declare a potential law an actual one. We do not deny them this right, and therefore cannot but regard them as possessed of discretion.

2. But it will be said that the Assembly advised the Faculty not to make the law, even though they did deem it desirable to have preaching. The Constitution says, "*When desirable, the Faculty shall furnish the students with preaching.*" The Assembly says, "*in the event services in the chapel be deemed desirable,*" we recommend that attendance be voluntary. In other words, when you deem that the contingency has arisen upon which the Constitution commands you to make the law, do not make the law; *i. e.*, disobey the Constitution.

It will be noticed that two things are assumed here. The first is, that wherever the Constitution commands the Faculty to supply any species of instruction to the students, they have no option as to requiring the students to attend. It is urged that the Constitution itself, in providing that the students shall take a pledge to obey all the laws and regulations of the Seminary, implies that the students shall be required to attend all lawful exercises whatever, instituted by the Faculty. This question, it will be observed, is very different from the question whether the Faculty have a right to require attendance. The question is, whether the Faculty have a right *not to require*—to refrain from requiring—attendance. Of course we would not deny that the Faculty have a right to require attendance upon any exercise they may appoint, which exercise the Constitution allows them to appoint. But it has never been proved that it would be a violation of the Constitution of the Seminary for the Faculty to leave it to the option of the students whether or not they should attend some of these services. It might be highly inexpedient to allow such liberty to the students. That is another question. But to say that the Faculty has no discretion whatever in such a matter, is a statement we are not prepared to accept until it is proved. We cannot believe that those who framed the Constitution had so little confidence in these venerable brethren as to tie them down by such a prohibition. The point, then, which we make is, that

it has not been proved that the Faculty has no discretion as to whether attendance upon certain exercises shall or shall not be voluntary. To say, in reply, that the students are under obligation to obey all laws and regulations, is to beg the question; for the point at issue is whether the Faculty cannot abstain from making a law or regulation as to attendance in any given case, even when the Constitution instructs them to institute the exercise. We trust we shall not be understood as advocating the expediency of making attendance upon all exercises of College or Seminary optional. But we do believe that circumstances may arise when it would be inexpedient to make attendance obligatory, and that the Faculty ought to be the judges of this; and therefore we do not feel ready to believe that the Faculty of the Seminary have less discretion than a Faculty ought to have, and that other Faculties really do have, in relation to this matter. We wait for *proof* that they have not.

The second thing assumed by the argument under consideration is that the phrase, "in the event services in the chapel be deemed desirable," occurring in the Assembly's deliverance, is to be taken as perfectly synonymous with the phrase in the Constitution, "when desirable." A thing may be desirable in so many degrees, and for so many reasons, that we do not suppose any one ever thought of claiming that it was the duty of the Faculty to institute chapel service when it became desirable in any, the lowest, degree, or for any, the most unimportant, reason. And yet the language used by the Assembly might very properly apply to this lowest degree of desirableness, or desirableness for reasons evidently not contemplated in the Constitution; *e. g.*, the very noble desire of members of the Faculty to be preachers of the Word from the pulpit of the chapel, as well as from the chair of the lecture-room.

It may be urged that the use of the word "*desirable*," on the part of the Assembly, makes it very probable that they intended to refer to the same word in the Constitution. We reply that this is far from a necessary inference, and we ought to be ready to presume that the General Assembly did not stultify itself. When a prisoner is at the bar, accused of any crime on circum-

stantial evidence, it is only necessary for his counsel to show how all the facts may be explained upon some other hypothesis than that the accused committed the crime. Even stern and rigorous law is thus generous to the man whose character may be known to be very bad; and shall the *charity* of God's people be so narrow towards a venerable court of the Lord Jesus Christ, as to refuse to give her the benefit of the doubt! She is accused: ought she not to have the benefit of the doubt? Even if she were reduced to the position of the veriest vagabond in court, it need not be said that she has ever advised any one to violate law and order.

In conclusion, we would say that we are not prepared to agree with our brother when he claims that members of the Faculty of the Seminary have been wronged by the Assembly. He asserts that they have been *condemned*. We cannot see wherein they have been condemned. The Assembly expressed its entire confidence in the Seminary. It impliedly approved their course towards the students. It "*respectfully recommended*" a change, it is true, in one of the laws made by the Faculty. But the language used could not possibly have been more courteous. And when it was seen that some felt hurt, a resolution was passed, expressly declaring, that in the action taken, there was no intention to reflect on the Faculty or Board of Directors. We are aware that it has been said, with reference to this interpretation, that it cannot avail to wipe out the stigma affixed by the Assembly's action. This is the language used: "But some will say, Shall not the Assembly interpret its own action, and say what it intended to declare? Certainly. But, if not impertinent, we would like to know what would be thought of us, should we say of our neighbor, he is a thief, and when confronted with the charge, reply, we did say you were a thief, but we did not mean by this that you had stolen." (SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Vol. XXV., p. 470.) This is certainly strong language. But we are utterly unable to see the parallel. We cannot find anything in the Assembly's deliverance which is parallel with saying of our neighbor, *he is a thief*. Here is the Assembly's action in full, as far as the Faculty is concerned:

(5). That the General Assembly hereby expresses its entire confidence in the Faculty of Columbia Seminary.

(6). That the General Assembly respectfully recommends to the Faculty, that in the event services in the chapel be deemed desirable, the attendance on said services, on the part of Faculty and students, be voluntary.—(Minutes, p. 677.)

Had the Assembly used harsh language and then undertaken to explain it away, without expunging it from its records, there would be some appositeness in the illustration; though still we think the taste would be bad. But as it is, the illustration does not apply at all. While we are upon this point we trust we shall be pardoned if we say that the persistent effort to fix upon the Assembly's action a meaning which the words, in the first place, do not naturally suggest, and which meaning has been expressly repudiated by the Assembly, seems very much indeed like charging upon that body equivocation and falsehood. We will not say that this is the intention, but it is most assuredly the appearance. And now, while revering and honoring the Faculty of the Seminary as much as our brother does, we beg leave to say that we think the General Assembly is worthy of equal respect.

But to return to the point. The Assembly's action cannot be construed by any legitimate interpretation as condemning, in any degree, any members of the Faculty. The most that can be said is, that it implies a difference from them in judgment as to a matter of expediency. This, of course, could not of itself, be construed into unkindness. Believing as we do, that the deliverance of the Assembly was intended to be perfectly courteous, as its form certainly indicates, we deeply deplore the fact that any should have felt that they were injured. We feel, in common with many others, that the Seminary has already received a serious blow in the resignation of two of its professors; and it would be a sad day indeed for us which brought intelligence that the others, who are said to have been condemned, had also left her. Their services have been invaluable to the Church, and they are appreciated by full many of her sons. We would appeal to them, therefore, in the name of many who have enjoyed

their instructions, and beg them to stand by this school of the prophets in this her time of need. Even had the General Assembly condemned them, we would not hesitate to say that the *Church* does not condemn them. On the other hand she honors them, and is ready to-day to frown upon every one who would impeach them.

We beg leave to say once more that nothing has been written in unkindness. We have tried to divest ourselves of all partisanship. We have written in the interests of peace. We seek to glorify God, by healing the breaches which have been made. Asking of all a patient hearing, we submit these views to the consideration of God's people.

The author of the preceding article has written, he tells us, in the interests of peace. Of his sincerity, of his ability, and of his regard for the Seminary, there can be no reasonable doubt. The suggestions we have to make in dissent are few in number. "Nothing is clearer," he says, "than that the Faculty of the Seminary had a right, under the Constitution, to appoint a Sabbath service in the chapel, and make the attendance upon that service obligatory." On this we remark, that if the Faculty should appoint such a service, attendance upon it *would be* obligatory, both by the Constitution of the Seminary and the young men's signature to that document. The *Faculty* do not make it so. It is so *per se*.

Again, he admits that "these young brethren, without seeing the bearings of their conduct, were really acting upon a principle at war with all sound ethics." Yes. We have hesitated to use the language, only because we have wished well to them, and have hoped that they would live to see their error.

The main point on which we are disposed to differ with him, is in reference to "the question whether the Faculty have a right *not to require, i. e., to refrain from requiring,* attendance upon any exercise they may appoint." "It has never been proved that it would be a violation of the Constitution of the Seminary for the Faculty to leave it to the option of the students whether or not they should attend some of these services."

There were circumstances in the case of individual students, in which, when they existed, attendance on the Sabbath morning service in the chapel was not required. If any one was occupied in any Sabbath-

school or missionary work at that hour, he had full permission to be absent. Occasional absences, too, were overlooked, because special reasons for them might occur. It was the persistent, and defiant, and total absence, which constituted the gravamen of the offence. The Constitution makes no difference between the obligation to attend the religious exercises of the seminary and the obligation to attend classical exercises. The attendance upon morning and evening prayers, "and such other religious services as the Faculty may appoint," is as binding, under the Constitution, as attendance upon lectures and recitations. There is *need that it should be so*. In the year 1849, morning prayers lapsed for a season, through the inattention of the Senior Class, who were depended upon to conduct them, unknown to the Professors, until news was brought to us of the same from friends in a neighboring city, where the fact was repeated as evidence of a low state of piety, and to the great injury of the institution.

The Constitution of this Seminary was not lightly adopted. That of 1829, under which the Seminary first opened, was some time in maturing. It received a thorough revision in 1832—1833, in view of the defects found in it, and in the prospect of having the Board incorporated, which took place in 1833. The Committee of Revision were the Rev. Elipha White, the Rev. Benjamin Gildersleeve, and the Rev. Dr. William McDowell; the first a graduate of Andover Seminary, and the last two of Princeton. According to the testimony of the only survivor, the Rev. Dr. Gildersleeve, there were only the Constitutions of two Seminaries before them, that of Andover and the less elaborate one of Princeton. The Constitution of 1829, of seven 18mo. pages, grew to sixteen pages in that which was adopted by the Synod in 1833. This Constitution of 1833, like the original, contemplated Sabbath services: "The Professors, agreeably to the directions of the Board, shall supply the students with the preaching of the gospel, and the administration of its ordinances." And it is reasonable to suppose, from the numerous additions made from that source, that the spirit of the Andover Constitution, which says, "Every student shall constantly attend morning prayers and public worship in the chapel on the Sabbath; and on all conferences and seasons of special devotion, as required by the Faculty," was infused into ours. The Constitution has been subject to various revisions since, under the eye of Dr Thornwell and others.

We do not see, after the students themselves have assented to the Constitution *voluntarily*, that they can claim exemption from its provisions. They have made their vow, they have given their word of promise, from which only extraordinary and providential circumstances of disability can absolve them. If the optional principle were introduced, there are *studies*—such as the word of God in the original tongues which God selected as the medium of his revelation, the voca-

bles of which are the only ones now on the earth indited by the Holy Spirit—which would be avoided by many, though a knowledge of these tongues is required for licensure and ordination in our Church, and our Confession declares that “in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them.”

The Columbia church was itself organised in the College chapel, and under Dr. Brown occupied its galleries as their place of worship. When, in 1815–1818, they had a house of their own and established an independent place of worship, seats were assigned to the College students in the galleries or elsewhere. The time came when, under the press of circumstances, an independent worship was established at the College, under Professor, afterwards Bishop, Elliott, and the body of the students, who had hitherto worshipped where they pleased, were withdrawn from attendance elsewhere to attend a Sabbath morning worship at the chapel.

The optional attendance claimed would put it in the power of the students to break up all attempted worship on Sabbath in the Seminary chapel, however desirable it might otherwise be, and however sanctioned, according to the provisions of the earlier Constitution, by the Board of Directors.—[EDITORS SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.]

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Genesis of the New England Churches. By LEONARD BACON. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1874. Pp. 485, 12mo.

This volume contains twenty chapters. The First undertakes to tell "What was in the beginning;" in other words, what the Church was as to organisation in the time of the apostles. The author makes "Christianity simply gospel," and *no order*, in those first days! Chapter the Second portrays the progress made "from the Primitive to the Papal." Chapter the Third is an attempt to describe what the Reformation in the sixteenth century did for Church Polity. It is meagre and shallow to the last degree. The next Chapter introduces the Puritans, whom Dr. Bacon describes as demanding "ecclesiastical reformation to be made by the national authority." He is zealous for distinguishing betwixt them and the Separatists. In Chapters Five, Six, and Seven, he carefully draws the lines dividing these two parties. His hero is the *Separatist*, whose enemies alike were the *Nationals*, both Conformist and Nonconformist. It is this latter class to whom he confines the name *Puritan*. Their enmity to the poor persecuted Separatists is but by some degrees less virulent than that of the English Church herself, to which Dr. Bacon is extremely unwilling to give the name of *Church* at all. The Puritans in fact are Presbyterians, and Presbyterianism is but a few degrees less evil than Prelacy or Popery. In one place we read as follows, where the author is describing Hatton, the Lord Chancellor: "Law had made him a Protestant; and if it should change, it might make him a Papist again, or a Presbyterian, or a Pagan." (p. 101.) Such being the Puritans, the Separatists were first the Brownists or strict and rigid Independents, and afterwards the Congregationalists, or followers of Robinson. The Separatist, as such, we repeat, is Dr. Bacon's hero,

and his work is a defence of what he calls "the Principle of Separation." (P. 222.)

Chapters Eight and Nine give a touching account of the martyrdom of sundry Separatists; amongst others, of John Penzy, a Welshman, the only charge against whom seems to have been his zeal for preaching the gospel to his poor countrymen. These chapters constitute a very heavy indictment against the English Church dignitaries of the period.

Chapter Ten describes the Church of Separatists at Scrooby, where our author finds "the germ of New England."

Chapter Eleven gives us the Separatists in their exile at Amsterdam.

Chapter Twelve presents them prosperously and peacefully settled at Leyden, under the pastorship of Robinson.

Then follow seven chapters recounting the thrilling story of the Pilgrims' departure from Leyden for the New World, and their landing and settlement on the wild New England shore.

The concluding chapter presents us with a Puritan colony settling in New England, (the forerunners of a great exodus,) and very soon coalescing with their Separatist brethren there, where "the air of the free wilderness" cured them of their antipathies to the theory of the Pilgrims. There was found no reason, "in the freedom of this great wilderness," why the Separatist should separate from the Puritan, or the Puritan purge himself from Separatism. (P. 477.)

Here, says Dr. Bacon, is "the beginning of a distinctively American Church History." New England has ever been prone to call its matters by a name which belongs alike to every section of this great country. But our author, throughout his whole book, dwells so constantly on the evil of Nationalism in ecclesiastical matters, that his use of the term *American* here is quite remarkable. His only fault with the Puritans is that they were *national*—which we had supposed was now considered *the very thing* all over the North, and especially in New England. On the other hand, with Dr. Bacon the great glory of the Independents was *separation*—their separate and voluntary action in matters of religion; or, as the author puts it, their zeal for "Reforma-

tion without tarrying for any." Dr. Bacon seems to us to see no great harm in corruptions of the primitive worship or government or doctrine. The great and solitary defect supervening upon "what was in the beginning," is with him a false theory of the relations betwixt Church and State! Just let it be understood and acted on, that "the Church is nothing else than the spontaneous association of 'the Lord's free people,' for spiritual fellowship; and neither king nor Parliament can put a man into a Church or put him out of it," (p. 305,) and Dr. Bacon appears to think all other evil things to be of trifling consequence. He even allows himself to say that "at the present day, it weighs not much in proof of Smyth's instability, [Rev. John Smyth, one of the erratic Separatists,] or against the soundness of his judgment, when we are told that he adopted those theological opinions which Arminians had maintained in opposition to Gomarus, and which were favored in England by divines like Laud and Bancroft." (P. 223.)

We propose in a future number of this journal to take up this work of the very Coryphæus of modern Congregationalism, and give it a somewhat more elaborate review. In the meanwhile we observe that many parts of Dr. Bacon's story have entertained and instructed us greatly. His account of Barrowe the Separatist, for example, is extremely impressive and interesting, and nothing can be more affecting than the history he gives of the persecutions generally undergone by these people. His account of the removal from Leyden to the shores of the New World is beyond measure touching, while his description of the voyage of the Mayflower is eloquent and beautiful in the highest degree.

We subjoin a few extracts from the work, which will give to the reader some idea of its style.

Here is first the picture of Robert Browne, the founder of Independency:

Robert Browne was a young man of impetuous and reckless zeal, and eloquent in popular discourse, but of an imperious, passionate, and unstable disposition. He was an active and daring agitator, not only in that diocese, but in other parts of England. More than once he had been called to account for ecclesiastical irregularities; and once, at least, he

had been imprisoned at Norwich by the High Commission Court. But being a kinsman of the Queen's most trusted and most powerful counsellor, Lord Burleigh, he had a measure of impunity, from which he seems to have taken courage. Not long after his release, in compliance with Lord Burleigh's request to the bishop, from the prison at Norwich, he was constrained to flee from England, as many had done already, and at Middleburg, in the Dutch republic, he gathered a church of English exiles, chiefly friends of his, who had accompanied him, (1582.) At that place he printed two books or pamphlets, setting forth distinctly the new idea of Church reformation, which was nothing else than to restore the purely voluntary Christianity of the New Testament. Such books could not have been printed in England but by stealth; yet they were printed for circulation and effect in England, as Tyndale's translation of the New Testament had been more than fifty years before that time. . . .

Robert Browne was not a martyr. He was not of the stuff that martyrs are made of. The passion that impelled him was the love of agitation. When that passion had partly spent itself, he did what mere agitators often do as they grow older—he turned conservative and betrayed the cause for which he had contended. After about two years in Holland, he passed over into Scotland, (1584,) his flock at Middleburg having been broken up, as might have been expected in view of his imperious and impulsive temper. A pastor of such a temper may be a much better man than Browne was, and yet bring ruin upon a much stronger Church than that little society of English exiles could have been. In Scotland the agitator was as obnoxious to the Presbyterian establishment as he had been to Bishop Freke in his native country. The next year (1585) we find him in England again, presuming on the comparative immunity which he had by virtue of his high connexion, and soon renewing his work of agitation. Five years after the martyrdom of Copping and Thacker, he was vanquished by the civil disabilities consequent on a sentence of excommunication which had been pronounced against him in a Bishop's Court, for the contempt of not appearing in answer to a citation. Thereupon he "submitted himself to the order and government established" in the Church of England, and was restored to good standing, not only in the Church, but in its priesthood. By the influence of his friends at Court, he obtained "means and help for some ecclesiastical preferment," and in a short time after his submission he received a benefice, (1591.) This does not imply that he recanted his opinions, or made any profession of repentance for what he had done—it was enough that he submitted. He had not even the desperate self-respect which prompted Judas to hang himself; but, like Benedict Arnold, he took care not to lose the poor reward of his baseness. He was the rector of a parish, and received his tithes, but never preached. By his idle and dissolute life, he disgraced his ministry; but inasmuch as

he could not be charged with nonconformity, he retained his living. The quarrelsome temper which had broken up his little church at Middelburg, vented itself upon his wife in acts of cruelty, and they could not live together. In a quarrel with the constable of the parish, he took the responsibility of beating that officer. Arraigned before a Justice for the unclerical offence, he used such violence of speech that he was sent to prison for contempt, and there he died at the age of eighty, a miserable and despised old man, but a beneficed minister of the Church of England, and in regular standing.* He died in the year 1630, when the separation, which he deserted, and for which Thacker and Copping suffered an ignominious death, had founded a Christian commonwealth in New England. They died in their early manhood; he lived on, and "the days of his years, by reason of strength, were fourscore years;" yet how much better and more blessed was it to die as they died, than to live as he lived!

The following is an account of the burning of the books of Barrowe and Greenwood, through the zeal of one who afterwards, by means of these very writings, was won over to their cause:

At the time when these partners in testimony and in suffering had overcome the "incommodities of the place," and notwithstanding the vigilance of their enemies, had their book ready in some sort for the printer, and when their manuscripts were smuggled "beyond seas" to be printed, Francis Johnson was ministering as chaplain to the English merchants at Middelburg, being supported by them with a commendable liberality. Like most of the English clergymen who found employment of that sort in foreign parts, he was an advanced Puritan, zealous not only against superstitious vestments and ceremonies, but against the government established in the Church of England. At the University of Cambridge, two years before, he had given offence to the ruling powers by a sermon after the manner of Cartwright, maintaining that the Church ought to be governed by teaching and ruling elders, and implying that any other government in the Church is unauthorised. For that sermon he was summoned before the Vice-Chancellor and the heads of the Colleges, and was by their authority committed to prison. Being required to make a public recantation, and refusing to make it in the terms prescribed, he was expelled from the University. He appealed against that sentence, and was then imprisoned again because he would not go away till his case had been decided. The result was that, after a twelvemonth of academic agitation between the Nonconformist and Reformist factions, he withdrew from Cambridge, and we next find him "preacher to the Company of English of the Staple at Middelburg, in Zealand." The

* Fuller, "Church History," v., 63-70.

fact came to his knowledge that a book by two Separatists, so notorious and so obnoxious as Barrowe and Greenwood, was in the hands of printers there; and as a loyal though Puritan member and minister of the Church of England, he was alarmed at the thought of how much harm might be done by the circulation of that book in England. He communicated the alarming information to the English ambassador, and was employed to "intercept" the publication, and to take care that the edition should be destroyed. He waited till the last sheets had gone through the press; and then he executed his commission so thoroughly that he permitted only two copies to escape the fire—"one to keep in his own study, that he might see the errors, and the other to bestow on a special friend for the like use." So the great labor of the two prisoners, amid "continued tossings and turmoils, searches and riflings, and with no peace or means given them to write or revise what they had written," seemed to have been in vain.

Yet it was not entirely labor lost. It took effect in an unexpected way; first, on the over-zealous Puritan who had "intercepted and destroyed the edition. When he had done this work he went home, and being set down in his study, he began to turn over some pages of this book, and superficially to read some things here and there, as his fancy led him. At length he met with something that began to work upon his spirit, which so wrought with him as drew him to this resolution, seriously to read over the whole book; the which he did once and again. In the end he was so taken, and his conscience was troubled so, as he could have no rest in himself until he crossed the seas and came to London to confer with the authors, who were then in prison." Fourteen years later, the "intercepted" book was reprinted at Amsterdam. Francis Johnson, banished from England as a Separatist, had become the pastor of a banished Church, which had found a refuge in that city; and there "he caused the same books which he had been an instrument to burn, to be new printed and set out at his own charge."

This concluding extract presents to us the prisoners, "Henry Barrowe, gentleman," and "John Greenwood, clerk," who have been six years in confinement for the crime of writing the seditious books just referred to, there being "nothing in the books but matters ecclesiastical, controverted betwixt this clergy and us." They make two escapes from death, but it overtakes them most unjustly at the last.

Two "near and miraculous escapes." What were they? "Early in the morning" of the day after the trial, ("direction having been given for execution to-morrow, as in case of like quality," and the night having come and gone with no intimation of "her Majesty's pleasure to have

execution deferred,") preparation was made for the execution of the condemned. They were brought out of the dungeon, their "irons smitten off," and they were "ready to be bound to the cart"—tasting the very bitterness of death—when a reprieve came. After that, "the bishops," thinking, perhaps, that their courage might have failed, "sent certain doctors and deans" to exhort them and confer with them. "But," said Barrowe, "we showed them how they had neglected the time. We had been well nigh six years in their prisons; never refused, but always humbly desired of them Christian conference; . . . but never could obtain it; that our time now was short in this world." Another week in the dungeon, and again, "early," the daylight struggling with the fog, Barrowe and Greenwood—the two less conspicuous offenders being left behind—are brought forth to die; again they undergo those grim preparations: they are bound to the cart, and "secretly," along the streets not yet astir with traffic, they are "conveyed to the place of execution"—"tied by the necks to the tree," and permitted to speak a few last words. Let Barrowe himself tell us how they speak: "Craving pardon of all men whom we had any way offended, and freely forgiving the whole world, we used prayer for her Majesty, the magistrates, people, and even for our adversaries." Then, at the last moment, when they had tasted again the bitterness of death, there comes another reprieve, and they go back to the dungeon. "Having almost finished our last words," says Barrowe, "behold! one was even at that instant come with a reprieve for our lives from her Majesty, which was not only thankfully received of us, but with exceeding rejoicing and applause of all the people, both at the place of execution and on the ways, streets, and houses, as we returned."

There was another month of waiting in prison, with "no assured stay or respite." Could the prisoners have been subdued by the twice-encountered terrors of death—could they have been brought, by any method of persuasion, to renounce the truth which it was their mission to maintain—could they have been induced, as Robert Browne had been, to dishonor their own testimony by a promise simply of submission to the Church of England—there was no room to doubt that the reprieve would have been made a pardon. But the labor of "doctors and deans," with the gallows in the background of every exhortation and every syllogism, was unsuccessful. Those prisoners had seen the gallows, and had felt the cord around their necks, but they had also seen a truth which the "doctors and deans" could not see, and for that truth they were willing to die.

. . . A certain bill, designed to make the law more effective against the Separatists, had passed the House of Lords, which might have been called in those days the House of Bishops, but in the House of Commons, where Puritanism was powerful, it had encountered opposition, and had been subjected to amendment.

It was about a month since the last reprieve of Barrowe and Greenwood, and they were still lying in jail and in irons, with "no assured stay or respite," when these proceedings, so distasteful to Elizabeth and her prelates, were had in the House of Commons. The next day, "early in the morning," the twice-reprieved prisoners were brought out once more; their irons were once more smitten off; once more they were bound to the cart and hastily driven to Tyburn.

Again, under the gallows, with the ropes about their necks, they prayed for the Queen and for England, spoke their last words to the people gathered around the scaffold; but there came no reprieve, and so they were hanged.

Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. By HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, Th. D., *Oberconsistorial-Rath*, Hannover. From the German. The Translation Revised and Edited, with the sanction of the author, by WM. P. DICKSON, D. D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. T. & T. Clark, publishers. Galatians, one Volume. Romans, Vol. I., (ch. i.—vii., 6.) pp. 324. Vol. II., (ch. vii. 7—xvi. 27,) pp. 392.

The earnest student of Biblical Science will hail with delight the English version of the greatest of German exegetes. And all the more surely will this be on account of the experienced failure of most if not all such German works as have been made accessible to English readers to meet our wants, or the expectations awakened by their announcement. For notwithstanding the faithful labors of Dr. Schaff and his editorial staff, we feel sure that the bulky and incongruous volumes of Lange's Commentaries have not met public expectation. And of Delitzsch, without the same personal experience, we believe the same. There is a desultory verbiage—a mere aggregation of opinions without regard to their value—which constantly reminds one of the Rabbins. Such is by no means the case with Dr. Meyer. More acutely critical than Dean Alford, in grasp of thought he excels Bishop Ellicott. His style is masculine, terse, and clear; his analysis, searching; his thought, bold and free as the eagle's flight; his learning, vast and exhaustive. In the doctrinal soundness of his views, judged by our Presbyterian standards, which we of course heartily believe to be the true sense of Scripture, he is not quite up to the mark. But in the forty years of ceaseless

labor, his noble intellect was seen moving steadily upward from the mists and quagmires of neology towards the platform of the Reformation divines and their Confessions. In his own simple, manly way, he thus speaks in the Preface to the last German edition: "Forty years have now elapsed since my Commentaries on the New Testament were first given to the public. The first edition of the first volume—the weak commencement—appeared in January, 1832. A scientific work, which has passed through a long course of development, and still continues that course, has always a history—a biography—of its own, which of course is intimately interwoven with that of its author. Yet in this retrospect I can only be filled with praise and thanksgiving to the divine grace; of myself I say nothing. The indulgence of friendly readers which I have experienced so long, will not, I hope, fail to be extended to me, when my day's work is drawing to its end."

It is our wish and hope that some scholarly hand will soon undertake to set before us the "biography" of this "masterpiece of exegesis," as Dr. Dickson well terms it; and that the "interwoven" life of the German student, burning quietly like the lamp in the seclusion of the holy shrine, may be so far unfolded as to enable us to trace through the constant alterations of his various editions the successive steps by which he pressed ever nearer to the purest evangelicalism and orthodoxy. We have imagined that in Dr. Meyer, as perhaps the highest type of German thought in the department of Biblical exegesis, we might best see the return of the Lost Pleiad—the retrograde movement which long since set in, and is slowly bringing back Teutonic thought from its wild vagaries in Philosophy and Criticism. May the "Fatherland" have abundant enjoyment of Augustine's saying: "He who hath never profoundly doubted, hath never profoundly believed."

In executing the delicate task of editor to such a work, Dr. Dickson has wisely chosen to let Meyer speak for himself. In such opinions as he cannot accept, he expects the reader to find ample means of correction in such commentaries as are within reach. Critical accuracy in rendering exactly the author's

meaning, seems to be his single aim; while in verbal fidelity to the proof-sheets, and in the clearness of type and paper, the Messrs. Clark have done justice to their own reputation. They apologise for the slow appearance of successive volumes on the ground of the time necessary for the great care taken, and the consequent cost. Their subscription price is one guinea for four volumes. The Edinburgh edition can be imported through our Committee of Publication in Richmond, or by any reputable bookseller. Our copies came from Messrs. Willing & Williamson, Toronto, Canada, who will send at small expense by mail. Perhaps other volumes have appeared in Scotland, but these are the only ones which have reached us.

Dr. Dickson has associated Professor Crombie, of St. Andrew's, with him in the editorship, and announces that a volume of the *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, edited by him, is ready to be issued with the second volume on the Romans. B.

The Combination Speller: A Scientific Development of English Orthography and Orthoepy, by a full Analysis of the Sounds of the Language and Adaptation of the Alphabet to a Phonetic basis; together with Rules for Spelling; the Meaning of Prefixes and Suffixes; the use of Words likely to be confounded, etc., etc. Conformed chiefly to Webster's Dictionary. By JAMES W. SHEARER. New York: Ivison, Blake-man, Taylor & Co., 138 and 140 Grand Street. Chicago: 133 and 135 State Street. 1874. Pp. 168, 16mo.

The anomalies of our language, as to spelling and pronunciation, are most perplexing to foreigners and to our own children. The author of this little work makes a full classification of them, and an elaborate attempt to devise a system that will make it easy to overcome them all. He declares in his preface that "the simplicity and practicability of this system has been universally commended at the leading institutions of our land, from Harvard to the University of Virginia." And he expects that it will constitute a "new era in primary instruction in lexicography and in the study of our language by foreigners." A cursory examination of it has not convinced us that it is so simple; but we are willing to suppose that it is as much so as the nature of the case will admit.

Delivery and Development of Christian Doctrine. The Fifth Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By ROBERT RAINY, D. D., Professor of Divinity and Church History, New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. MDCCCLXXIV. Pp. 409, 8vo.

All that we can at present attempt in noticing Dr. Rainy's work is to set briefly before our readers what it is that this eminent Presbyterian divine and Professor holds and maintains in these six Cunningham Lectures. After clearing the way before him in four lectures, he comes in his fifth lecture to the question, "Ought we to recognise development of doctrine as a legitimate function of the Church of Christ? and if in any sense it is to be recognised, then in what sense?" He answers his own question: Development there certainly was under the Old Testament, and the light shining more and more, as the rising of the Sun of Righteousness drew nearer. But this was provided for in those days by a progressive revelation, which guaranteed what it gave. Development also may certainly be traced in the writings of the New Testament, but here, too, the inspiring Spirit who guided the human element, while he supplied the divine one, is to be confessed. But ought we to admit that, after the removal of inspired teachers, doctrines are unfolded and elaborated as the ages pass—doctrines which were not unfolded at the first, and which yet deserve a place in the system of the Church's faith? By those who accept the Scriptures as the sole, complete, and adequate rule of faith, difficulty has been felt. For what more of Christian truth can men have than the apostles delivered by word and writ to the early Christians? Or, if more be asserted, does not the assertion imply, first, that the Scriptures are by themselves insufficient, and, second, that valid additions from other quarters (whatever these may be) have been made to the teaching which they contain?

Development has been powerfully asserted both by Rationalists and by some Romanists. Rationalists commonly regard and represent Christian doctrine as one branch of the general progress of the human mind. The Scriptures are with them not properly a rule of faith, much less a complete rule, but only

the record of certain movements of the human mind due to natural causes, or, as some would admit, due partly to causes which are, in some sense, supernatural. Development was, therefore, natural and valid. It could not be dispensed with, and it could not be arrested.

A companion theory has been brought out by some of the defenders of Rome, asserting a development, very like that of the Rationalists, in so far as the human forces are concerned, which urge on the process, but superintended by the infallible Church, which sifts the results and guarantees to the faith of Catholic Christians those which are authentic. Dr. Newman has been the most brilliant and ingenious expounder of this theory. And he had gifts and peculiarities of mind which perfectly fitted him for the task.

Now this theory of development was not the old Romish doctrine of tradition, and it is regarded with suspicion and dislike by many influential persons in the Church of Rome. Moreover this is not the original Anglican or High Church doctrine. Indeed that party, both in its ancient and in its recent, or Tractarian, form, proceeded on views totally inconsistent with any such theory. They relied on an alleged consent of the Fathers as the explicit warrant for all they taught, and a sufficient ground of sentence against any later doctrines. Newman has told us how the break-down of this *via media* led him to embrace Romanism and the development theory both at once.

The old Protestant position in the polemic against Rome was not friendly to a theory of development. Not only was the original or primitive teaching of the Scriptures asserted as the proper test or standard, but it appeared suitable to assume and assert a corresponding original faith in the Church which had been corrupted by Antichrist, but to which the Reformation had brought the Church back. Hence some Protestant writers, as well as Romish, have laid it down that a negative prescription runs against anything taught for Christian doctrine, which was not taught in the early Church. And every one knows how freely the challenge to produce early authorities for what is taught has been accepted, on the ground that in a pure age of

the Church the pure doctrine must be presumed to have been extant.

Accordingly, most, if not all, those who argued on the Protestant side against Dr. Newman, thirty years ago, generally treated the assertion of any substantial development as if it were treason to the faith. None among them could more worthily represent the rest, than the lamented Archer Butler. He lays it down expressly that the only development he grants, (setting aside the development of error) is that which may have taken place by strict logical inference from Scripture propositions.

Yet even those who were most rigid in excluding development, have commonly been obliged to make concessions at some point in their argument. They have been obliged to admit that inevitable processes are at work in the Church, producing changes in the modes of statement and of explanation adopted. Abroad, also, in Germany, theologians were well accustomed to represent the history of theology as a process of development; and if this began with the Rationalists, ere long the believing theologians followed in the same line. In Great Britain likewise, since the date of the publication of Newman's work, the tendency has much increased, amongst men of different schools, to admit and apply the idea of development, though it is often done with little regard to the grounds on which it should be placed, or to the consequences which may be involved in it.

The object of Dr. Rainy, then, in his fifth lecture, is to assert and vindicate development of doctrine as a function of the Church of Christ, belonging to her duty, connected with a right use of her privileges, and indeed indispensable to her life. It is asserted as a source of change and advance, not sudden, impulsive, and fitful, but commonly slow, secular, and cumulative. It is asserted as consisting well with all that Protestants hold of the completeness, perfection, and clearness of the Word of God; and therefore, as free from implication with the principle of Rationalism on the one hand, and with the principle of Romanism on the other—with both of which it has been represented as allied. It is asserted as necessitated, *a priori*, by the nature of

the case, and proved, in fact, *a posteriori*, from the evidence of history.

But where is the starting point to be fixed? Not, says Dr. Rainy, from the completed revelation, as delivered by apostolic men—that would be indeed a lofty starting point. The development starts from the measure of understanding which the Church had of the Revelation at the time when apostolic guidance ended. Between these two there is a connexion, but there is a very great difference also between them—a difference as great as that between the brightness of the sun and the reflection of it on some imperfectly polished surface.

First, in the Church generally there must have been a thorough acquaintance with the history of the great facts of divine revelation. There was also a very lively appreciation of the mercy of God set forth in these facts. This included, *secondly*, a great deal that was in the strictest sense doctrinal. The fundamentals of Christian truth were doubtless so received that instant way was made for the appropriation of Gospel blessings, and for the enjoyment of fellowship with God. *Thirdly*, as this was connected with the inward grace of the Holy Spirit, so also it was sealed in the experience of a Christian life. Yet, *fourthly*, there might remain, and there must have remained, a great disparity between that which was delivered in the Scriptures, and that which the Church had as yet taken in and received.

Now this disproportion or defect may be traced to different causes, and so might exist in different ways. *First*, it might exist as an elementary way of conceiving things, which ought to be looked at as natural and blameless. Now the very earliest Christian literature is, in fact, characterised by a strong and joyful hold of the Christian facts, and a fine perception of the way these bear on practical life; but there is a manifest feebleness and uncertainty in handling Christian principles. Here then, was room for progress. But besides an elementary style of conceiving and contemplating the faith, which is natural and blameless—to grow on which and from which is the Church's proper calling—there were defects arising from causes less inno-

cent. First of all, indocility cleaves to men, even renewed men. Secondly, sluggishness embarrasses their proficiency as Christians. Thirdly, men's minds were prepossessed. A leaven of old prejudice, whether from old Paganism or old Judaism, or old philosophy, or old art, or old social life, pitched, as it had been, to a non-Christian key. Such were common and pervading conditions of the Church's life, and the result was a more or less pervading and characteristic defect in the Church's attainment.

It is easy to see, then, that the starting point of a process of development is not the apostolic teaching, but something far lower, viz., the initial attainments of the Church under that teaching. This once admitted, it will also be understood that the development ought to be, not so much *from the Scriptures* as a point of departure, but *towards the Scripture* fulness as the goal and landing place.

This is not all we should wish to present to our readers from Dr. Rainy's fifth Lecture, but it is enough to define his position before them. And the concluding sentence, just quoted, is enough to evince how very far this theory of development is from disparaging the perfection and completeness of the Word of God.

Public Worship, Partly Responsive. Designed for any Christian Congregation. With an Introduction by REV. DANIEL MARCH, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co., 710 Arch street. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. Pp. 212. 16mo.

This is a series of prayers for public worship, prepared for the mornings and afternoons of five Sundays, and a sixth one which is abbreviated from the Episcopal book of common prayer. The book is prepared for use in College chapels, in schools, in public institutions, in reformatory houses, at sea-side and other resorts, in places where there is no settled ministry; and, in short, wherever Christians desire to worship—no minister being present—and where a responsive service is desired, but there is an unwillingness to use the Liturgy of the Episcopal Church.

Undoubtedly the Holy Spirit helps men to pray, and therefore we ought not to bind ourselves rigorously to the use of any form of prayer, but allow free scope to the desires which the Spirit may awaken.

On the other hand, few men ever pray, whether alone or in the company of others, without the use, more or less fully, of some form of prayer. Often, too, the forms used are exceptionable in one way or another, so that any honest attempt to improve our own forms and those of others, is a thing worthy of commendation. And surely, it were better to read, with the heart, a good prayer out of a book, than not to pray at all.

We are for liberty in prayer, hostile to any imposition of forms of prayer upon ourselves by any human authority whatever; we are equally opposed to any attempt to hinder any who so choose, from using a good form of prayer. Our Lord gave us one form, and the inspired Psalmist many forms of prayer as well as praise.

These forms are apparently what their compiler claims that they are—"simple, dignified, devotional,"—and we add, scriptural.

The Genius of the Gospel, a Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew. By DAVID THOMAS, D. D., Minister of Stockwell C. Church, London; editor of the "Homilist;" compiler of "The Biblical Liturgy;" author of "The Practical Philosopher," "A Homiletical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles," etc., etc. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM WEBSTER, M. A., late Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge; author of "The Syntax and Synonyms of the Greek Testament," joint editor of "Webster and Wilkinson's Greek Testament," etc. Seventh Thousand. Smith, English, & Co., booksellers and importers, No. 710, Arch street, Philadelphia. Pp. 560. 8vo.

This work consists of the "substance of discourses first spoken from the pulpit, and afterwards published in "The Homilist," from month to month, extending over a period of well-nigh fourteen years." The author says: "They are full or sketchy, discursive or condensed, according to the time at my disposal when I wrote—elaborate or analytically, vivacious or otherwise, according to

my mood at the hour in which the thoughts took their rise, shaped their form, and gave their expression." And he says that, "although several thousand copies of this work have already been sold, most urgent demands have for some time been made for another edition," and that "in yielding to the general request, the author has neither felt the necessity nor possessed the time for making any alterations; this edition, therefore, being identical with the last, the original preface is reproduced."

Not to dwell long on the logic of the last two or three lines, let us just remark that it plainly signifies, not only that this edition is identical with the *last*, but with the *first* also. We are left to conclude, therefore, that these observations on Matthew, depending for their character on the author's mood at the hour when he spoke or wrote them, have never found him sufficiently at leisure to revise or to amend and improve them. He must be a very busy man; he certainly is a tolerably confident one. To perpetuate a volume of 560 closely printed and wide octavo pages, made up of things struck off frequently in a hurry, and getting their shape from the feelings of the hour, was bad enough for a man to do once, or to do and say nothing about it; but to do it repeatedly and to boast, as it were, about it, is entirely too much. Yet the author naively tells us that he has "the assurance of the distinguished scholar who kindly undertook the editorship of this work," * * that his "interpretations of the sacred text are justified by the best hermeneutical authorities." So, of course, then, all is right with the book, especially as Bengel, Stier, Olshausen, Tholuck, Livermore, Ebrard, Jacobus, and others, have laid the author under "special obligations."

In no degree charmed with the author's preface, or encouraged by it to study his work, we have nevertheless carefully examined a number of his Homilies. They appear to us to possess but little merit. Common-place and wordy is what we inclined to pronounce them, but will content ourselves with two epithets he furnishes himself, and say that he is "sketchy and discursive."

Solar Hieroglyphics; or the Emblematic Illustrations of the Revealed Doctrine of the Tri-Personal Godhead which are discernible in the Solar Light. With an Introduction by Rev. J. GRIER RALSTON, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co., 710 Arch street. 1874. Pp. 136, 16mo.

There two parts to this little work, each presenting us with some preliminaries, and then three sections.

In the first part the author sets forth:

1. That the ascertained constitution of the solar light is emblematic of the revealed constitution of the Godhead.
2. That the coöperative economy of the solar light is emblematic of the coöperative economy of the Godhead in the works of creation, redemption, and personal salvation.
3. That the manifestive or luminiferous constituent of the solar force is especially the emblem of the Son of God.

In the second part he maintains:

1. That the solar light is the cause of color in natural objects.
2. That colors have a hieroglyphic history.
3. That the colors inherent in the light are emblematic of the perfections of the Godhead.

This may be a very learned work, as Dr. Ralston claims that it is. From the scientific side of it, we do not undertake to decry its merits, for our calling is theological rather than scientific. Viewing the work through our own spectacles, and from the theological side of it, we have to say it is not at all to our taste. God is compared in the Scriptures to light; for in Him is no darkness at all. But it savors of presumption, in our view, to run the parallel, as this book does, between the properties of light and the persons or perfections of the Godhead. What one man shall assert on such a subject as this, another is equally authorised to deny. And so all attempts, and they have been many, to find the Trinity in nature, appear to us ill-advised and hurtful.

A Commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrews. By GEORGE JUNKIN, D. D., LL.D. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co. Pp. 516, 12mo.

This volume is one which will not detract from the well-earned reputation of its author. It is a fine specimen of pulpit exposition, founded, as will appear to the intelligent reader, upon the principles of hermeneutics applied to the original text, without that display of learning which those unacquainted with that text would be unable to appreciate. It is "the result of long, careful, and enthusiastic study, begun by the author in early life, and revised during the two years preceding his death." He had repeatedly lectured on this Epistle during the eleven years of his pastoral labors, and in the College of LaFayette, and the University of Miami, over which he successively presided. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, to borrow the language of Delitzsch, "the Old and New Testaments are set the one over against the other, the moonlight of the Old Testament paling once and again before the sunrise of the New, and the heavenly prospects thus illumined." Not only is this shown in these expository lectures, but many points of instruction and reproof are set forth, applicable to the circumstances of those before whom he spoke, addressing themselves with striking force to the thinking mind, and worthy of remembrance. And so these Old Scriptures are ever new in all ages; this marvellous Epistle is ever fresh, as if those sacred words were sounded forth just now, for the instruction of the present generation. Happy is that "scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven," as this author evidently was, and who "is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old."

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVI.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXV.:

ARTICLE I.

THE GENESIS OF THE NEW ENGLAND CHURCHES.

The Genesis of the New England Churches. By LEONARD BACON. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1874. Pp. 485, 12mo.

The general character of Dr. Bacon's interesting work was sufficiently indicated in a brief notice of it which appeared in the January number of this REVIEW. It is now proposed to enter into a more thorough examination of the principles which the venerable author has inwoven into his touching narrative, and which he seeks as his main design to establish thereby. The book he has written is not a volume of original research or elaborate learning, and claims to be only "a history digested from materials prepared by others." But while "it simply tells an old story," the author undertakes to give "here and there a new interpretation or a new emphasis to some undisputed fact," and addresses himself in so doing to "all sorts of intelligent and thoughtful readers." He does not write for "scholars, or the men of some learned profession," but "to stir the sympathies of the many;" and he aims, while thus interesting the popular affections and moving the hearts of the masses, to gain also their understanding and convince their judgment in favor of certain ideas of his own. Under the garb of a mere popular narrative of comparatively recent events, this is, really, an endeavor to strengthen

the foundations of a certain theory of church government as that which was from the beginning. It is polemics disguised. The author not merely "constructs a story," but battles for a dogma, and that not before scholars who are competent judges of his attempt, but before "the many," who must simply accept and cannot correct his reasonings. It is a good way for disseminating opinions. Dr. Bacon has as good a right to use it as anybody else. It is the way of our times. This is the day of story books for the many, rather than of treatises for the few. Books of solid learning do not sell like piquant narratives and ingenious endeavors "to stir the sympathies of the many." Messrs. Harper & Brothers, and all the other book publishers, know well about this matter. Had Dr. Bacon offered them a thoroughly learned discussion of the principles of church government held by him, they would have politely and respectfully begged to be excused from running the risk of publishing any such work. Readers in our day and country go through books in a hurry, as they go through everything else. So the *story* is read, but the *treatise* not studied, and not even bought. Now a book issued but unsold for six or twelve months, is *dead* commercially, and it cannot be got to live again commercially. And books for scholars can never have any but a limited sale. And publishers dread loaded shelves as much as loaded guns, but they are eager to issue the book that bids for universal popularity. Book-making thus degenerates into an affair of the pockets rather than the brains. So that for every reason, and in every aspect, authors nowadays, and amongst our countrymen, are, in one sense, wise when they disclaim learning and research, as well as when they send forth their invitations for the many and not the few to come and partake of their repast.

The purpose of this article, therefore, is not to criticise Dr. Bacon's story of the trials and persecutions of his forefathers, either in England, or after they fled to Holland, or subsequently emigrated to America. That is a story which never will wear out, like other similar stories of martyrs, whether of one Christian Church or another, and whether of modern or of ancient times. Whatever the ecclesiastical relations of the sufferers,

stories of martyrdom must be of immortal and of universal interest. Let them be told over and over again, in all countries and to every succeeding generation, that tyrants may be shamed, and that weak hearts may grow strong under oppression. Let them be told everywhere, that the glorious ideas of the right of private judgment and of the liberty to think, to believe, and to teach, may be spread abroad amongst mankind. And yet there will ever remain but one standard of truth in religion for all those who accept Christianity as from heaven. For them the appeal must always be to the Word fairly interpreted. There must be freedom to judge every one for himself; but there is a weighty responsibility which that same freedom involves. And whoever goes further and undertakes, through "stirring the sympathies," to convey opinions into the minds of others, must stand prepared to have the soundness of those opinions thoroughly canvassed by comparison of them by others with the written revelation.

Dr. Bacon means by "The Genesis of the New England Churches," not merely the beginning in 1602 or 1603 "by divers godly Christians in the north of England" to be "studious of reformation," "and to witness against human inventions and additions to the word of God," and "to enter into covenant to walk with God and with one another according to the primitive pattern in the word of God." He does, indeed, say of the Church which, four years later, that is, in 1607, met ordinarily in the manor-house of Scrooby, (on the great road from London to York and thence into Scotland)—he does say of "this church which was in the house of William Brewster" at Scrooby: "*There was the germ of New England.*" But he does not mean to say that "the Separatists of Scrooby" were the true and proper fathers of the New England Churches. On the contrary, he traces the lineage of these churches, of course, up to apostolic times. His position is that Congregational Independency is *the* form which the Scriptures give to the Church. Accordingly, the theme of his first chapter is, "*What was in the beginning,*" and his first paragraph runs thus: "In the beginning, Christianity was simply gospel. Ecclesiastical organisation was not the cause,

but the effect, of life. Churches were constituted by the spontaneous association of believers. Individuals and families, drawn toward each other by their common trust in Jesus the Christ, and their common interest in the good news concerning the kingdom of God, became a community united not by external bonds, but by the vital force of distinctive ideas and principles. New affections became the bond of a new brotherhood, and the new brotherhood, with its mutual duties and united responsibilities, became an organised society. The ecclesiastical polity of the apostles was simple—a living growth, not an artificial construction.” It is upon such a foundation as this, the eminent and venerable author, the great Coryphæus of Independency in New England, builds his argument.

Let us examine the stones out of which this fundamental position is constructed. The first one is, that “*in the beginning Christianity was simply gospel.*” This means, of course, that it was doctrine without order or government. Now, can this be admitted to be true? We are constrained to say that our author takes a very narrow view of Christianity. For Christianity was truly just a new dispensation of an antecedent system of things. It was not a new religion Jesus of Nazareth set up, and it was not a new Church. There has been but one Church from “*the beginning,*” which was not, as Dr. Bacon seems to say, the time of Christ upon earth, but dates back to the first interposition of grace on behalf of fallen man. The Church begins, of course, where the gospel begins, and that was in the promise of the woman’s seed. And the Church began as a *kingdom*, and in every age to the present has continued to be a *kingdom*, of which Christ is the Head. So that there never was, and there is not now, and there never will be, any such thing as a Christianity that is “*simply gospel.*” The King has always ordered all things regarding his Church. Moses, who was faithful as a servant, in setting up the Jewish Church, followed the pattern given to him in the Mount. And the incarnate Lord and Saviour came not to destroy but fulfil what his servant Moses had established. When that passed away which had been for a time and for a purpose, (both of them fully accomplished,) it was no new

Church which was set up, but only a new dispensation of the same, with higher and wider privileges. But it was not one of these privileges to have order abolished and doctrine left alone, for manifestly the former is necessary to fortify and establish and perpetuate the latter. Accordingly, whilst the temple worship, with all that pertained to it, is abolished, the old synagogue system remains and passes over into the new dispensation. The synagogue, with its ruling elders and the councils which they constituted, is Christianised; and so the one Church perpetuates its life in the new dispensation under which we live.

The second stone laid by Dr. Bacon is, that "*ecclesiastical organisation was not the cause but the effect of life.*" This is a singular denial. Did any one ever affirm that organisation can produce life? But why make this denial as to order any more than as to doctrine? Can doctrine itself give life? No, only the Spirit is the author of life; but whilst doctrine feeds the Church's life, organisation surely guards and perpetuates it, and both are absolutely needful to her prosperity.

There remains a third stone to be examined: "*Churches were constituted by the spontaneous association of believers,*" and the bonds which united them were no external ones, but merely those of similarity of ideas and union of affections. When these new affections had drawn together the new brotherhood, then there becomes "an organised society." There appear to be three ideas expressed in this statement: one is, that there was no organised society belonging to Christ and presided over by him until the first one of these voluntary associations of believers in him was formed after his ascension from earth to heaven; another is, that believers in him came together spontaneously, that is, of their own motion entirely; and a third is, that no external bonds united them, but simply the vital force of ideas. The first of these three is the denial over again of there being any Church of Christ on the earth before his incarnation. Nothing additional to what has been suggested requires to be said about it. The second appears to be an extravagant assertion of what is certainly true, that a Church is a voluntary association of individual believers. The extravagance is found in the author's denial that organisation be-

longs essentially to Christianity. That believers associate voluntarily together when they form a Church is true, of course; but it is equally true that they are required of the Lord so to associate themselves together, and therefore it is not true in every aspect that their mutual association is spontaneous. In other words, Christianity is not, and never was, simply doctrine, but always and ever is *doctrine and order*, both equally revealed and equally to be received by men. The third idea is like the other two—there are no external bonds of church fellowship; it is all in the vital force of ideas and principles. We certainly agree that great is the vital force of ideas and principles, and we honor every man who magnifies the importance of these. Such a man, if honest and consistent, will have a creed, and will hold fast to it, and his creed will not concern abstract principles only, but along with these he will accept practical truths and hold fast by them. And others like him will associate with him in maintaining the ideas they hold, not merely as to abstractions, but also as to things practical and positive. It was undoubtedly thus with the first believers. The Lord had made known his will touching the doctrine, and the discipline, and the worship of his house, and these believers were obedient to him, and of one mind with each other, in all things; but, in these circumstances, to say they were united by no external bonds of government and of worship, by no common use of sacraments and ordinances and rules, but only by the force of certain ideas and principles considered abstractly, may suit a pious Congregationalist divine, but would better become, in our judgment, the mere Rationalist.

After laying such a foundation for his building, Dr. Bacon proceeds to describe the Christian Church as a new commonwealth of persons united by faith to Christ, which we always supposed the Old Testament saints every one to have been. He then says: "At first the few disciples seem not to have thought much about how their society should be organised and its affairs administered, their minds being otherwise occupied." That does not show, however, that there was not one mind occupied about the matter—the mind of their King and Head. Our author proceeds to say that "the earliest appearance of anything like organisation amongst them"

was when one was to be elected in the place of Judas. But, we reply, the appointment of the other eleven by the King took place before this; and what else was that but organisation? He insists that the election of Matthias was democratic in form, though theocratic in its spirit. We do not object to the statement. Presbyterians hold that the people have an indefeasible, divine right to elect their own church rulers. Only we wonder at the terms in which he refers to the use of the lot on that occasion by the apostles as "an expedient resorted to, which, had the assembly been unanimous concerning the superior fitness of either candidate, would have been preposterous." If it was an election by the people, what was the necessity for it to be unanimous? The rule of the majority has always been accepted where popular government has prevailed. Are elections amongst Congregationalists always unanimous? Or are they held to be invalid when not unanimous? For Presbyterians we may say, with John Calvin, that this election being of an apostle, there was a direct appeal to the Lord, and a direct decision of the question by him, whilst at the same time the grant made to his people of the right to fill all church offices was also recognised and allowed.

The next step towards organisation in the Christian Church, Dr. Bacon finds in the election of deacons. The only objection to be made to his account of that matter, is, that he appears to be quite sure that this was altogether a new institute; whereas many hold, and we think with some show of reason, that there were deacons in the old synagogue system. But he falls into quite an ecstasy over the fact that the election in this case also was popular, as though it were quite a point gained for the Congregationalists. After this he proceeds to insist that the churches instituted by the apostles were only local churches, and that there is no sign of a national or even provincial Church in the writings of the apostles; that these local churches were entirely self-governing, except that they would naturally apply to the apostles for *information*, where the congregation differed amongst themselves; that these particular churches knew no other unity than that of ideas and affections, there being no subjection to any com-

mon jurisdiction; and that discipline was in the hands of the whole congregation, and their decision always final and without appeal. These points made, and a general statement urged of the simplicity which marked the apostolic methods, and we come to the close of the first chapter.

It will be observed that our author here enunciates all those principles which are included under the two names of Independency and Congregationalism—he asserts the full competency of every particular church to manage its own affairs, without any appeal being necessary or allowable to any higher authority, which makes him an Independent; and he asserts that all the members of each church, as well as its office-bearers, have a share directly in its government, which makes him a Congregationalist. His system of church order, therefore, is generally known by the double term, *Congregational Independency*, which refers to both these cardinal ideas. This system acknowledges only two senses of the word Church in Scripture: *one*, where it signifies the whole mystical body of Christ, consisting of all the true believers in the world; the *other*, where it sets forth a single local congregation. But Presbyterians conceive that there are three other senses in which the New Testament writers employ this term: *one*, to signify the whole body of those in all the world who profess the name of Christ, consisting of many not spiritually united to him; a field of tares and wheat growing together; the kingdom of heaven set up in this world, but not yet free from sin and imperfection; the visible Church to which the ascending Redeemer gave apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, for its edification and comfort; a *second*, to signify a plurality of congregations in different places, connected together under one ecclesiastical order,* as “the church at Jerusalem,” with its thousands

*In Jerusalem there were *πέντε μυριάδες*, *how many ten thousands of believers*. (See Acts xxi. 20.) Of course they could not all compose a single congregation, and yet they are called “*the church which was at Jerusalem*.” (See Acts xi. 22; xv. 4.)

We read also of the Christians at Antioch, to whom so many prophets and teachers ministered, as “*the church that was at Antioch*.”

In Acts ix. 31, we read, “Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria.” Now, Tregelles alleges that the true

of members, making, of course, many congregations; or "the church at Antioch," or Ephesus, or in Galatia; and a *third*, in which it is applied to the body of believers in a given place, as represented by their ruling elders. Now if the Presbyterians are right in this view of the five senses of the word Church, then of course most of the points insisted on by Dr. Bacon must be given up. Then as to the apostles being appealed to merely for information which might guide the decision to be made independently by every congregation for itself, Presbyterians believe that in the fifteenth chapter of Acts they find an account in full of an appeal from the brethren at Antioch to a high court assembled in Jerusalem, which made a decree that was afterwards published far and wide through the churches, and accepted as final and conclusive amongst them. Very remarkable it is, indeed, how, in the seventeenth chapter of Deuteronomy, it was provided for the Old Testament Church that Jerusalem should constitute the centre, to which all parts of the body should resort for decision of difficult questions. Let any one examine the passage extending from verse eighth to verse thirteenth inclusive, and he will see how natural it was, in view of such an arrangement having

reading here is *ἐκκλησία*, and not *ἐκκλησίαι*; *the church*, and not *the churches*; which gives us *the church of Palestine*. And this reading of Tregelles is adopted by Tischendorf and Lachmann.

At Ephesus, Paul labored long; and we cannot doubt there were several congregations of believers in that city; yet, in Acts xx., Paul speaks of them as "*a flock*," under the rule and care of a united body of bishops and presbyters. And in the Apocalypse they are described as *the church in Ephesus*, (or *the Ephesian church*,) for there is high authority for the former reading. Instead of *τῆς Ἐφεσίνης ἐκκλησίας*, which we find in the *textus receptus*, Griesbach puts as a preferable reading, *τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας*, and he is followed in this by Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf.

We have also a letter in common to the "churches of Galatia," (Gal. i. 2,) requiring them to "serve one another," and to "bear one another's burdens," which they could not well have done without somehow acting as a united body.

Peter also addresses the disciples "scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," as an associated body, exhorting their elders to "feed *the flock* of God amongst them."

come down to them from so old a date, for the early Christians to turn to the apostles and elders, brethren, at Jerusalem, for the authoritative decision of all matters in dispute amongst themselves. In this Synod at Jerusalem sit the apostles, not deciding by inspiration what is brought before them, but reasoning together amongst themselves and with the elders on the subject. It is a deliberative assembly. The apostles, being extraordinary and temporary officers, who were to have no successors in their peculiar and distinctive calling, here sit side by side with the permanent rulers of the church, called *elders*, and seem to induct them, as it were, into the business of deliberating upon church questions. The apostles being ministers of the Word, are church rulers; and the elders, who are found at this time congregated there together, are church rulers, representing in one body the whole visible Church on the earth, and they entertain the appeal brought before them from Antioch, and give their decision. It is not *information* they send down to Antioch, but a decree; and the bond here seen binding the whole Church together as one body, cannot be, as Dr. Bacon holds, merely the unity of ideas and affections, but manifestly appears to be the very thing which he denies, viz., a common jurisdiction. And then, once more, as to discipline being in the hands of the whole congregation, Presbyterians consider that when our Saviour said the brother offended must take his complaint and tell it to *the Church*, he could not have intended to say that the whole congregation, men and women, old and young, wise and foolish, must be assembled to hear the story, and have their passions and prejudices all aroused and inflamed by it; but must have had in his mind the arrangements of the Old Testament times of the synagogue, which he had determined should pass over into the New Testament Church; according to which a bench of elders, good and wise men, chosen to represent the congregation, should be appealed to by individuals having a difficulty, and their decision be heard, on pain of the recusants' being considered heathen and publicans. Thus Presbyterians find, in this latter case, the authority for their session; and in the former case, the authority for their highest church court; and then, in like manner, they

can produce from Scripture the authority and the model of their classical presbytery—the body that governs several different churches associated together, and that occupies the middle position betwixt their highest and their lowest eldership. And thus they understand the Scriptures as revealing the grand and glorious idea of representative government, which occupies the safe middle between the extremes of a tyrannical rule by one absolute head, and of the yet more tyrannical rule of an unreasoning multitude. *Incertum scindi studia in contraria vulgus*—the untrustworthy crowd is split up into contrary factions, said the great John Calvin; and he touched there as with a needle the weakness and inefficiency of Congregational Independency. The Lord Jesus gave his Church the unspeakable blessing of being governed by her own chosen representatives; and he gave her also a Constitution, which binds all her parts and members together in one body, having joints and bands. If her chosen representatives, her ruling elders, are often very unworthy of their high trust, so that the church really finds no blessing in them, let that be for a lamentation; the same, alas! is also true of her ministers and her deacons and her members in all branches of the Lord's household. And if, on the other hand, the bonds of union, whether in the whole Church at large, or in any particular denomination, seem too weak to hold the parts well together; and if divisions and schisms and separations are constantly ensuing, let this also, alas! be for a lamentation. But neither the one nor the other of these lamentable things constitutes any proof that the Presbyterian system cannot be the one revealed in Scripture. No where in the Holy Book is the Church on earth held up to our view otherwise than as full of imperfections. What her Lord and Head appointed that she shall be, and what she has actually attained to, as yet are very different things.

Dr. Bacon admits that “soon organisation in a more definite way would become necessary. There must be recognised distribution of duties; one must do this work, another must do that.” “But,” he says, “if we would know how the organisation was completed . . . we must forget for the moment all the modern systems of ecclesiastical polity and let the apostolic documents

teach us." Well, he will, no doubt, find it necessary to forget his Congregational Independency, if he sets about learning from the apostolic documents how the organisation of the Christian Church was completed. His "discipline in the hands of the whole congregation" directly, his "local churches entirely self-governing" and getting only "information" from the inspired apostles, Dr. Bacon will hardly find anywhere in the New Testament. On the very surface of those writings, we think, there lies the idea, *first*, that the whole visible Church of Christ is to be one kingdom, divided, if at all, only through sin and ignorance, and constantly striving to realise more and more fully the communion of saints both inwardly and outwardly; and *secondly*, that the Church is to be governed by officers divinely called and divinely empowered, but elected by the free choice of the people. It lies on the surface of the apostolic writings that the twelve were extraordinary officers for the founding of the Church in its New Testament form, inspired ministers of the Word and ruling elders, to be followed by teaching and ruling elders who were not so gifted but who were yet to be put in charge of the flock. From the beginning the Lord sent forth evangelists, and he sends them forth now (and Dr. Bacon will agree with us here) to found the Church in new places, and when thus founded to ordain over them ruling elders and teaching elders as well as deacons whom themselves have freely chosen and called to those offices; and then the evangelist passes on to do the same thing in other regions beyond. This it seems to us was the plan from the very beginning, and so we think there was organisation from the very beginning; every where *elders* and *elderships* or presbyteries, some local, which we call *Session*, some classical, which we call *Presbytery*, and some of wider and higher authority, which we call *Synod* or *Assembly*, as the case may be. Every where, from the very first setting up of the Christian Church, there was government, representative government, the same as there had been more or less fully exercised from the very days of Moses, yes and before his days, where we trace up elders and elderships till this divine institute is lost to our sight in the original system of

patriarchal government through the heads of tribes and of families.

In his second chapter Dr. Bacon treats of the progress "*From the Primitive to the Papal.*" We are unable to recognise in this chapter either learning or originality, although it is a tolerably respectable history of the evil development, that is, *the corruption* of the original presbytery of apostolic days, first into prelacy, and then, following the same track a little further down the ages, into Popery itself. We find little to object to in this account, but must criticise a single paragraph, which runs as follows:

"As the New Testament gives us no system of definite and formulated dogmas in theology, so it gives us no completed system of church government. Ecclesiastical polity grew age after age, just as theology grew. What there was of organisation in the primitive churches was more like the organisation of a seed than like the organisation of the tree in its maturity. The period between the day of Pentecost and the middle of the second century—or the narrower period between the date of the Pastoral Epistles and the beginning of that century—could not but be a period of rapid development in the Christian commonwealth. Nor did the growth of ecclesiastical polity terminate then. It went on, imperceptibly but steadily, to the age of Constantine—as it went on afterward to the age of Luther—as it goes on now, even in communities most abhorrent of progress and most observant of traditions."

Now what is this thing which was so rapidly developed down to Constantine's day and then down to Luther's, and which is now also developed more and more even amongst those most abhorrent of progress and most tolerant of traditions? It is "ecclesiastical polity" or "church government." Well, is that a good thing in Dr. Bacon's estimation or a bad thing? He seems to consider it about as good a thing perhaps as the "dogmas of theology," which have not, however, in general, the very highest consideration amongst those whom our author represents. But was there any of this thing of "ecclesiastical polity" in the beginning? Dr. Bacon would be apt to answer doubtfully, for he says: "What there was of organisation in the primitive churches was more like that of a seed than of a tree." So then there was, at least, a little of it at the beginning—just a seed, whether sown in the Church by the evil one or not, does not, however, seem to be very clear. On the whole it would appear

that the seed in question must have been rather a good one, for the time when it was found first in the Church was when the apostles were alive, and it was right under their influence and administration that Dr. Bacon says it had a rapid and a necessary development. But now let us look and wonder at the subsequent history of this seed—a good thing, it would seem, in the beginning, it *grows* to be a bad one! It is not supplanted by the bad—it is not exchanged for the bad, which sort of revolutions are constantly occurring; no, but this good thing imperceptibly but steadily *grows to be bad* down to Constantine's day, when Prelacy is seen to be established, and then it *grows to be worse*, through the Middle Ages down to the Reformation, at which time the Papacy is revealed in all its enormity of evil. But, when before did ever a good thing grow, and that steadily, to be a bad thing? The wonder is, however, not yet fully before our eyes—this evil thing, for such it has become, Dr. Bacon says, is growing still at this very time; and where? Well, in communities most abhorrent of progress and most observant of traditions. That must be in Rome and such like Churches, for they most abhor progress and are most observant of traditions; and they do both alike, for the one is the complement of the other. They abhor progress because observant of traditions, and they observe traditions because abhorrent of progress. But if so abhorrent of progress, how is it possible that this thing can grow and make progress amongst them? And if so observant of traditions, how is it that they do not stand still in that sort of perfection which the traditions of the past give to them? What does Dr. Bacon mean? His paragraph is a puzzle. Must we get at his meaning by supposing that Congregational Independency is so much in love with democracy that it is ready to condemn as evil all ecclesiastical polity and all church government?

But let us carefully avoid doing injustice to our author: is it possible he may mean to say that whilst there is no completed system of church government in the New Testament, yet nevertheless ecclesiastical polity is revealed there, and that the Word of God is our sufficient rule of faith on this as on other subjects? This is indeed precisely the Presbyterian idea of the relation of

the Word to church polity. It does not seem to be Dr. Bacon's idea. He cannot hold that the Word teaches as fully and completely the will of the King on the subject of the government of his kingdom, for he says the seed must needs grow and develop into a tree, and that progress was necessary and is now going on. But according to the Presbyterian idea of the revelation of church government in the Scriptures and of the Word as our only rule of faith on this as on every other matter relating to the kingdom, it necessarily follows that every change of what was revealed must be a *corruption* of it, so that there is to be no growth of ecclesiastical polity but the very closest possible observance of the scripture-model of the Church. Presbyterians acknowledge no development except in the Church's knowledge of the immutably perfect truth that was revealed. They cannot accept Dr. Bacon's idea of a doctrine being revealed in the beginning which must necessarily have a development into something altogether different. They have no opinion of that progress which adds any new things to the old thing revealed from heaven. Many Episcopalians hold that the Scriptures give the germs of church order, but it was for the Fathers to develop them, so that their rule of faith on this point is the Word and the Fathers. In like manner many Congregational Independents hold that the Scriptures give good instruction on this subject, but partial only, and that the discretion of the Church is to supplement what is lacking in the revelation. With them, accordingly, the rule of faith on this subject, as on many others, is the Word and Reason. No completed system of church government is given in the New Testament, but merely a seed of organisation is planted at the beginning, and the King leaves it to the wisdom of his servants to develop this little seed, as best they know and can, into a tree of right proportions.

But still more charitably construing our author's meaning, did he design to signify that ecclesiastical polity is in the Scriptures in the very same way that the Christian doctrine on other points is there? Was it his meaning that there is no system of formulated dogmas of theology arranged in the New Testament as a Confession of Faith arranges them scientifically, and so there is

no completed system of church government drawn up with logical precision as in modern church formularies; but that nevertheless the doctrines of Christian theology are all in the Word ready for the human mind to arrange in its own way of orderly statement, and that just so the principles of the polity which the King has given to his Church are all revealed in the Word ready for his servants to draw out and apply in suitable forms of procedure? If it is possible to understand our author as meaning to say this, no more can be demanded, and his position must be acknowledged to be scriptural and satisfactory. And we may proceed to make very frankly a brief statement of the Presbyterian belief, as we understand it, upon the question, What do the Scriptures reveal in the way of a system of ecclesiastical polity?

We begin with the declaration, nearly in the words of a celebrated old treatise on "the Divine Right of Church Government by the London Ministers," that the *substantials* of church order are all laid down in Scripture in particular and express rules respecting officers, ordinances, courts, discipline, etc., whilst the *circumstantials* are laid down also, but only in the general rule of doing all things decently and in order and unto edification. This is the doctrine of *Jus Divinum* in its true and just form as held forth in our standards. According to this view of it, church government is revealed in the Scriptures like any other doctrine; and the truth on this subject may be discerned by a church with more or with less clearness, and may accordingly be followed out into practice with a more or a less complete obedience. So that a Church may still be a true Church although holding erroneous views about ecclesiastical polity which lead her into erroneous practice on that subject, just as a Church may still be a true Church although holding erroneous views respecting the doctrine of the divine decrees, or like points in Christian theology. Not to receive and practise the doctrine of church government laid down in Scripture makes an imperfect Church, but does not destroy its title to be considered a true Church of Christ and to be acknowledged and treated as such by us. We must acknowledge all whom Christ acknowledges, and fellowship all whom he receives. We must, so far as in us lies, maintain communion,

at least the unity of the Spirit, with all who hold the Head. Now this is evidently a very different form of *Jus Divinum* from that offensive and unscriptural aspect of it in which it is held by the Church of Rome and some Protestants, according to which not only is a particular form of church government appointed, but so appointed as to be essential to the very being of the Church—there is no Church possible where that form of government is not. Our Presbyterian Confession states the true *Jus Divinum* doctrine in these words: “The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man’s salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; unto which nothing is at any time to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men. Nevertheless, we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saying understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word; and that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.”

What now are the *substantials* and what the *circumstantials* of church order? The former may be thus summed up under four heads, as set forth in the Scriptures: 1. The Church is one organised body, and not an indefinite number of independent congregations. 2. The members of the Church are all professed believers and their children. 3. The officers of the church, ordinary and perpetual, are presbyters and deacons, the former being of two classes. Every individual of each class is equal, officially, to all the rest of his class, and both classes are of equal authority in the courts of the church; only that the teaching elders, *as such*, and in their separate work of teaching, are manifestly very far superior to the ruling elders, by reason of that highest and most dignified office of teaching, which is committed to them singly and severally. All these ruling officers of the church are to be chosen freely by the people; but when chosen and ordained, they are to be always obeyed in the Lord. 4. The

power of rule by these officers is a joint and not a several or one-man power, and it is to be exercised only in free deliberative assemblies. These assemblies are of higher and lower authority, so that appeals can be taken up to the topmost; but their whole power is only declarative and ministerial and spiritual, Jesus Christ himself being sole Lawgiver and Head over his Church. These four are the *substantials* of the Presbyterian ecclesiastical polity—setting before us the voluntary membership which, with their offspring, compose the body of Christ on the earth; and the only officers whom the Lord sets over them after they have voluntarily chosen and called them; and the limited yet real and solemn power to be exercised by these officers in ruling the body, and exhibiting that body to be only one in all the earth, even as it has one Head only. Now, are not all these points of the doctrine of church government perfectly and indisputably scriptural? And do they not set before us the whole system of Presbyterianism; for what else is there belonging to it as of the substance besides these four points? All the rest are mere *circumstances* of time and place, of order and method, to be regulated decently and becomingly by human wisdom, which is quite competent to such a task. Let it be admitted that Scripture teaches what is declared above as to the Church's being one body, and as to her members, her officers, and her courts, and it will be thus granted that the Word gives the limbs and members, the bones and sinews, and flesh and blood, the whole framework of the system. Grant that these substantials are written in the Word, or are deducible therefrom by good and necessary consequence, and so are of divine right, and Presbyterians are then perfectly willing to let human wisdom and discretion come in, as Scripture authorises, to arrange all the mere circumstantials, according to the general rules of decency and order.

These four principles of ecclesiastical polity constitute the Church a free commonwealth. It is not a monarchy, with a human head on earth, as Popery makes it; it is not an oligarchy or an aristocracy, as Prelacy makes it; and it is not a democracy, as Congregational Independency makes it. But it is a free representative republic. The Church is not subject to any human

power; her officers are all her servants, given to her by her Head. They belong to her, not she to them, and are employed by her for her edification and comfort. But then the Church does not directly, but only indirectly through these officers, govern herself. The flock has need of under-shepherds, and she has them given her by the Lord. The representative system is a thing from heaven, revealed in his Word by God, who is author both of State and Church, as also of the Family lying at the basis of both; and a thing it is which is exactly adapted to meet most perfectly the wants of man in all these aspects of his being. As it is not the monarchy of a man the Church needs, nor yet an aristocratic oligarchy, so also it is not democracy, the direct rule of the people, the government of the crowd, the sway of a headlong, inconsiderate, loud-tongued, many-voiced mob; the control of passion, or prejudice, or interest, or mere sympathy and feeling. What she needs, and what Christ has given her, is representative government, he creating all the offices in his Church, and bestowing on them certain simple, spiritual powers, limited, well defined, and special, and she at liberty to fill these offices with such men as she freely chooses for her servants, but yielding thereafter to them that cheerful obedience in the Lord to which they are entitled after they have counselled together and proclaimed their judgment. What the Church has had given her is constitutional government, the Word being her charter, wherein are written all her rights, and her formularies being based on the provisions of the Word, and being accepted by her own free approving choice. And as she must not yield her rights to any usurping monarchy or aristocracy, but stand fast in her liberty, so she must not swing round to the other extreme of wild license, giving the control of things to those not called of God or elected by the Church to office, allowing men or women without gifts for ruling to intrude into the sacred work of governing the kingdom and breaking up the one body into a thousand thousand fragments.

Dr. Bacon's third chapter discusses, "*What the Reformation in the sixteenth century did for Church polity.*" The fundamental fact on which he builds his superstructure here will be

disputed by none, that "everywhere a political element was combined with the simply religious element in effecting the Reformation." The Church of Rome was a political institution. Earlier attempts at Reformation failed because the civil power regarded them as dangerous; but Luther and Zwingli found protection, and in some sense help, from secular powers, and so they succeeded. Accordingly the Reformers had to accept what they could get from the States which protected them. There is truth in these statements; but it cannot be said that the idea of a national Church had existed before the Reformation only as "a rudimentary notion," and was the offspring, in its fulness, of religious and political forces in coöperation at that time; for surely the Jewish Church was a national Church, and when Constantine became the patron of Christianity there ensued the Church of the Roman Empire. What if the providence that has always watched over the Church, and raised up defenders for it when it seemed good in God's sight, did use Frederic of Saxony to sustain Luther, and free Switzerland to give Zwingli support, and Geneva to house John Calvin, fleeing from France, and afford him opportunity to exhume the apostolic church-order from the grave in which it had been buried for ages—how do these things prove that Luther's, Zwingli's, and Calvin's theories of church government were all poisoned with "Nationalism," but that Francis Lambert of Avignon, who, in 1526, nine years after Luther began his work, devised a purely Congregational platform, which shortly "vanished away, leaving behind it no enduring fruit," was the only one of the Reformers who repaired directly to the Bible for instruction about church polity? Lambert failed, says Dr. Bacon, because the time had not come for "building the house of God according to the pattern given in the Scriptures." It was "set aside to wait for better times," although it alone would have had the "churches ordered strictly according to the law of Christ." This sounds a little strange from Dr. Bacon, when we recall to mind what he says in the preceding chapter about the New Testament giving us no completed system of church government, and of ecclesiastical polity being necessarily a growth under guidance of human discretion. But he cannot divest John

Calvin of the glory of having gone directly to the Word for all his principles of church order. It is certainly not true of him that his ecclesiastical polity was determined "not so much by reference to the primitive model as by considerations of temporary and local convenience." He was not able, indeed, to establish his scriptural discipline in its fulness at Geneva; but certain it is that his whole life was but one struggle to accomplish this, and that in the French Church, through his influence, that discipline was established in considerable purity, and flourished there in great vigor for one hundred years. Still further, it is certainly not correct, so far as Calvin is concerned, to say of the Reformers, "what they were contending for was the primitive gospel, rather than the primitive church polity." Principal Cunningham will be admitted to be higher authority on this point than Dr. Bacon could possibly be, and he says: "The systematising of divine truth, and the full organisation of the Christian Church, according to the word of God, are the great peculiar achievements of Calvin;" but that his "contributions to the establishment of principle and the development of truth were greater in regard to church organisation than in regard to any other department of discussion—of such magnitude and importance, indeed, in their bearing upon the whole subject of the Church, as naturally to suggest a comparison with the achievements of Sir Isaac Newton in unfolding the true principles of the solar system." (Cunningham's *Reformers and Theology of the Reformation*, pp. 27, 294.) No man can read Calvin's Letters without perceiving how near to his heart lay the reëstablishment of the original church government of the Scriptures, and with what preëminent zeal he addressed his energies to this consummation as the great labor of his life. But Dr. Bacon misunderstands the true attitude which Calvin occupied on this subject, and hence we hear him gravely affirming, "At Geneva, Calvin, not to be out-voted by fellow-presbyters unfriendly to the Reformation, established a consistory in which representatives of the laity, annually chosen, were confessors with the clergy." Upon which statement we have to remark, *first*, that neither the word "clergy," nor the idea it conveys, had any favor with Calvin. The former he expressly con-

demns more than once ; the latter he abhorred and opposed everywhere, and the names he gives to those who teach in the Church are always and only bishops, presbyters, pastors, and ministers; *secondly*, we have to say that Calvin no where teaches that ruling elders are any more representatives of the laity than are ministers of the Word ; and *thirdly*, we have to protest that, seeing the great Reformer has expressly traced the institution of ruling elders, and of the consistory and other church courts, up to the Word of God, it is hardly a liberal or a fair thing to charge that he invented them purely to serve a temporary and selfish purpose.

The fourth chapter of this volume is entitled "*The English Reformation and the Puritans.*" Dr. Bacon traces the twofold character of this Reformation, running up its religious side to Wycliffe, one hundred and fifty years before Luther, and running back the political or national side of it also through centuries of conflict between the State, as represented by King and Parliament, and the Church as governed by a foreign potentate, the Pope. Two results followed the politico-ecclesiastical movement which occurred under Henry VIII.: one that the Church becomes dependent on the crown, and allied with the aristocracy ; the other that two parties show themselves hereafter in the national Church, the party of the old clergy who submitted to the new arrangements with little of the revolutionary spirit, and constantly looked to the past with a feeling akin to regret, and the party who had received their ideas of Reformation by tradition from Wycliffe, or by communication and sympathy from the Reformers on the continent. Then begins the conflict of the government Protestantism, completed and immovable, and the demand for a more thorough reformation. On the one side the court and what were called "the court clergy ;" on the other side the men who wanted purity in the worship of God and the administration of Christ's ordinances, who were therefore nicknamed "The Puritans." Such, then, is the origin of Puritanism in England, according to our author. "It was not, nor did it intend to be, a secession or separation from the national Church." Dr. Bacon says they were not "Dissenters," in the modern

meaning of that word—not Congregationalists, nor, at first, even Presbyterians. In the early stages of the conflict, they had not generally reached the conclusion that diocesan episcopacy must be got rid of. The most advanced of them were at the beginning only “Nonconformists,” deviating from some of the prescribed regulations for public worship. What they desired was not to withdraw from the National Church, but reformation of the National Church itself, by national authority. But beginning with certain conscientious scruples about some of the ceremonies and of the vestments prescribed in worship, because appearing to them to sanction pernicious superstitions, they came, at length, to be satisfied with nothing short of an entire revision and reconstruction of the ecclesiastical establishment. This progress of opinion was due to various influences—one being the obstinacy of conscience once roused in conscientious men, which could not be quieted, but must needs be roused the more when the strong arm of power sought to quiet it by force; and another being the influence of Thomas Cartwright, a Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, of great learning and eloquence, who began to discuss in his lectures (1570) the theory of church government given in the Scriptures. Yet even Cartwright, Dr. Bacon says, “aimed at nothing more than a complete reformation by the government,” “though his system was essentially that of Geneva and Scotland.” Under the influence of this man, “English Puritanism became essentially . . . Presbyterianism, like that of Holland or of Scotland.”

But our author holds that “something better than Puritanism was necessary to liberty and to the restoration of simple and primitive Christianity.” And so in the fifth chapter, which is entitled “*Reformation without tarrying for any,*” he proceeds to tell us what that something was. The Puritans demanded that the established forms of public worship be purged of all idolatrous symbols and superstitious ceremonies, and a variety of changes be made in the ecclesiastical government, so as to conform it to the apostolic pattern; but this was to be done “by the national authority, inasmuch as the English nation itself baptized and Protestant was the Church of England. No withdrawal from

the National Church was to be thought of, for that would be schism." "But under oppression men sometimes get new light." Fines and imprisonments led the sufferers to doubt whether the Church of England, having Elizabeth Tudor for its supreme ruler on earth, was really any Church of Christ at all. They began to inquire whether the apostles ever instituted any national churches. Such questions among the Puritans gave origin to another party aiming at a more radical reformation." And this party is one which, "instead of remaining in the Church of England to reform it, boldly withdrew themselves from that ecclesiastico-political organisation, denouncing that and all other so-called national churches as institutions unknown to the law and mind of Christ." They propound a theory of separation, and they undertake to embody it in organised churches. The Separatists put forth books to disseminate their opinions, and there is no excess of moderation in their style of setting forth their ideas. Queen Elizabeth sets up her court of High Commission to "make inquiry concerning all heretical opinions, seditious books, . . . false rumors or talks, slanderous words and sayings," having power to punish the refractory, amongst other ways by fines at discretion and unlimited imprisonment. Of the forty-four members of this English Inquisition, twelve are bishops; and any three of them, one being always a bishop, could proceed in any case. John Copping, Elias Thacker, and Robert Browne were leading Separatists, and were imprisoned. The former two are condemned for sedition, because they disputed the Queen's supremacy in religious things, and they are put to the felon's death. Robert Browne, whose name, *Brownists*, the Separatists bore, recanted, and turned conservative and betrayed the cause. Next we meet with Henry Barrowe, *Gentleman*, and John Greenwood, *Clerk*, friends and fellow-sufferers for Separation, who, after years of imprisonment, during which they bravely maintained their opinions, and even managed sometimes to publish them in books by means of the press in Holland, were at last both hanged as seditious, praying meanwhile for the Queen and for England! Then we are made acquainted with John Penry, a

Welshman, who also sealed his testimony for Separatism with his blood.

Dr. Bacon's touching narrative now goes forward into full details of the removal of these suffering Christian people out of England into Holland, and their sojourn there, and then of their translation to New England and settlement in the American wilderness. We need not enter upon that oft-told story, which, in fifteen thrilling chapters, is again here well told and most affecting. We must go back and take notice of our author's account of the gradually increasing divergence between the two classes into which the Puritans have come to be divided. Whilst Barrowe and Greenwood are in prison, they carry on a bitter controversy with Giffard, who had himself suffered as a Puritan. He was "a great and diligent preacher," who had found "some things in the Book of Common Prayer not agreeable to the Word of God;" who was therefore twice suspended from his ministry and imprisoned, but got released, and who, Dr. Bacon says, notwithstanding the vigilance of Bishops Aylmer and Whitgift, was still, as "minister of God's holy word," at his post in Maldon, "carrying on the reformation he had made in that market town by his preaching, and steadily puritanising the whole parish, when Barrowe sent forth from his prison the 'Discovery of the False Church.'" In this book, Barrowe assails in no measured terms "the attempt of certain Puritan clergymen to institute and carry on a Presbyterial government in the National Church." Barrowe calls them "Pharisees of these times," ridicules them as "your good men, who sigh and groan for reformation, but their hands, with the sluggard, deny to work;" but they wish to "bring in a new, adulterate, forged government, in show (or rather in despite) of Christ's government," which they "most miserably innovate and corrupt." Dr. Bacon says, "Barrowe and the Separatists, as they compared that scheme with the model which they found in the New Testament, were of the opinion which Milton, himself a Separatist, afterward expressed: 'New presbyter is but old priest, writ large.'" Also he says: "It did not escape the notice of Barrowe, that the Puritan scheme proposed an ecclesiastical government of the people, but not by

the people." Accordingly, Barrowe charged that "they give the people a little liberty to sweeten their mouths and make them believe that they should choose their own ministers; yet, even in this pretended choice, they do cozen and beguile them also, leaving them nothing but the smoky, windy title of election only." Giffard, the Maldon preacher, publishes a rather temperate reply, in which he calls the Brownists by the old and odious name of "Donatists," and says they are "a blind sect;" and he complains with some warmth that they called the Puritan assemblies "Romish, Idolatrous, and Antichristian," and declared them to have "no ministry, no word of God, nor sacraments." Other like combatants on both sides are described by Dr. Bacon; but it would appear from his own account of them, that the commonly received estimate of the Brownists is correct, and that in comparison with the Puritans, they exceeded in objurgatory bitterness. It was not strange. More bitterly persecuted than their brethren, because more bitter in their hatred of the Government religion, they became bitterer still, and realised to the full Solomon's picture of the effects of oppression; and then, in the madness which came on them, it was not easy for them to distinguish the different classes of their opponents.

Dr. Bacon justifies not, but condemns, the bitterness of Brownist zeal. Not Robert Browne, but John Robinson, who tempered and toned down the fierce spirit of the Separatists, is his hero. "Learned, polished, modest in spirit," and "growing saintlier" year by year as he drew nearer to heaven, well may our author admire John Robinson, father of the Congregational brethren, as they were distinguished from the original Independents or Brownists. "He became a reformer of the Separation." Yet Dr. Bacon, as between Puritans and Separatists, always prefers the latter. It is impossible to deny that the Separation was fanatical, severe, and contentious, harsh and abusive in spirit and in language, even beyond the ordinary harshness of that age; yet Dr. Bacon, whenever he places Puritan and Separatist in opposition, is prone to speak of the former as the enemy of the latter, rather than the latter as the enemy of the former. In his account, it is not the Church of England which per-

secuted both classes of the Nonconformists, but it is the Church of England and the Puritans who persecuted the Separatists. So strongly does he sympathise with these last against the other Nonconformists, that the very name, *Puritan*, seems to have grown hateful in his eyes. This is a new fashion he has adopted. When he published his "Congregational Order," giving his historical account of the ancient platforms, the Saybrook and the Cambridge, which Congregationalists accept, he gloried in the Puritans. But this was long years ago. He has been learning better. He has found out contrary precisely to what he said in the historical account, that the Puritans were not Congregationalists, but were all Presbyterians; and so now he is for turning them all over to us. And as Robinson advised his brethren to "avoid and shake off the name of Brownist," Dr. Bacon now wants to avoid and shake off a name he used to glory in. He will now call his forefathers only *Pilgrims* or *Separatists*. Great must be his zeal against Presbyterianism, when, because some Puritans adopted that view of church government, the very name of Puritan, gloried in so long by all New England, must now be foresworn and proscribed. Dr. Bacon cannot change this fashion. Words are things, and no one man has any right nor any power to change the meaning of them. Everybody knows that *Puritanism*, like *Protestantism*, is a term which included originally those who afterwards became widely separated in opinion. As said the late Dr. Moore, of Nashville, writing in this REVIEW in March, 1866, in every great movement in history, there are two elements at work, corresponding with two great types of human character, the radical and the conservative element. The former is destructive, seeking thorough change in everything, and for slight defects will raze a building to its foundations; the latter is moderate in spirit, preferring to remove always what is defective only, and seeking to retain what is good in existing institutions. These two elements showed themselves amongst the Puritans, and the one assumed the form of Independency and the other of Presbyterianism, as both were opposed to and by the English Church.

Towards the close of his book, our author is completely carried

away with this new-born prejudice. The writer who could say in his Historical Account of the Saybrook Platform, that "The Puritans who came to New England, particularly those who came to Connecticut, were neither Presbyterians nor Independents, but Congregationalists"; and again: "But while the Puritans disliked Presbyterianism, they objected to strict Independency"—closes this "*Genesis of the New England Churches*" with three chapters portraying the bad treatment of the *Pilgrims* by the *Puritans*! And the very last chapter of the work is entitled "*The beginning of a Puritan colony in New England, and what came of it.*" The object of this colony, it is said, was that *there*, "Puritan principles abhorrent alike of Popery and Prelacy on the one hand, and of schism on the other, should have free course and be glorified." Dr. Bacon describes this new colony at Naumkeag as instinct with "the Puritan idea of a National Church, and the Puritan method of church reformation," viz., the planting "in that territory a Christian state after the Puritan theory." It was originated by men "whose conscientious antipathies had convinced them that 'they should sin against God by building up such a people' as those Pilgrims were who 'renounced all universal, national, and diocesan churches.'" And yet it turns out that John Endicott, the leader and governor of the new colony, who had been selected as a "fit" man for this Puritan undertaking, writes very shortly after his arrival to Governor Bradford, of New Plymouth, desiring that the "sweet harmony and good will" which was "proper to servants of the same master," should prevail betwixt them and their followers; which letter Dr. Bacon has the candor to acknowledge was both "frank and generous." And so it was not long before these ill-disposed Puritans and the Separatists were in full fraternity and mutual confidence!

"Under Cartwright's influence," says Dr. Bacon, (p. 71,) "English Puritanism became essentially, in its ideas and aspirations, Presbyterianism, like that of Holland or of Scotland." Here we have the reason and ground of his dislike of "the Puritans." And the charge which he brings against them throughout his work, is that they sought to reform existing "ecclesiasti-

cal institutions—such as public worship, the choice and induction of ministers, the administration of sacraments, and the infliction of censures—in conformity with the theory which it will be convenient to designate as *Nationalism*. The underlying idea was that the baptized people of an independent state, being a distinct Church, were as independent of Rome as Rome was of them, while they were also a constituent part of the true Church catholic.” “It was assumed as a first principle, that the people of a Christian state or kingdom, being all baptized, were all Christians and members of Christ’s Church in that state or kingdom.” (Pp. 51, 52.) This is Dr. Bacon’s description of what he calls *Nationalism*, regarded and represented by him as the chief characteristic of the Puritans, whom he describes as Presbyterians. “The English nation itself, baptized and Protestant, was the Church of England.” “Ecclesiastical reformation must all be made by the national authority.” “No withdrawal from the National Church was to be thought of, for that would be schism.” (P. 73.) But on the other hand, the cardinal idea of Separation was that a “Church is nothing else than a society of Christian disciples, separated from the world, and voluntarily agreeing to govern themselves by the law of Christ, as given in the Holy Scriptures.” (P. 88.) All this, we are persuaded, is erroneous and unfair, considered as a delineation of the difference between Puritanism and Separatism, just as it is unfounded and in fact absurd, considered as an account of the main characteristic of Presbyterianism. Dr. Bacon has only seen a ghost—that’s all. He is carried away with a phantom of his imagination. *Nationalism* was not the main idea of those Puritans who were Presbyterians. Dr. Calamy says, (Nonconformists’ Memorial, Introduction, p. 5,) that they “were for Calvin’s Discipline and Way of Worship,” which means what the Scripture sets forth. This and not Nationalism has ever been the distinguishing and chief feature of Presbyterianism—it demands for every doctrine and every observance a *thus saith the Lord*. Dr. Bacon introduces George Giffard as a chief opposer among Puritans of the extreme Brownists. Well, we confidently ask, can he produce a word from Giffard about Nationalism? Still further,

Dr. Bacon says Cartwright's influence made Puritanism essentially Presbyterianism, like that of Holland or of Scotland; and surely, then, he can tell us of much that Cartwright had to say about Reformation by national authority. We are of the opinion, however, that Dr. Bacon may be safely challenged to quote anything from the writings of this great Puritan leader to substantiate the statement made about Nationalism. Here are the six propositions containing the opinions he had disseminated at Cambridge, where he was Professor, which, being submitted to the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Whitgift, caused his expulsion from the University. They seem to contain some *very good reading*, such as suits well the Presbyterian palate; but surely no flavor of what Dr. Bacon calls *Nationalism*, can possibly be detected in them. We quote from Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, Vol. II., p. 140—an authority several times referred to and often copied by our author. These propositions were delivered under Cartwright's own hand to the Vice-Chancellor:

"1. That the names and functions of archbishops and archdeacons ought to be abolished.

"2. That the offices of the lawful ministers of the Church, viz., bishops and deacons, ought to be reduced to their apostolical institution: bishops to preach the word of God and pray, and deacons to be employed in taking care of the poor.

"3. That the government of the Church ought not to be intrusted to bishops, chancellors, or the officials of archdeacons; but every church ought to be governed by its own minister and presbyters.

"4. That ministers ought not to be at large, but every one should have the charge of a particular congregation.

"5. That no man ought to solicit or stand as a candidate for the ministry.

"6. That ministers ought not to be created by the sole authority of the bishop, but to be openly and fairly chosen by the people."

Let it be observed, that with Dr. Bacon the chief error of the Puritans in England was, that "ecclesiastical reformation was to be by national authority," while the cardinal idea of Separation was, that "a church is nothing else but a society of disciples, governing themselves by the law of Christ alone," "acknowledging no jurisdiction of Cæsar or of Parliament over the things that are God's." And let it also be observed, that our author

glories in the Pilgrim Fathers as having actually established in America "the simplicity of self-government" for their churches, "under Christ alone." Such a quantity has the venerable Doctor to say about that frightful apparition of *Nationalism* discovered by him in the Puritans, and so sincerely does he seem to worship Congregationalism as divine, that for his edification and comfort we must needs recall to his mind some passages written by him years ago, and which are to be found in his "Historical Account of the Saybrook Platform."

First, then, let us here copy what Dr. Bacon quotes from Trumbull, a high New England authority, as to the condition in which Separation, as it was first established in Connecticut, placed their churches:

"For the want of a more general and energetic government, many churches ran into confusion: councils were not sufficient to relieve the afflicted and restore peace. As there was no general rule for the calling of councils, council was called against council, and opposite results were given upon the same cases, to the reproach of councils and the wounding of religion. Aggrieved churches and brethren were discouraged, as in this way their case seemed to be without remedy. There was no such thing in this way as bringing their difficulties to a final issue."—Trumbull, Vol. I., p. 480.

Again:

"Churches might meet in consociation from the vicinity or from a distance, in larger or smaller numbers; and there was nothing to prevent one consociation from sitting after another upon the same case. There was no suitable nor direct provision for the relief of aggrieved individuals, nor indeed for convening the members of the body. The churches of Connecticut realised these defects, both before and after the session of this Synod.* The difficulty in the first church in Hartford, growing out of a controversy between the pastor and ruling elder, afflicted them exceeding, and in fact all the churches in New England. Other difficulties, arising in different churches, afflicted them also."

This second extract is in Dr. Bacon's own words. The two together sufficiently evince that Separation had not, up to the period referred to, proved to be a perfect panacea for church troubles. But what remedy was devised? The answer is, associations of the ministers and consociations of the people. Good

* The Massachusetts Synod, which met in 1662.

Mr. Hooker had told them, (so records Dr. Bacon,) about a week before his death, "we must agree upon constant meetings of ministers, and settle the consociation of churches, or else we are undone." Separation, pure and simple, was found to be not what the churches required. Somehow, the union and communion of the particular congregations with one another, must be brought about, or confusion must continue and increase, and ruin overtake the whole. "The simplicity of self-government" must not be too absolute, or all will come to destruction, and there be no church whatever left. So much for Dr. Bacon's revelations to us years ago, respecting strict and proper Independency, even as it was modified and softened under the teachings and influence of the gentle Robinson. It is not enough that Brownists become Congregational brethren. Another step must be taken to destroy the too great isolation of particular congregations—a step in the direction of Presbyterianism.

But who is to undertake the work of uniting these Separatist churches? Here let Dr. Bacon stiffen his sinews and screw up his courage, for the ghost is about to appear again—the very ghost of *Nationalism*, which he declares that he has seen so often amongst the Presbyterian Puritans, but which never dared to shew itself amongst the Separatists. Speaking, as quoted above, of the troubles in the first church in Hartford, which so afflicted all the churches in New England, and of the other like difficulties arising in different churches, Dr. Bacon goes on to say as follows:

"The Legislature were so annoyed by these, that in 1668 'they conceived the design of uniting the churches of Connecticut on some general plan of church government and discipline, by which they might walk, notwithstanding their different sentiments, in points of less importance.' With this view an Act passed, authorising four distinguished clergymen in different parts of the colony, viz., the Reverend Messrs. James Fitch of Norwich, Gershom Buckley of Wethersfield, Joseph Elliott of Guilford, and Samuel Waterman of Fairfield, 'to meet at Saybrook and devise a way in which this desirable purpose might be effected.' 'This appears to have been,' Trumbull remarks, 'the first step towards forming a religious constitution.'"

Again, at a later day, the same thing occurs. We quote again from Dr. Bacon:

“The substance of all this appears from the Act of the Legislature appointing those conventions in 1708 in the different counties then in Connecticut, whose delegates formed the Saybrook Platform. ‘This Assembly, from their own observation and the complaint of many others, being made sensible of the defects of the discipline of the churches of this Government, arising from the want of a more explicit asserting of the rules given for that end in the Holy Scriptures, from which would arise a permanent establishment among ourselves, a good and regular issue in cases subject to ecclesiastical discipline, glory to Christ our Head, and edification to his members; hath seen fit to ordain and require, and it is, by the authority of the same, ordained and required, that the ministers of the several counties of this Government shall meet together at their respective county towns, with such messengers as the churches to which they belong shall see cause to send with them, on the last Monday in June next, there to consider and agree upon those methods and rules for the management of ecclesiastical discipline which by them shall be adjudged agreeable to the word of God, and shall at the same meeting appoint two or more of their number to be their delegates, who shall all meet together at Saybrook, at the next commencement to be held there, where they shall compare the results of the meetings of the several counties, and out of and from them draw a form of ecclesiastical discipline.’

“Agreeably to this order the ministers and messengers of the churches met and drafted four models of church discipline, and appointed delegates to the Convention at Saybrook. The delegates met and adopted the Confession of Faith which has been spoken of,* and the Heads of Agreement and Articles for the Administration of Discipline.”

In these formularies, which together constitute the famous Saybrook Platform, provision is made, as Dr. Bacon tells us, “to preserve, promote, or recover the peace and edification of the churches by the means of a consociation of the elders and churches, or of an association of elders, both of which, (the compilers say,) we are agreed have countenance from the Scriptures.” “The articles provided for one or more associations in each county, consisting of the teaching elders, who should meet at least twice in the year,” etc. “The Platform also recommended a General Association, . . . to meet once a year.” “Being thus formed, the Platform was sanctioned by the Colony Legislature, and as soon as practicable went into operation.”

Let us retrace our steps. The *Legislature*, in 1668, were so

* The Savoy Confession, nearly identical with the Westminster.

annoyed by the difficulties which absolute Separation produced amongst the Connecticut churches, that *they conceived the design of uniting them in some general plan of church government and discipline.* An Act of the Legislature passes, *authorising four ministers to meet and devise a way.* Again, in 1708, the Legislature, sensible of the defects of the discipline of *the churches of this Government*—mark the claim here made—*hath seen fit to ordain and require, and it is, by the authority of the same, ordained and required,* that the ministers and messengers shall meet and draw out a form of *ecclesiastical discipline.* Then, after the Platform is made, the Colony Legislature *sanctions it, and it goes into operation!*

Now, where is our venerable friend, Dr. Bacon? Has he survived the terrors of this manifestation of such a frightful *Nationalism* in the very midst of his Separatist brethren?

Whoever will examine the Cambridge Platform, adopted in 1648 by delegates from Connecticut and other New England colonies, along with those of Massachusetts, will discover that it makes Christ the King and Lawgiver, and declares the doctrine of *jus divinum*, and also makes the same distinction, with our system, as to *the parts of church government and its circumstances*; that it acknowledges the distinction of the Church visible and the Church invisible; that it accepts the ruling elder as of divine authority, and distinguishes between him and the teaching elder, as also between this latter and the doctor; that it holds to deaconesses as well as deacons, and accepts synods as the ordinance of Christ, and necessary to the well-being of churches. But to remedy the manifest defects of this Platform, and put an end to the confusion which arises under it, the Saybrook Platform was set up in 1709, providing for consociations and associations, and councils for appeals. This attempt at mutual government by the churches looks somewhat like the engrafting of a Presbyterian or *quasi* Presbyterian idea upon the Congregational system. Thus early Congregationalism was assimilated in various particulars of importance to the Presbyterian system. It cannot be denied, however, that the present successors of the old Congregational Puritans have fallen away from some of the best

parts of the testimony of their fathers. There lies before us a very able and conclusive argument, read in 1859 before the General Association at Bloomington, by the Reverend President Blanchard, pleading for the restoration to use amongst his Congregational brethren, of the office of the ruling elder, as set forth in the Scriptures, and also in the Cambridge and Saybrook Platforms. He argues: I. That then they would be abiding in Christ's words, instead of man-made church arrangements. II. That this would give their churches the strength of right position in argument. "We now teach them (he says,) that Christ 'has given no church polity,' and yet complain when our ministers or people desert to other churches. Why complain, if Christ has left the form of church polity to each man's sense and judgment of convenience and propriety?" III. That this return to the Bible forms and names of discipline, and this alone, will give our churches that sacredness in the eyes of our members which Christ intended that his body, the Church, should have. If we go to our town meetings and lyceums instead of our Bibles, for the names of our church-officers, we so far make our churches like our lyceums and town meetings, in the eyes of our people. A church differs from another meeting in that Christ is there, and his Spirit dwells there; and surely such a body ought to be constructed in all things after the pattern shewed us in the New Testament, and not to be disfigured and marred by the inventions of men. Where there is no eldership, the place will be supplied by man-invented and unordained committees. We are losing our liberties as God's children, by having no clear, definite, well-defined scriptural views of church polity." About the same time the late venerable Dr. Hawes, of Hartford, Connecticut, delivered a discourse before the Congregational Board of Publication in Boston, in which he declared that their system has "one great want—organic unity. The churches have no bond of union in faith or practice. We have no common standards. When asked, What is Congregationalism? it is not easy for us to give an answer. There are great divergencies in faith and order. We want more unity, and we must wisely and considerately move in this direction, or we shall

lose our hold on the conservative and thoughtful amongst us, and fall into the hands of the rash or the radical. Young America wants holding in." So, then, Dr. Hawes testifies that the Cambridge and Saybrook Platforms are no longer held in the New England churches for "common standards!" Said we not truly, that they have fallen away from the testimony of their fathers? Clearly they are *in the downward drift*, obeying that law written on the history of the whole past—the law of degeneracy after *renaissance*. Would to God that our own beloved Church, so lately reformed, were giving no sign of her following now herself the same law!

The late Rev. Dr. Moore pointed out in this REVIEW for March, 1866, the differences that mark Independency and Presbyterianism. The one is a pure democracy like that of Athens; the other a representative republic. The one is a government of the existing numerical majority, whose decision is final, for Independency recognises no court of appeal that can reverse the action of the congregation; the other is a government of tribunals with appellate courts above, to correct the errors of the judicatories below. The one is a government of the individual will of the majority; the other necessarily involves a fixed and written constitution, by whose terms its complex system of tribunals is constructed. The one has not, and cannot have, any fixed creed, as this would interfere with that liberty and responsibility of the individual will, which is its cardinal feature; the other has had from the beginning a fixed creed, whose leading articles of faith have changed but little since its first establishment. The one is mainly negative, denying much, but affirming little, as a system, leaving that to the individual; the other is positive, affirming more than it denies, and requiring assent to these affirmations as a condition of association with it.

Now the one system, (continues Dr. Moore,) in its very structure, implies the fallibility and weakness of man, by making many provisions, which the other does not make, to correct and restrain it. The system which implies that man is a fallen, fallible creature, needing restraints and correctives, requiring checks and balances of the most guarded kind, will tend to produce a

type of theology, philosophy, and individual character conformable to this idea. The opposite system will produce an opposite type of theology, philosophy, and personal character. Here let us listen to Prof. Porter, of Yale College, whom Dr. Moore quotes, as delineating with the most admiring love the Independent system, in its effects on personal character: "The freedom and independence of the individual man characterised the Puritan. . . . It was not, however, a lawless freedom, but a liberty implied in that separate responsibility which each individual man holds to himself and to his God. The Puritan must judge of a law, to know why he must obey it. No authority or organisation steps between himself and his conscience. Hence he stands or falls for himself; he is independent in his bearing, self-relying in his character, and marked by his own individuality. This, not because he scorns the restraints of society or of law, but because he is overmastered by a restraint which is higher; not that he despises authority, but that he reverences the authority that is highest of all. This feeling of responsibility leads him to a personal and thorough investigation; an investigation which is not content till it has tested every question at the highest tribunal. He calls in question every truth, not because he is sceptical by nature, but that he may distinguish the true from the false. He must examine all truth. He questions his own being, and the powers of his own soul, the existence and character of God, the authority of conscience, the reason of this or that duty, the evidence of divine revelation, the genuineness of the text, the exactness of its meaning. He calls in question the tenure of magistrates, the right by which they bear the sword, and the use or abuse of the power intrusted to their hands. . . . The Puritan believes in no fixed institutions. . . . Hence he is by nature a reformer. He is intent upon changing old laws, old institutions, and old habits, that they may meet new exigencies and the new character of those for whose benefit they exist."

This principle of individual responsibility (says Dr. Moore,) is vital in Protestantism; but where it works unchecked, in connexion with a theory of human nature which exalts the natural powers and the goodness of men, much that is valuable in the

opinions and institutions of the past will be rejected, endless diversities of opinion be generated, and an unsettled state of opinions in politics, philosophy, and religion must result. Individual energy will be developed, a jealousy of individual rights be produced, popular education be promoted, and popular advancement stimulated; but its defect is the lack of those checks and restraints, those elements of stability and permanence needful in every enduring state of society. Precisely here Independency differs from Presbyterianism, with its conservative and restraining influences. The two systems were antagonistic—but Dr. Moore holds that they were not of necessity mutually destructive. In the largeness of his catholic spirit he compares them to the centripetal and the centrifugal forces of the great system of the universe, whose antagonism is so wisely adjusted and balanced, that there results a progress at once safer and faster than either alone could produce. We leave it for the reader to judge for himself whether any such adjusting and balancing by man is conceivable for the Presbyterian and the Independent systems. We have ourselves been trained to a jealousy of all such mixtures.

ARTICLE II.

THE RELATION OF PAGAN SYSTEMS TO EACH OTHER, AND TO THE REVEALED SYSTEM OF RELIGION.

When examining the researches of the learned into the mythology and religion of the Pagan nations, it has occurred to us that there are points of marked coincidence and resemblance which it would be profitable to note; not for the purpose of speculation, but as throwing light upon the origin of those several Pagan religions, and also as connecting them in a remote and prehistoric age with the men and religion mentioned in the Old Testament.

In the ante-diluvian age traditions were doubtless more accurate and trustworthy than since, because man's days have been shortened, and what was handed down through the successive generations has undergone more frequent and more imperfect transmissions since than before the flood. But these are all we have left us of all that men once knew. A haze of myth hangs over the prehistoric age of every Pagan nation, partly on account of the exaggerations of traditions so often repeated from father to son, and partly on account of the superstitions into which these had fallen.

But notwithstanding these drawbacks, we have abundant data in these old mythologies and religions to prove that they had a common origin, and that very many of their notions and practices were derived from God's revelation to man. Let us adduce some of these points of agreement.

1. And beginning with the deluge, we find all nations have, with more or less fulness and faithfulness, a "great flood" handed down to them; and to many of them the ark and the dove are *sacred* things. We are aware that the deluge is not of itself a religious matter; but when we see in religious traditions and sacred ceremonies of some of the Pagans, references had to the deluge, the ark, and even to the dove perched upon the roof of the ark, it does create in our minds a presumption of no ordinary

force that the whole Pagan system of mythology and religion had their origin with Jehovah's "preacher of righteousness;" and that the facts on which these systems rest, are but the distorted and perverted traditions of the signal deliverance of Noah and his family, as authenticated to us by the inspired record of Moses.

The student will find, upon consulting Sir W. Jones, Bryant, and Faber, on these subjects, that Noah has been personated and worshipped, under a multitude of names, as one of the first deities of the nations, viz., among the Greeks, under the name of Deucalion, of Atlas, of Saturn, of Inachus, and of Janus, and others; among the Egyptians, under the name of Isis, of Osiris, of Sesostris, of Oannes, and others; Among the Phenicians, under the name of Dagon, of Sydyk, of Agruerus, and others; among the Assyrians, under the name of Astarte and others; among the Hindoos, under the name of Buddha, of Menu, of Vishnu, and others; among the Chinese, under the name of Fohi, and of another deity sitting upon the waters; among the Japanese, under the name of Budo and of Jakusi.

The aborigines of the American hemisphere also furnish us most interesting traditions of the same general character, going to show that the fact of a deluge is deeply imbedded in the mythologies and religions of those who have not the word of God. But we cannot enlarge on this.

2. The Pagans all agree there is a God, a Supreme Being. It always has been true, and it always will be true, that this world has never seen a *nation of Atheists*. Man did not create himself. This he knows; and equally well he knows that by some power he has been brought from nonentity into existence. Man does not sustain his own life. The heart that continually beats the march of time, and the lungs that inhale and exhale the life-giving air, are kept in motion by an unseen Hand, which removed, they pause in their labors and the man dies. These things are true every where. If men think, they must perceive their dependence; if they do not think, they must feel it! And so it is that men every where acknowledge a "Higher Power," whether they find this energy impersonated in some fowl or fish

or beast ; or lifting their eyes upward and beholding the shining constellations that adorn the "adamantine vault"—the moon, that rides as mistress of the night, and the sun, as he blazes in the forehead of the mid-day sky—they fall down and worship ; or whether looking up through nature unto nature's God, they grasp the fact that God is a person, a spirit. Under all circumstances men are religious beings. Left, as the greater part of our wicked race have been, to walk, for many centuries, in the light of their own eyes, the feeling that God is a Father and Protector has lingered in their hearts, and the sense of their dependence has led them still to seek his favor and help. Having departed from the glorious light of revelation, (which was given, no doubt, to Noah's immediate descendants,) they groped like blind men ; some devising one method of access into God's favor, some another, as their ideas of the nature of God differed. Of course, in every instance, the ideas of the Pagans were fatally defective, as they all came short of apprehending the glory of God. But let us particularise ; and that our idea may make a distinct and sharp incision, we will here adduce the *five* most prominent Pagan systems, viz., the Egyptian, the Greek, the Roman, the Teutonic, and the Brahman. These, as all Pagan religions, were national and local. So also was Judaism, in an important sense. Ammon made Thebes and the country of the Nile his home ; Zeus dwelt among the clouds that surrounded the peaks of Mt. Olympus ; Jupiter reigned supreme over Etruria and Latium ; from Asgard the mighty Odin looked down upon his Teutonic worshippers ; and the triple-formed "Indra," as of old, still absorbed in the topmost "bobun," looks carelessly forth upon the prostration of about one-half the human race.

These five great systems have exerted a tremendous influence on the world's history. Four of them have passed away. The millions who once feared and worshipped Ammon, have long since passed to the spirit world, and the name at which every knee bowed, is to-day in Egypt a jest and a by-word. Men no longer adore Zeus or Jupiter ; and the savage Northmen, as they overran Italy, forsook Odin and owned Jesus as their God and Saviour. The fifth system is now put in closer contact with

Christianity, and the day is coming when it too will be superseded by the dominion of him who was born to be the King Universal.

But these five forms of religion are so separated from one another by nationality, time, and distance, that we may properly consider them as five separate attempts to solve the problem, "What is God?" As we have already said, they each declare the existence of *one Supreme God*. In Egypt he is Ammon; *i. e.*, "*the concealed God*." In Rome, he is Jupiter; *i. e.*, "*the Father of Light*." In Greece, he is Zeus; *i. e.*, "*the Living One*." In Scandinavia, he is Odin Alfader; *i. e.*, "*the Father of all*." In Hindostan, he is Indra; *i. e.*, "*Lord of the air*." They all assert supremacy for these gods. True, it seems absurd to predicate supremacy of beings which are neither eternal nor omnipotent. We can hardly help smiling when reading the mythologies of these poor Pagans. Take three incidents: (a) Odin in conflict with a monster wolf, is devoured, and so ends Alfader! (b) In the war of the Titans, the giants capture Jupiter, and take the sinews out of his legs and arms, so that he is rendered impotent. Behold the Father of Light unable to resist his enemies until the indispensable sinews are restored to him by the knavery of one of the lesser gods! (c) We find Zeus—"greatest of the gods"—"god with many names"—"god ever ruling and ruling all things"—engaging in the basest intrigues; and frequently at banquets spread in the halls of heaven, the gods are represented as going from words to blows, until they kick up such a rumpus that the empyrean shakes and trembles!

We can show that, though supremacy was claimed for Zeus and Jupiter, both these gods had, instead of eternity of being, a *derived existence*. Jupiter was the son of Saturn, who was the supreme god at first; but the ungrateful son seized the opportunity when Saturn's affairs were in confusion, and dethroned him. So much for the Father of Light! And according to the Greeks, Zeus was the head of the third dynasty of gods. First was the rule of Chaos; next, the rule of the Titans; and then, the rule of Zeus. It seems strange that supremacy is affirmed of Zeus and not of Chaos, from which all the gods sprang. And to

test the Teutonic deity in the same way: The earth existed and was inhabited by a race of giants before Odin came into existence; and he was not self-caused, but was begotten by Bor.

The Sacred Book of India places *Indra* in much the same predicament. "Who knows exactly, and who shall in this world declare, whence and why this creation took place? The gods are subsequent to the production of the world; then who can know whence it proceeded, or whence this varied world arose, or whether it upholds itself or not?" Rig-Veda, B. X., ch. 11. In the same connexion it is stated that "all things were evolved out of some incomprehensible being." But if *Indra*, *Mitra*, *Varuna*, and the other deities came into existence *after the world*, does not that "*incomprehensible being*" from which all things evolved, deserve the name of god rather than *Indra*?

The Egyptian god *Ammon*, on the contrary, was uncaused and self-existent. No attempt seems to have been made to account for his origin. Says *Bunsen*: "Incontestably he stands in Egypt at the head of the great cosmogonic development."

From these facts thus thrown together in one view, the conclusion is reached that the heathen hold with more or less distinctness the idea of *one Supreme God*.

Now, whether this is due to a common origin of the race, and points to a period in the hoary past, when man summed up in one family, dwelt in the presence of God, and had correct views of his nature; or whether it can be sufficiently explained by "the light of nature" and the logical powers of the human understanding, is a question about which a German scholar might (spider-like) spin out of his own bowels an alarming mass of arguments, *pro* and *con*, and then not decide. To ourselves the matter is plain. "God hath made of one blood all nations;" and originally the whole race knew him; but certain branches refused to obey him as God, "and even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind," etc.

Every one of these Pagan systems teaches that in the remote past there was a "golden age," a time when the gods held communion with the dwellers upon the earth. Every one of these

systems bears the marks of deterioration. "*Humanum est errare!*"

Holding up these several forms of Paganism, and looking first on this picture and then on that, we cannot help seeing that they are the defaced, blotted, tattered copies of the same divine original.

3. The third feature common to all these Pagan systems is *Polytheism*.

We were disposed to mention "the trinity of persons of the one Supreme God," as a common feature of the Pagan systems. But we will not press analogies too far, for there is great obscurity and confusion, not to say contradiction, in the several systems we have referred to, as also in others. Bishop Tomline says, (and he is supported by the researches of Sir W. Jones and Mr. Maurice,) "that nearly all the Pagan nations, in their theologies, have acknowledged a kind of Trinity." Plato distinctly affirms a trinity of persons, (three "hypostases,") the 1st, τὸ ὄν, *i. e.*, "the *Being*;" 2d. λόγος, *i. e.*, "the Wisdom or Word;" and 3d. ψυχή, *i. e.* "the Soul of the World." And according to Sir Wm. Jones and others, Brahma, the supreme god of the Hindoos, is a triune, a triple-formed god. To this much might be added; but we forbear. The Pagan Trinity would not accord with the formulated statements of that doctrine, as held in our Christian books and schools. But the almost universal prevalence of this notion of a "Trinity" in the Gentile kingdoms of the world, is a very singular and unaccountable fact, unless our hypothesis be true, "that these notions were derived from the patriarchs and their descendants, not long after the flood." The doctrine itself is so unlikely to have been invented by the wit or reason of man, that it may be said to have the *internal* marks of its divine origin. Now the degeneracy of the descendants of Noah will account for the deterioration of their knowledge of divine things, whilst the traces of this "Trinity" in their god will help to explain the steps of that deterioration: 1st. *Monotheism* and Trinity; 2nd. *Tritheism*; 3d. *Polytheism*.

After this digression, let us particularise as to the *Polytheism* of these Pagans. The Egyptians had twenty-seven gods; the

Indians had five ; the Greeks had three generations of gods : the first and second containing about thirty-six—that beginning as powers of nature ended as persons ; the third contained eleven beings, who, together with Aphrodite, of the second generation, are “the twelve Olympian deities.” The Romans had three classes of gods. (1) The old Latin and Etruscan divinities ; (2) Gods invented by the college of Pontiffs for moral or political purposes ; and (3) Greek deities introduced with a change of name into their own Pantheon. These gods numbered in all forty-two ; though if we were to allow a separate and distinct god for every name that occurs, we should multiply them very much. For instance, we are not to suppose that a separate person is designated by each of these names : “Jupiter Pluvius,” “Fulgurator,” “Tonans,” “Fulminator,” “Imbricator,” “Serenator,” “Optimus Maximus,” “Imperator,” “Victor,” “Invictus,” “Stator,” “Predator,” “Triumphator,” “Urbis Custos.” Jupiter was worshipped under three hundred names, but he is the same in all. By pursuing this plan we can easily show that it is an utter mistake to suppose that the Romans had three thousand gods ; they only had three thousand names. The Teutons had about fourteen male gods, and a good many of the other sex.

The question naturally arises, in considering these facts, how is it that men following the light of nature, become Polytheists ? We think this may be accounted for : (1) By the base and unworthy ideas men entertain of God. After they have dragged him down to a level approaching their own, it is natural that they should subject him to circumstances similar to, though higher than, those of man ; and the nearer to the level of man their conceptions placed God, the more were the conditions of his existence humanised. As regards origin, his existence is derived—yet at a very remote period. As regards mode of subsistence, he is not ubiquitous, but is found now here, now there. The only advantage he has over mortals, is that he can move from place to place with inconceivable rapidity. But this single defect *necessitated* the multiplication of gods ; while the belief they entertained of his *derived existence*, readily suggested a facile

explanation of the origin of as many as they desired or needed. (2) By the unbelief of the heathen. Their faith was not founded on truth, and so was not solid; they felt it yield beneath them as they were called to meet danger and misfortune. When in circumstances where they needed help, they invoked the higher power; and not altogether certain that he whom they adored could just then render the needed assistance, they would invoke also the genius of the place, the forces of nature, and make vows to them. But invoking and making vows to anything is worshipping it; and soon acquiring names, these forces that were supposed to have afforded assistance, were enrolled among the immortals. Thus we see that in a sense, "*fear made the gods.*" This is the natural and rational account of the origin of Polytheism. It is only a confession of creature-emptiness, of weakness, and of dependence. Here we see the result of departing from God. As men do not like to retain God in their knowledge, he gives them over; and as they depart from him, he forsakes them; and the result is they believe lies so palpable that we are surprised.

As we look upon the millions of heathendom deifying sun, moon, and stars, wind, rivers, oceans, seasons, fowls, fishes, beasts, and men, and (still unsatisfied) erecting altars to "*the unknown God,*" it is a sad spectacle! These several deifications are but so many confessions of human weakness and ignorance and unhappiness. They are but the efforts of drowning men to seize a something to support their souls, lest they sink beneath the tide of human misfortune. And it is a humiliating and alarming spectacle; for in the darkling and wanderings of these men, we see exemplified the weakness of our own mental powers, the superstition of which we are capable, and the moral degradation to which we might stoop if deserted by God's grace! While filled with pity at seeing them groping in darkness, and beseeching the aid of an unseen but needed power, let us profoundly acknowledge that we owe to God's distinguishing goodness any clearer views that we may have.

4. The fourth common feature of them all is Idolatry or Image Worship.

The Greeks expressed their ideal of the gods in beautiful statuary and paintings. The human form, in its noblest and loveliest appearance, was exquisitely reproduced in the speaking marble. Artists of all subsequent ages have vainly tried to rival the statue of the god Apollo. The Greek conception of the gods was, that they were persons who wore a form resembling that of man, only more beautiful and majestic. This imaginary excellence they tried to express in their statuary, and this is the explanation of the beauty of the Greek idols.

The Romans seem to have entertained the same ideas of the gods. The Roman legends of the origin of the race begin with a theophany. Mars appears to Rhea Silvia, and she becomes a mother. Not many years later, Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome, was believed to see and converse with the goddess Egeria, in the Sacred Grove of Aricia, near the city. They had, too, the Greek belief of the majestic beauty and appearance of the gods. Virgil describes the appearance of Venus as follows :

“Dixit, et avertens rosea cervice refulsit,
Ambrosiæque comæ divinum vertice odorem
Spiravere: pedes vestis defluxit ad imos;
Et vera incessu patuit dea.”—*Vir. Aen., Lib. I., 402—405.*

And so the Roman ideal, like that of the Greeks, found expression in beautiful statuary. Among these images were those of many distinguished men, beginning with Romulus and ending with the Roman Emperors.

The Indians, differing from the Greeks and Romans, expressed their conceptions of God by many-headed, many-armed, many-legged, many-breasted, many-eyed monsters. If they wished to represent the god as powerful, they gave him a great many hands, each one brandishing some weapon; if ubiquitous, he is represented with several pairs of legs; if omniscient, he has a great many eyes; if beneficent, he has many breasts, indicative of his nourishing care. They believe that Krishna, who has been called the Indian Apollo, was a very handsome youth; but their purpose is to express in the statue, not beauty, but the traits which characterise the particular god.

The Egyptian idols are misshapen, symbolical figures. The

Sphinx has the head of a man, indicating wisdom, and the body of a lion, indicating strength; and the pictures in their tombs abound in figures of this kind. They worshipped, also, as an idol, a live bull, under the name of Apis. The bull must be perfectly black, with a blaze of white in the forehead; no other would answer. When they had found such a one, the Egyptians brought him with great rejoicing to the temple of Osiris, and worshipped him as long as he lived.

All these heathen were idolaters, worshipping wood and stone and metal, the work of their own hands.

In pleasing contrast with these were the old Teutons. They used no temple but that whose floor is the bosom of the earth and its roof the star-lit vault of heaven; no altar but the huge undressed stone; no image by which to represent the deity, but they worshipped him as the invisible God!

Why do we wonder at the idolatry of the nations? Man's depravity and blindness will explain the sad, sad wonder. But, aside from this, it can be at least partially explained by a tendency in the human mind to deal in the concrete and not in the abstract. The abstract and the general are hard to comprehend; it requires an activity of the mind that is painful to ordinary men; hence the tendency to come down to the easier level of the concrete, where the mind may find at the same time *employment* and *rest*, in apprehending facts and illustrations of truth. Now the *spiritual* is related to the *material*, very much as the *abstract* is to the *concrete*. The former lies beyond the domain of our senses. We cannot see it or comprehend it. Of the latter we have some knowledge; for all of our senses are correlated to the material world, and thus we become, in a measure, acquainted with it. Now, although the heathen believed God to be a spiritual being, it is not surprising that, unable to lift their minds to the contemplation of an invisible and incomprehensible something, they substituted the *known* for the *unknown*, the *material* for the *spiritual*.

Another natural explanation of idolatry (which finds its apologists in the image-using Christian churches,) is the plea that

“*images help devotion.*” This help is rendered by presenting a *definite* object.

Doubtless these images were at first mere figurative representations of the deity. Men, by looking upon them, were reminded of the god, and thus, through them, as remembrancers, prayers ascended to him whom they symbolised. The mind and heart, when called upon to adore a great abstraction, may soar aloft on the wings of imagination for a while; but when these weary, it turns earthward again, and is very apt to find its way back to the cares and forms of life before the worshipper has arisen from his knees. And so, to engage the attention and fix it, men began to use images. It is stated that the Roman Dictator, Sylla, used to carry about in his pocket an image of Apollo, the god whom he worshipped. He was a wicked man, but a very religious one, and often prayed to this image. We recollect having seen in Pinnock's History of Rome, a picture of Sylla upbraiding Apollo for allowing him to be defeated in some battle. It was a good representation of the incident. It represented Sylla, the Dictator, as sitting on his war-horse, holding between his thumb and forefinger the image of the god with whom he was angry. Now it is hardly conceivable that this man, whom his contemporaries honored with the name “Felix,” for a moment thought that he was carrying in his pocket the great god Apollo, or that he was holding him between his thumb and finger. Whatever may have been his superstition, he could hardly have entertained such an absurd belief! He looked upon the image as a mere representation. And so generally it is in the beginning of the use of images.

In the course of time, however, men forgot that the image was only a *help to devotion*, and that the idol was intended to be in itself nothing at all! They lost sight of the fact of a great spiritual God; and they began to pay divine honor to stocks and stones, the workmanship of their own hands. The notion prevailed that when the images were consecrated, the divine beings came down and took up their abode in them. And so, when the idolater came before the image, he came not to look on the symbolic *representation*, but to behold and adore the *present god*.

Yet another explanation of image worship is that the heathen did not believe in the ubiquity of God; and therefore several motives would impel them to consecrate an idol to him: (1) The hope to secure him as the tutelary divinity of their own nation. (2) That they might know where to find him. They had no idea that he would hear those who prayed, unless they came to his shrine. When Tarquin would inquire about a matter of importance, he had to send his sons and nephew to consult the Oracle at Delphi.

Before dismissing this branch of our subject, let us recur to the fact that not only have the Pagan nations generally been *idolaters*, but several branches of the Christian Church have apostatized, and departing from the divine simplicity of God's word, have become, in fact and in form, image worshippers. Why is this? How can we account for this tendency in our humanity to seek for some *embodiment* of their religious ideas and their devotional feelings? It surely does not imply that images are right or useful. Then, *why is this?* It is something more than the mind's *craving* for the *concrete*. It is a blind prophecy of an incarnation! A craving that manifests itself wherever men attempt to worship the spiritual God; a prophecy (because an expression of the soul's needs) before or after the event, but before the knowledge of the event reaches that particular people; a craving, a prophecy, that finds its fulfilment in the incarnation of Jesus Christ. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." No man or people that believe in an incarnate Saviour, can worship idols; for idolatry is the fruit of apostasy and unbelief. But they who have partially known him may depart from him, and then they may and will have recourse to this wretched device.

Thus, while the idolatry of the nations reminds us of the folly and blindness of the human mind when left to itself, it also presents to us this interesting thought, that it proves that man needs, and always and everywhere needs, an embodiment, an incarnation of God; and this need is met in the gospel of Jesus Christ.

5. The fifth and last common feature of these Pagan systems to be considered in this article is *sacrifices*. They were introduced into Greece, it is said, by Phoroneus, in the year 1773 B. C. ; that is, several hundred years before the deluge of Deucalion. This date is of course prehistoric. The Greeks had no authentic history of events, even so far back as the Trojan war, and that was only 1193 B. C. They sacrificed various kinds of animals, and occasionally human beings.

The Romans tried to appease the gods by about the same offerings. The blood of bulls and of goats was freely shed as an expiation for sin; and when it was believed that nothing else would appease the gods, human beings were offered. Of this we have instances in the self-sacrifice of P. Decius Mus, B. C. 340, and of his son, P. Decius Mus, B. C. 295.

The Teutons sacrificed human beings in great numbers. The victims were generally those who had been captured in war. They were tied to some forest oak, there slain by the priests, and there, beneath the spreading branches, offered by them in sacrifice to their god, while the grim warriors stood around in reverential silence.

That the Egyptians offered sacrifices is evident from the fact that there was an altar placed between the front feet of the "Sphinx," and from the paintings found in the tombs. Inasmuch as the bull was one of the sacred animals of this people, we may be sure that they never used cattle as victims. This fact will give us at least one of the reasons why Moses demanded of Pharaoh that he should allow the Israelites to go three days' journey into the wilderness, that they might offer sacrifices to God; for in offering bullocks they would be sacrificing the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord, and at the same time be in danger of death at the hands of the infuriated people. Exod. viii. 26.

The Indians, too, make use of the blood of brutes and of men, in their attempts to worship God. It is not necessary to enter into particulars. The general fact stands forth in astonishing clearness: all the heathen offer sacrifices of some sort, and most of them offer bloody sacrifices.

Now there are several thoughts which press out to our view, viz. : (1) All nations regard the gods whom they worship, as being for some cause or other angry with them. How came this to pass? (2) In the act of sacrifice, all nations express a hope and belief that their anger may be appeased. How came this? (3) All nations and people, in these religious acts, consciously or unconsciously confess that their lives are *forfeited*, and that they hope for forgiveness because a life has been offered instead of their own. These truths are plainly implied in every human or even animal sacrifice.

The similarity between these facts and the facts revealed in the word of God are very striking. Note what God's word reveals; and as we go along, notice how the Pagan facts seem to tally with them.

God is angry with the wicked every day; not, however, as the Pagans imagine, because of a cruel disposition, but because men are sinful creatures, and he is holy and cannot look upon sin.

There is a way of reconciliation and recovery for man. The blood of bulls and goats cannot take away sin; nor can man buy the favor of God by offering to him the most precious gifts; but of his own mercy he saves us.

The life of man is forfeited, really forfeited by his sin. He is saved from death by the offering of another life instead of his own. He is redeemed not by corruptible things, as silver and gold, but by the precious blood of the Son of God. Here, in the gospel, are brought out in their full meaning the several facts that are implied in the heathen sacrifices. These all unconsciously typified the great sacrifice of which the Jewish offerings were the divinely expressed predictions, (printed in blood,) the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

Here, too, is an interesting fact, which proves the human race to be one family. Despite the few discrepancies, (which are slight and superficial,) the points of similarity are many and strong. All forms of Paganism present this idea: man is to be reconciled to God by the shedding of blood, and all of them have been marked by this teaching and practice, quite back to the pre-historic times. This great fact marks the human race as one.

We cannot get away from this fact, theorise as we may! Whatever fitness there may seem to be in the sacrifice of life to save life, when once the idea is discovered, *the universal prevalence of that idea among the nations cannot be fortuitous*. What must Reason conclude? The Scriptures tell us of the time when sacrifices were first instituted, and so we are not left to the *inferences* which Reason may draw.

It has been interesting to us to study out and mark these several common features of the false religions of the world; and we have written them here to stimulate and encourage others to enter this field. It is full of interest, and needs careful and earnest attention. We conclude this article with the following reflections:

1. It is manifest that those nations which are now in the deepest Pagan darkness, once had a far clearer disclosure of the character and will of God, and they have not retained God in their knowledge. Their present deep depression is but the necessary result of their departure from God.

2. Man, however, in times past exalted and blessed by God, when left to himself will wander into pitiable darkness, and go on into the grossest follies and absurdities. Where are the lost ten tribes of Israel?

3. That in the religious notions and practices of the heathen, there are unmistakable traces of a divine original—and so a confirmation of that divinely inspired book, in which there is no error at all; in which we are taught rightly to know our spiritual wants, and the remedy which divine grace has provided for these wants, in Jesus Christ our Lord.

ARTICLE III.

CHURCH UNION.

It may be said that these two words express what is the hobby of many in our times.

The cry of *union* has been notoriously conspicuous among the followers of Alexander Campbell. It has ever been characteristic of them, especially when commencing services in a new location, to cry out for *union, union*; but it has always turned out at last that the way to accomplish *union* was for everybody to join their sect. In order to give coloring to their cry of union, they have eschewed giving a distinctive name to their sect, and presumed to call themselves *Christians*—thereby assuming that they alone of all people were entitled to be called by that name. This pretence, however absurd, has probably been instrumental in drawing not a few into their party.

Some one has recently done us the honor to send us a newspaper published in the city of New York, entitled "*Church Union.*" The paper professes to be published in the interest of all evangelical Churches, and that it has for its object the organic union of all churches so called. It is evidently conducted by the friends of Congregationalism, and puts forth the same scheme for accomplishing union as that which has been adopted by the Campbellites, namely, that the true plan for accomplishing union is for all evangelical Christians to join the Congregational Church. In the number, January 2d, 1875, page 9, is found the following language:

"Probably there is small danger of any actual subversion of independence in the attempts at union. Those who have liberty will not be likely to surrender it for the sake of an experiment, for a unity so often pronounced impracticable; *while those who have it not* are at least safe from losing it. It is union that may be a failure, if in its new attempts it blunder into an opposition to independence; but we hope better things of it, though we thus speak.

"But the truth goes far beyond the assertion that unity must not throw itself into antagonism to independence. If the children of light have indeed grown wise in this generation, after so many grievous centuries of

mistake, will they not now see that independence is essential to unity? That it is not a something inevitable and powerful and stubborn, and therefore not to be offended, but that it is a something to be used and prized as the very means for the grand end sought. . . . Whereas church politicians have been always saying, how much independence can we make men and churches give up for the sake of union? they must now begin to say, how much independence can we possibly bring men to possess, that they may therein rise to union?"

In these extracts it is clearly manifest that Independence or Congregationalism is set forth as being not only the divinely appointed form of church polity, but as being also the polity indispensable to union. It is also quietly assumed, as if it were undisputed, that other denominations are destitute of independence or liberty. There is another example of a sophistical play upon words in order to uphold a favorite theory. One denomination call themselves *Baptists*, thereby assuming that they alone of all Christians baptize. Another party call themselves *Christians*, as if they only were entitled to this name. Another party call themselves *Unitarians*, as if they only believed in the unity of God. So another party call themselves *Independents*, as if they only had church independence or liberty. Independence, in its common acceptation, signifies exemption from outside control. To assume that a church organisation is destitute of liberty or independence, because they choose to govern themselves by established laws, through officers of their own appointment, is like assuming that the people of the United States have no liberty or independence, because they choose to govern themselves by means of judges, sheriffs, jurors, legislatures, a congress, and president! Are they not still exempt from outside control? It would not add to their political liberty for each county or town to govern itself without judge or jury, sheriff or constable, or without any appeal to a higher tribunal. The counties and towns might possibly congratulate themselves on their independence, but it would be an independence equivalent to mobocracy, and furnishing the poorest sort of guaranty for civil rights. The advocates for what is called the Independent form of church government, have as little reason to congratulate themselves on what they are pleased to term their independence in church polity.

All experience shows the superiority of a representative republic over a pure democracy. The executive administration of government, in the hands of a few select persons, is vastly more trustworthy than when committed to the multitude. Large bodies are slow, and they are unwieldy in the management of matters; then, many of the multitude are unfit, by reason of their want of intelligence and training, to participate in government and discipline. Who would not rather intrust contested interests to a few such men as Judges Marshall, Story, or Taney, than to a court composed of the whole assembled multitude of any town or county, including all the women and half-grown boys and girls, and all the most ignorant men? Then how unseemly it is for ladies of refinement to be present, as judges, in cases of scandalous crimes. Would it not be unsuitable, to the last degree, for ladies of refinement to act as judges of the court, and to listen to the testimony in such a case as the recent scandalous trial in Brooklyn? Should it be replied that cases of that kind could be tried by a committee or commission, the reply is, that this is virtually stepping off from the platform of Independency and rising to the platform which is known by the name of Presbyterianism; only in such a case the committee or commission would not be so well qualified for their duty as if the duty rested permanently in their hands, and their decision might be reversed or set aside by the Church as a whole. Surely it must be admitted that Judge Marshall was more to be trusted after an experience for years in the constant habit of looking into questions of right, in the view of law and equity. The form of church government styling itself Independent, claims that each congregation decides for itself ultimately, and without appeal to any higher tribunal, all questions of government and discipline. Each church-member, whether man or woman, girl or boy, intelligent or unlearned, has an equal right to vote with any other member. The preacher and deacon have no more than a single vote, the same as all the other members. Consequently, if their preacher can succeed in attaching the members to himself as personal friends, no matter what he teaches, and no matter how scandalous his acts, he can defy the efforts of discipline against himself.

Some adopting this government, practise the expedient, in such a case, of having the Associations, so called, to declare non-fellowship with a church which thus allows heresy or immorality to go unrebuked. Here, again, they step off from their Independent platform. To cut off offenders from the communion of saints, is the highest penalty pretended to be inflicted by any Protestant Church. To declare non-fellowship, is to cut off from the communion of saints; but by the Congregational or Independent plan, the innocent minority of such a congregation are equally cut off with the guilty majority, without any crime or heresy charged against them. Without any crime or heresy charged against them, they are visited with the highest penalty known to church discipline; and there is no appeal from such decision, no matter how unjust to such innocent minority.

It is to be noticed, too, that the Independent theory cannot be reconciled with Scripture teachings. Its advocates do indeed claim that it alone can be so reconciled; but there is one fact which alone, without anything to be added, so completely negatives the Independent theory, that it is amazing that any intelligent man, with the Bible open before him, can fail to see it. The fact alluded to is this: that *rulers* were appointed in the apostolic Church, and the people exhorted and commanded to obey them. 1 Tim. v. 17: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor," etc. Rom. xii. 8: "He that ruleth with diligence."

These rulers are indifferently called either elders, bishops, or pastors; in proof of which see Acts xx. 17-28. The overseers or bishops here spoken of, are also styled elders, and exhorted to be faithful as pastors. This is more fully seen by looking at the Greek language used. The same fact is apparent from 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, and 1 Tim. iii. The term elder, as used among the Jews, signified a *ruler*, and the term, as such, was transferred to the New Testament Church. The literal meaning of bishop is overseer or ruler, and the term pastor, which refers to the shepherd's care of his flock, indicates power to direct and govern, as well as to provide for his flock. Here notice the following scriptures: 1 Thess. v. 12: "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them

which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you." Heb. xiii. 7 : "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God." Heb. xiii. 17 : "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief; for that is unprofitable for you."

The Independent theory of church government totally ignores these Scripture teachings. It is not possible to torture these passages so as to reconcile them with that theory. Their preachers and deacons are not *rulers*: they have no more authority than any other member of the congregation. Instead of its being the case that Independency occupies a higher plane than any other form of government, it is a long step below the plane which is occupied by those churches who govern themselves by their own selected representatives as rulers, and by established laws. In the light of common sense, and of the Scriptures, the one is far below the other. If, then, we have to step down from the platform recommended to us both by common sense and the Scriptures, to accomplish union, it is not likely we can be persuaded to accept the blessing. Grant that the Scripture form of government is not essential to the being of a church, still, if the church exist at all, it must exist under some form of government. The "*Church Union*" admits this, but would have us unite on Independency as the more excellent way. We beg pardon; we do not so consider it. We beg leave to amend the statement of the "*Church Union*," and have it put in this form: "Will they (Christians) not now see that 'Presbyterianism' is indispensable to unity; that it is something to be used and prized as the very means for the grand end sought?"

The "*Church Union*" thinks that those have no liberty who have not adopted Independency; but we vastly prefer the regulated liberty of Presbyterianism to that which looks to us to be very much akin to license; especially because, in our judgment, the one is according to the Scriptures, and the other is not. We apprehend that most Christians would be willing for union, on the basis that all should join their particular church. It does

not seem to us to be very consistent to decry all stickling for things not essential to the existence of credible piety, and then stickle for one's own peculiar form of church government, a polity which is admitted not to be essential to salvation. This is certainly a very presumptuous way of promoting church union. One would think that such a setting forth of things was intended for irony; that it was intended to turn the whole thing of church union into ridicule.

The Saviour prayed for the unity of his people; but may there not be unity in diversity? Is it essential to the unity for which the Saviour prayed, that all his people shall agree in doctrine, government, and discipline, and that they must all belong to the same organic Church? If not, then perhaps the union he prayed for may already exist. There is already an agreement in things essential to piety and salvation. The churches described by the term *evangelical*, already agree in this respect; but there are other churches to whom this term is not applied; yet they claim to be true friends of Christ. If they are not, then the prayer for unity contemplates their conversion. This is the view taken by some; but without pressing this view of the subject, we proceed to remark:

That it is sometimes intimated in the interests of union, that the different churches require their members to adopt all the tenets of their church creed; and it is therefore argued that this requirement stands in the way of union. But it is apprehended that this is an erroneous representation of the state of the case. So far as Presbyterianism is concerned, this certainly is not true. We do not presume that when one is converted and ready to join the church, he must be a profound theologian, and able to answer intelligently whether he does or does not adopt all the tenets of our creed. On the contrary, our theory is, that to join the Church is to enter the school of Christ, in order to be taught. While to be a profound theologian is not necessary to the existence of piety, yet, truth being in order to goodness, the higher one's attainments in religious knowledge, the higher are apt to be his attainments in spirituality and piety. The stream cannot rise higher than its source; so no one can be better than his

principles; no one can act better than he knows how; he may fall in practice far below his knowledge; he cannot, in practice, go with design beyond what he knows. Officers and teachers must adopt the creed, because no man is qualified to teach unless he himself has first learned that which he is to teach, and because we judge that the creed sets forth the doctrines which we understand the Scriptures to teach, and which are for the highest good of man. Besides all this, as a matter of benevolence and good will to men, we give our formal testimony in the creed to what we understand to be taught in the Scriptures, for the benefit of others. To bear testimony to the truth is one of the great missions of the Church. It is astonishing that so many should so grievously misapprehend the object of a comprehensive creed. If there were any purpose to force church-members to adopt the tenets of the creed, there might be some reason to declaim against the use of such formularies. It was the plan of a certain father not to teach his son any religious principles, so that when he was fully grown he might investigate the whole subject of religion without prejudice. The folly of such a course is seen in the fact, that if he were not taught the truth on religious subjects, he would be sure to imbibe error, and be prejudiced in favor of such error. It is far better to be prejudiced in favor of the truth, than to be prejudiced in favor of error. If a boy, as he grows up, is not trained in the principles of a gentleman, he is sure to be vulgar and boorish, and unfit to move in genteel society.

The declamation against creed is both absurd and self-contradictory. The word *creed* is synonymous with belief. Are those who scoff at creeds without a creed or belief of their own? It is not necessary for tenets to be written out, nor to be long or short, in order to be properly called a *creed* or belief. The followers of Alexander Campbell have made themselves conspicuous in declaiming against creeds, while they themselves have a creed, which is, as we understand it: I. That a person must be dipped, or his baptism is not valid. II. That dipping secures regeneration. III. That faith is nothing more than intellectual assent. IV. That it is wrong to have any creed at all. V. That

the Bible is a sufficient creed. VI. That Independency is the proper form of church government. VII. That all Christians ought to unite on their platform. The self-contradiction is that a part of their creed is that it is wrong to have any creed.

The idea has had not a few advocates, that one belief was as good as any other, provided the holder of it was sincere. This principle will not do in worldly matters. We might as well suppose that a draught of prussic acid or corrosive sublimate would be as good as anything else to refresh and nourish the human system, provided the person himself sincerely thinks so. So of all other worldly matters. It is not true that a physician might just as well administer one medicine as another for a given disease, provided the physician sincerely thinks the medicine the best. It is not true that a farmer might just as well plant his seeds in any one month in the year as in any other month, provided the farmer sincerely thinks so. It is not true that a vessel at sea might just as well be steered on one course as another, provided the captain sincerely thinks that the course, whatever it is, will safely bring him to the desired port. It is not true that the general of an army might as well adopt one set of tactics as another, provided he sincerely thinks that the tactics adopted are the best. The principle that sincerity is sufficient will not do in any worldly matters. Why, then, should the most imbecile intellect ever imagine for a moment that truth is of no importance on the subject of religion? Let it be remembered that worldly mistakes may cease to harm us when we are done with the things of this world; but mistakes on the subject of religion may not cease to harm us while eternity itself may last. He who takes a poisonous drug into his stomach, may forfeit his natural life; but he who imbibes a moral poison, may forfeit the life which is eternal.

Principles, whether true or false, have a sort of semi-omnipotence to work out consequences of tremendous import. The sincerity of the parties have little or no influence to modify the consequences. Take a few cases for illustration. At the time of the Saviour's advent, the Jews believed that he was to be a temporal king, and wield a civil sceptre; that he was to throw off the

Roman power from over the Jews, and establish a great empire, extending over the earth, and that the Jews were to be his favorites and subordinate rulers. When the Saviour made his appearance in the world, because he did not correspond with their expectations, they rejected him; and not only rejected him, but imbrued their hands in his blood. When Pilate would have released him, they cried out, "Crucify him, crucify him; his blood be upon us and our children." How terrible have been the consequences of that mistake, though sincerely believed. For many long centuries that people have been blinded to the truth, and going unwashed and unsanctified to the judgment seat. For many long centuries they have been rejecting the only balm in Gilead, the only Physician there. Can figures express or words describe the woes, the terrible woes, which have resulted to the Jews? It was principle, false principle, that has produced all the religious persecutions of the past. It was principle, false principle, that originated and carried on the Crusades. It was false principle that produced the massacre of St. Bartholomew. It was principle, whether true or false need not here be decided, that actuated certain men when, in disguise, they boarded the vessels in Boston harbor and cast the tea overboard. The same principles, in their out-workings, produced the old revolutionary war, severed the colonies from British dominion, and wrought bloodshed, suffering, and crime and poverty in large amounts. It was principle, whether true or false, need not be here decided—certainly false on one side—that produced the recent war in this country, in which probably a million of lives were forfeited, millions of property destroyed, and poverty, suffering, and crime multiplied extensively. When such woes follow in the wake of false principles, have we not good reason to be afraid of them? Indeed, there is nothing so much to be dreaded as false principles. The more sincerely they are believed, the more they are to be dreaded, for the more honest and zealous are people apt to be in working them out. It is true, all errors are not equally injurious. There are some fundamental errors in reference to the scheme of salvation. The apostle speaks of "*damnable heresies*," by which are meant, we presume, that some errors damn the soul, and that

some other errors do not damn the soul. Paul's error led him to persecute the Church of Christ—"But (says he,) I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." This ignorance and unbelief so palliated his crime that his sin might be pardoned on repentance. This language seems to imply that had he done the same things knowingly; that is, knowing at the time that Jesus Christ was truly the divine Son of God, even repentance could not secure him pardon. There could have been no repentance in the case—only such remorse as Judas felt.

The apostle Paul speaks of some works which are of the nature of gold, silver, and precious stones, while other works are of the nature of wood, hay, and stubble. These works are the result of principles adopted: the gold, silver, and precious stones being the result of good principles; the wood, hay, and stubble the result of bad principles. These last are to be burned up, while the individual may be saved; yet he shall suffer loss, his works being burned up. Thus it appears conclusive that errors are to be dreaded, even when they do not damn the soul.

So it is in worldly matters. The farmer may make slight mistakes, which will only shorten his crops; but his mistakes may be so important as to bankrupt him. The physician may make such slight mistakes in administering to his patient as only to retard his recovery; but his mistakes may be so important as to destroy the life of his patient. And while all mistakes are injurious, yet they are so only in the degree of their importance. From all these considerations appears the folly of undervaluing truth, even when a truth may not be regarded as of fundamental importance.

We hear it sometimes said that one church is about as good as another, since in all there are good and bad people. We might as well say that truth is a matter of no importance. We might also just as well say that those principles which will make one's works of the nature of wood, hay, and stubble, are quite as good as those which will produce works of the nature of gold, silver, and precious stones.

If, then, all truth is important, it is equally important to witness for it all. It is one of the glories of the Presbyterian

Church, that she has always witnessed for all truth as she understands it. And while we do not claim to be infallible, nor to dictate to others what they shall believe, we choose to declare what we ourselves believe, and thus perform one great duty of the Church: to bear testimony to the truth, the creed being such formal testimony. We sometimes hear people speak disparagingly of what they call *sectarianism*, by which they mean, so far as we can understand their meaning, a disposition to exalt one's own church as being the best. If we did not regard our own Church as being the best, we certainly would not stay in it. The charge of sectarianism is evidently founded on the idea that there is no importance to be attached to those principles about which true churches differ; it implies that union is of more importance than truth, it implies that it is right to hide our light under a bushel, by ignoring any principle that is not absolutely necessary to salvation.

Has this age forgotten that God holds us responsible to him for what we believe? Do any imagine that this responsibility only attaches to those truths which are to be regarded as of fundamental importance? If so, this is a great mistake. Sir James Mackintosh and others have held that, belief being founded upon evidence, the mind cannot but believe that for which there is sufficient evidence before the mind. Sir James's illustration is this: that the successive steps by which a mathematical proposition is evinced being mastered, the mind is obliged to believe the proposition; that volition, as such, has nothing to do with the question whether it is or is not believed. We admit in part this process of reasoning. We admit that the evidence being perceived by the mind, the proposition must be received; and it is because this is so, that we are held bound to believe the truth. God has made the proof complete in favor of truth, and therefore holds us responsible for rejecting it. It depends upon voluntary action whether we shall perceive the evidence. Without voluntary action, the successive steps in the mathematical demonstration will not be perceived; but being perceived, no man may stultify himself in rejecting the proposition. God's works are perfect; in all cases the proof in favor of truth is complete. It

is as much so in regard to moral and spiritual truth, as it is in regard to mathematical science. Dr. Bledsoe was right in asserting that no falsehood can be proved by good and sufficient proof. If we do not perceive the demonstration in favor of moral truth, it is either because our moral perceptions are blunted by sin, or because we do not exercise sufficient candor and industry in searching for the truth. It is still true that the truth is complete, whether perceived or not. Without candor and diligence, we will not perceive that the mathematical demonstration is complete proof. Is not this precisely the ground taken by the Saviour in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus? "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." The rich man thought that if his five brethren had more evidence they would believe; but the reply of Abraham implied that if they would not be influenced by the evidence already within their reach, no additional amount of evidence would suffice to move them.

It is every one's business to find out the truth for himself. It is the farmer's business to find out the best modes of planting and cultivating the earth. If he is too careless or indifferent to do this, he must experience damage in proportion to the importance of his mistakes. It is the physician's business to find out the nature of drugs and of the different diseases, and to ascertain what sort of practice is best calculated to relieve disease. In neglect of this, he must expect to suffer damage and be the means of damage to others. So of any other affair. The subject of religion is not exempt from the operation of the same principles. It is sometimes alleged that if one is already satisfied with the correctness of his belief, he has no inducement to look into the proof any further. This does not relieve the matter. It has already been shown above that sincerity in believing falsehood does not turn falsehood into truth nor truth into falsehood, nor does it hinder the injurious consequences of falsehood.

The Saviour prayed for the unity of his people. That prayer does not require nor allow his people to undervalue truth. It does not require them to accept the idea that some truths revealed in his word are to be ignored as being of no importance. It is

likely that when that prayer is fully accomplished in the answer, that his people will all be able to "see eye to eye;" that there shall be none, not even any false principles, left to hurt or destroy in all God's holy mountain or Church.

When we pray for the unity of God's people, we are to understand that we are virtually praying for the refutation of error and the establishing of truth. This prayer, rightly understood, would lead us to be very candid and very industrious in searching after truth.

Dr. Thornwell has justly remarked: "Few are sensible of the close alliance which subsists between partiality to error and duplicity and fraud in conduct; they are shoots from the same stock, fruits from the same tree. He that lies to his own understanding, or what amounts to the same thing, does not deliberately propose to himself truth as the object of all his investigations, will not scruple at deceit with his neighbors. He that prevaricates in matters of opinion, is not to be trusted in matters of interest. The love of truth is honesty of reason; the love of virtue is honesty of heart; and so impossible is it to cultivate the moral affections at the expense of the understanding, that they who receive not the truth in the love of it, are threatened in the Scriptures with the most awful malediction that can befall a sinner in this sublunary state: an eclipse of the soul and a blight upon the heart, which are the certain precursors of the second death." The cry for union at this day seems to forget this solemn truth. It is to be apprehended that not a few at the present day, if judged by this rule of Dr. Thornwell, would be convicted of untrustworthiness in the ordinary interests of the world. If the proof in favor of truth is complete—made so by the great Creator—how is it that there is such a diversity of opinion on religious subjects? It must be because people are not sufficiently honest and industrious in seeking after truth. What shall we say of those who deliberately falsify history in order to maintain their favorite dogmas? Or of those who torture and twist Scripture declarations in order to find something by which to bolster up their preconceived opinions? It is a fearful thing thus to lie to one's own understanding. If

saved at all, their works of wood, hay, and stubble being burned up, they shall suffer great loss. We would desire to take these solemn lessons to our own heart, as well as suggest them for the consideration of others.

Union is not to be sought at the expense of truth. Says the apostle James, iii. 17: "But the wisdom that is from above is first *pure*, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy." It will be noticed that the first thing is *purity*; and we imagine that the *purity* is not merely to be confined to external conduct, but to opinions as well. *Partiality* to opinions not sufficiently proved, is one species of *hypocrisy*. It is as much hypocrisy to pray for the unity of God's people, and then be partial to opinions, because we are committed to them in our church, as it would be to pray for the success of missions, and then give not a cent of our abundance for the promotion of missions.

We believe the only true way to promote union, such union as will enable God's people to see eye to eye, such union as we think the Saviour prayed for, is for all parties to direct their labors to the promotion of unity of belief.

ARTICLE IV.

MODERN SCEPTICISM.

Modern Scepticism: A Journey through the Land of Doubt and Back Again. A Life Story. By JOSEPH BARKER. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1874. Pp. 448, 12mo.

On a first cursory examination of this book, we were inclined to think it calculated to raise more devils than it could lay. A second and more thorough perusal has very considerably modified this opinion. We are not prepared to accept the work as of wholesome character in all respects or in every part. It would be strange were Mr. Barker's present views to be found unmarked by any unhappy peculiarities, considering to what lengths his mind had been led astray. Fully persuaded, therefore, that our author is not a sound teacher now upon all points of Bible doctrine, we have nevertheless closed his book very profoundly impressed with the belief that to many persons it is calculated, with God's blessing, to prove useful in the highest degree. Our purpose is immediately to place our copy (sent by the publishers for critical notice) in the hands of a friend who is inquiring after the truth. He is an intelligent, candid, and thoughtful man, and to such this work can hardly fail of carrying conviction respecting the divine origin of Christianity.

In a very modest preface the author tells us the object of his book is to explain a portion of his own history, to check the spread of infidelity, and to promote the interests of Christianity. He proposes to follow up this volume with another, in which he will review the autobiography of John Stuart Mill; Strauss's last work, "The Old Faith and the New;" the Life of Robert Owen, and the Autobiography of his son, Robert Dale Owen. He will also notice the views of Fanny Wright, "the great female Atheist of her time;" those of Buckle, the "Atheistical historian;" and those of Matthew Arnold, in his "interesting book entitled Literature and Dogma." Much impressed with the spirit of kindness so constantly manifested by Mr. Barker towards those with whom he was associated formerly, and with the excellent sense con-

tained in the advice he gives to preachers of the truth to deal gently and respectfully with the opponents of Christianity who are oftentimes sincere and honest in their objections to it, we anticipate in the second volume which he promises, a most valuable contribution, from one who has so much ability and so much information, and such an experience, towards the defence of the truth against error.

The Rev. Joseph Barker was born and reared in England, and at sixteen became a member of the Methodist Society there, and at twenty-three a travelling preacher of great success. How came he to wander into doubt and unbelief? He answers the question by naming various general causes of scepticism and infidelity. *One* is vice; *another* is a constitutional tendency to doubt; the *third* is the real difficulties in the Christian scheme, which are calculated to try human faith; then, *fourthly*, religion is not, as a rule, presented to men in its loveliest and most winning or in its grandest and most overpowering form. The teachings and character of Christ present to us the perfection of wisdom and goodness, but the creeds, characters, and writings of many advocates of Christianity often give to us in perfection neither beauty nor worth nor credibility. Some teach a very small portion of Christianity, and what they teach is often taught amiss. Some doctrines they exaggerate, and others they maim. Some they caricature, distort, or pervert, and inventions of their own or foolish traditions from their fathers are by many added to the gospel. *Fifthly*, the divisions of the Church and the uncharitableness displayed occasion the stumbling of many. *Sixthly*, many advocates of Christianity, more zealous than wise, say more about the Bible than is true, and attempt to prove points not admitting of proof. Unsound arguments bring truth itself into discredit. Pious frauds have been a stumbling block to thousands. Albert Barnes says: "There is no class of men that are so liable to rely on weak and inconclusive reasonings as preachers of the gospel. Many a young man in a theological seminary is on the verge of infidelity from the nature of the reasoning employed by his instructor in defence of that which is true and which might be well defended." *Seventhly*, theological

students sometimes adopt erroneous principles, landing them in doubt and unbelief. Men of high repute for science are sometimes mad, fanatical infidels; and they manufacture principles, without regard to truth or purpose, to undermine the faith. Writers on science of one school tell you that in your study of nature you must be careful never to admit the doctrine of final causes; if you would be a true philosopher, you must shut out from your mind all idea of design or contrivance in nature; must look at what is, and never ask what it is for; must see adaptations, but not suppose any one planned them; must limit your observations to what is done, and never dream of any doer! A sillier notion can hardly be conceived, and the ignorance or impudence which could propound such an absurdity as a great philosophical principle, would be a mystery, did we not know how infidelity perverts the understanding, and puffing up men with a conceit of their own wisdom, transforms them into fools. And yet this monstrous folly, finding its way into books, papers, and reviews, and so into the minds of some Christian students, has made them abandon their confidence in the truth. Again, some adopt the principle that reason is our only guide. This sounds plausible, but in a sense is not true. In many cases reason is no guide at all. You cannot prove by what is generally called reason alone, that man is not a machine, governed by forces over which he has no control; and so you cannot prove by reason that there is any such thing as virtue or vice, liberty or moral responsibility. Able logicians, taking what is often called reason alone as their guide, have concluded that all is fixed, all fate, from eternity to eternity, and so they become Atheists. But on the contrary, many of our beliefs are instinctive; and reason, when it is reasonable enough to deserve the name, will advise you to cherish these as your life, in spite of all the infidel philosophy on the earth.

But our author has not yet named the chief cause of his own separation from the Church, and then of his estrangement from Christ, which he says was the influence of bad feeling towards a number of his brother ministers, which took possession of his mind. He explains how he came to be the subject of this bad

feeling. As a young minister he had two or three marked tendencies. One was a rationalizing tendency: he was anxious clearly to understand his professed beliefs, and to be able to make them plain to others. He did not fancy travelling in any theological fogs. He was sensible of certain mutual inconsistencies in the doctrines received from his teachers, and desired strongly to have them all harmonised. He likewise longed to harmonise his views with what he found in the teachings of Christ and his apostles, and these in turn with what he found in God's works in nature. To these ends he became, we should judge, a most diligent and thorough student of the Bible; and some of his methods are worthy of the highest commendation, and will serve to account for his complete and perfect mastery of every topic as he viewed it. He was a great reader also of many other books besides the Bible; many of them productions of leading theological writers. But he says that he had no judicious guide to direct his studies; also, that he read and studied quite too much, wearying both mind and body to the utmost, and brought on himself a kind of moral and mental dyspepsia. The result was an abandonment of many religious views which he had been educated to believe, and the reputation amongst his brethren of his becoming heretical, which was the first cause of his unhappy feelings towards them.

A second tendency which bred trouble for him was inherited from his father, a pious Methodist, with whom all religion was goodness. Our author's favorite theologian was Baxter. He had not much use for doctrine. He had learned to regard doctrinal preaching (notwithstanding his rationalizing tendency,) as Antinomianism. His aim, therefore, was to be a *practical* preacher, and he carried this so far that some of his brethren said he was a legalist, and did not preach Christ; and regarding him, therefore, as a dangerous man, they did what they could to bring his preaching and sentiments into suspicion, and prepare the way for his exclusion from the ministry.

He says he had a third tendency, which he calls a *reforming* tendency. He wanted to reform everybody and everything, and to do it thoroughly and without delay. Extravagance in dress

evil speaking against the brethren, neglect of domestic duties generally, too much wine drinking and beer drinking, and many other evils not often preached against, he delighted to handle in his sermons and lectures, and to do it severely. He becomes a very violent *teetotaler*. He is strong and loud in his condemnation of tobacco smoke and tobacco spittle. All these and many like things made many enemies for him, even amongst his brethren. At the same time he was unusually popular as a preacher, and got invitations to preach special sermons, which annoyed some who were over him in the Church. He comes under accusation of having Shakespeare and Byron in his library. He read and admired and praised a volume of sermons by the Unitarian Dr. Channing. At last charges are brought against him, and he is expelled the Conference. He thinks, in reviewing the case, that there were errors and failings on both sides. He was much tried by his brethren, and they, no doubt, very much tried by him. He lacked humility and he lacked meekness, and was too critical, too pugnacious, and too controversial. The result of his expulsion was that many professed friends forsook him, and he was abused and slandered by his enemies. But there was great excitement, and divisions about his case arose. His labors as a preacher and lecturer were incessant. He becomes pastor of a church in Newcastle, which had left the Methodist body on his account. Other churches and ministers joined this one. But after a while he gets into new difficulties and goes out from this connexion, and resolves to speak, write, and act more freely than ever. To support his family, he begins business as a printer. He enters on a career of wholesale and untrammelled investigation and discussion. In this state of mind he could hardly do justice to existing institutions. He is led into extreme views and positions. He gets into many and various public debates, and publishes sundry periodicals and multitudinous pamphlets. He has many friends amongst the Quakers, and lectures much on Peace. The Unitarians court him; Dr. Bateman and Dr. Bowring are very kind to him; he finds that their idea has many phases. Some he finds to be admirers of Priestley, some of Carpenter, some of Channing, and others, again, of Theodore Parker; al-

ways and everywhere he discovers a tendency amongst them downwards from the Christian to the infidel level. He begins with admiring Channing, though disliking something said by him about Christ and the atonement, and viewing Theodore Parker's views with horror. "Yet time and intercourse with the more advanced Unitarians brought me in a few years to look on Parker as my model man." "When I first heard a Unitarian say, 'Supernaturalism is superstition,' I gave him to understand that I did not feel easy in his company. 'You are right,' said Dr. Bateman; 'pay no regard to such extreme views; preach your own old-fashioned practical doctrines.' This made me feel more at ease." Yet he afterwards discovered that this Dr. Bateman was himself, at the time, an anti-supernaturalist, who saw that Barker required to be dealt with carefully, not to be hurried nor argued into extreme views, but led gently and unconsciously along to them. And so gradually, and, as it were, imperceptibly to himself, he slid down to Deism and Atheism.

Then he enters politics, and advocates extreme views. He becomes a wild Republican and is arrested, but on his trial the Government is defeated, and he is elected to Parliament. But his health breaks down, and he moves to America and settles for a time on a farm in the Northwest. There he falls in with the Abolitionists and Women's Rights men and women. Here let us pause in our summary of Mr. Barker's interesting story, to introduce a few paragraphs descriptive of these scenes:

"Before we had got ourselves fairly settled, we began to be visited by a number of friends. And many of those friends were wilder and more extravagant in their views on religion and politics than myself; and instead of helping me to quiet reflection, did much to render such a thing impossible. They were mostly Garrisonian Abolitionists, with whom I had become acquainted while in England, or through the medium of anti-slavery publications. Many of them had an experience a good deal like my own. They had been members and ministers of churches, and had got into trouble in consequence of their reforming tendencies, and had at length been cast out or obliged to withdraw. They had waged a long and bitter war against the churches and ministers of their land, and had become sceptics and unbelievers of a somewhat extravagant kind. Henry C. Wright was an Atheist; so were some others of the party. My own descent to scepticism was attributable in some measure

to my intercourse with them, and to a perusal of their works while in England. The first deadly blow was struck at my belief in the supernatural inspiration of the Scriptures, by Henry C. Wright. It was in conversation with him, too, that my belief in the necessity of church organisation was undermined, and that the way was smoothed to that utter lawlessness which so naturally tends to infidelity and all ungodliness. My respect for the talents of the Abolitionists, and the interest I felt in the cause to which they had devoted their lives, and the sympathy arising from the similar way in which we had all been treated by the churches and priesthoods with which we had come in contact, disposed me first to regard their sceptical views with favor, and then to accept them as true.

“And now they welcomed me to their native land, and embraced the earliest opportunity of visiting me in my new home. And all that passed between us tended to confirm us in our common unbelief. I afterwards found that in some of the Abolitionists, in nearly all, I fear, anti-Christian views had led to immoral habits, which rendered their antipathy to Christianity all the more bitter. In almost all of them, infidelity had produced a lawlessness of speculation on moral matters, which could hardly fail to produce in the end, if it had not already produced, great licentiousness of life.

“I had no sooner got things comfortably fixed at home, than I received an invitation from the American Anti-Slavery Society to attend their annual meeting, which was to be held in Rochester, N. Y. I went, and there I met with S. S. Foster, Abby Kelly Foster, Parker Pillsbury, C. L. Remond, Henry C. Wright, Wendell Phillips, W. L. Garrison, Lucy Stone, Lucretia and Lydia Mott, and a number of other leading Abolitionists. Here, too, I met with Frederick Douglas, the celebrated fugitive slave, who had settled in Rochester and was publishing his paper there. Some of the Anti-Slavery leaders I had seen before in England, and had had the pleasure of having them as my guests and of enjoying their conversation. Henry C. Wright, W. L. Garrison, Frederick Douglas, and C. L. Remond, were old acquaintances. The rest I only knew by report; but I had read the story of their labors and sufferings in behalf of the negro slave, and had longed for years to make their acquaintance. They were, in my estimation, among the best and bravest of their race. I had read of them a thousand times with the greatest interest, and a thousand times I had wished for the honor of co-operating with them in their generous labors. And now I was in their midst on American soil! And all seemed glad to make my acquaintance, and eager to testify their regard for me, and to welcome me to a share in their benevolent labors. I was soon at home with them all, for they were a free and hearty people. I attended both their public and their private meetings. The anniversary lasted several days, and the time was one continued festival. There were people from almost every part of the

country, and the house of every Anti-Slavery person in the city was placed at the service of the visitors. They were as one family, and had all things in common. The public meetings were largely attended, and the audiences seemed favorably impressed. In the intervals I visited the Falls on the Genesee River. More beautiful and enchanting scenes I never beheld. In all but terrible grandeur they equal, if they do not surpass, the Falls of Niagara.

“ And there was an infinite abundance of strange and exciting conversation in many of the circles, not only on Slavery, but on the Bible and Religion, on the Church and the Priesthood, and on Woman's Rights, and the Bloomer Costume, and Marriage Laws, and Free Love, and Education, and Solomon's Rod, and Non-resistance, and Human Government, and Communism, and Individualism, and Unitarianism, and Theodore Parkerism, and Spiritualism, and Vegetarianism, and Teetotalism, and Deism, and Atheism, and Clairvoyance, and Andrew Jackson Davis, and the American Congress, and Quakerism, and William Henry Channing and his journey to England, and Free Soil, and the Public Lands, and the Common Right to the Soil, and Rent, and Interest, and Capital, and Labor, and Fourierism, and Congeniality of Spirit, and Natural Affinities, and Domestic Difficulties, and—the Good Time Coming. All were full of reform, and most were wild and fanatical. Some regarded marriage as unnatural, and pleaded for Free Love as the law of life. Some were for Communism, but differed as to the form which it ought to assume. One contended that all should be perfectly free—that each should be a law unto himself, and should work, and rest, and eat, and drink, as his own free spirit should prompt him. Another said that the principle had been tried and had failed—that some were anxious to do all the eating and sleeping and loving, and left others to do all the working. Joseph Treat was there, advocating Atheism, and defending the right of men and women, married or single, to give free play to native tendencies and sexual affinities. But Treat was indifferently clad, and not well washed, and he was evidently no great favorite. . . Most were in favor of non-resistance and full individual freedom. To acknowledge the right of human government and human laws was treason to humanity; man is a law to himself; he is his own governor. The Protestant principle of the right of private judgment and liberty of conscience strikes at the root of all the governments on earth. Each one's nature is his own sole law. The one principle of duty is for every one to do that which is right in his own eyes. The principle of the Anti-Slavery Society means that, and neither more nor less. And the Anti-Slavery Society will, after emancipating the negro, destroy all the governments, remodel all the laws and institutions, and emancipate all the nations of the earth. Of course the laws of marriage will fall to the ground. Why not? They originated only with men—with men who lived in darker

times, and who were less developed than we. It would be strange if children could make laws fit to govern men. And with the laws of marriage will go the laws of property in land. Land was common property at first, and what right had any one to make it private? The first man who appropriated land was a thief. And those who inherited it from him were receivers of stolen goods. And the title that was vicious at first could never be made valid by time. The continuance of a wrong can never make it right. Allow that men have a right to the land in consequence of long possession and inheritance, and you must allow that men may have a right to their slaves. The right to land and the right to slaves are not so different as some would suppose. What is man's right to his own body worth, if he is deprived of his right to the land? Man lives from the land; and unless he has a right to the land, he can have no right to life. A right to life implies a right to the land. Men live *on* the land as well as *from* it: and if they have not a right to the land, they can have no right to live. And man has a right to perfect freedom. Life without freedom is slavery; and slavery is the extinction of all rights, the right to life included. And woman has equal rights with man. And children have equal rights with either. The idea that human beings have no rights till they are twenty-one is monstrous. What mighty change is it that takes place the moment a person reaches the age of twenty-one, that he should be a slave the moment before and a free man the moment after? No change at all takes place. The rights of a human being are the gift of nature, and not the gift of the law. Who authorised men to make laws for one another? In making men different from each other, nature has made it impossible for one man to legislate wisely for another. The majority have a right to rule themselves, but they have no right to rule the minority. All rights are the rights of individuals, and the rights of individuals composing a minority are the same as the rights of individuals composing a majority. A man may elect a representative, but he cannot be bound by a representative elected by others. Children should be educated, not by force or authority, but by attraction. The assumption of authority by a parent over a child is usurpation; the use of authority over a child is tyranny. The individuality of a child is its life, and life is sacred. To destroy individuality is murder. We have no right to take nature's place, and make a human being something different from what she has formed him. Solomon's rod and Paul's authority are alike immoral." (Pp. 257-262.)

After these things Mr. Barker has a public discussion with the celebrated Dr. McCalla in Philadelphia, and then an eight nights' debate with Dr. Berg, and other debates in Ohio, Indiana, England, and Scotland. Afterwards he lectures on the Bible in Ohio, and a riot ensues. He is forced to move, and settles sub-

sequently amongst Liberals and Come-outers. But fresh troubles assail him, and he has to make another forced move. Again he settles, but it is in the wilds of Nebraska, amongst Indians, wolves, and rattlesnakes.

It is in the midst of these untoward circumstances there begins to be wrought a favorable change in the feelings of our author. There at length, strange to say, he begins to experience the benefits of quiet and to find the advantage of reflection. He gets a view now of the horrors of atheism—how it destroys the value of life, deceives you, mocks you, makes you intolerably miserable. Mr. Barker finds that whilst prosperity is not good for much without God and religion, adversity, sickness, pain, loss, bereavement, are absolutely unbearable. He has many strange adventures in the wilderness, encounters some terrible dangers, but experiences not a few wonderful deliverances. He has solemn thoughts and feelings in the boundless desert. Solitude and silence preach to him. His religious feelings revive. He tells us that when he began his career of religious exploration he had expected to find a region where all should be light, without any more harassing or perplexing mysteries; but that when he got outside of the religion of Christ, more difficulties than ever, and difficulties of a more appalling character, made their appearance. All the great difficulties of Christian theology he found had ugly likenesses in infidel philosophy. Instead of a region of light, he had got into one of clouds and darkness; and the further he wandered the blacker became the clouds and the thicker the darkness. Again, he was frequently tried with the characters of unbelievers. “Often when I became acquainted with the men who invited me to lecture I was ashamed to be seen standing with them in the streets, and I shrank from the touch of their hand as from pollution. And many a time when I had associated with persons for a length of time, thinking them above suspicion, I was amazed to find at length that they looked on vicious indulgence as harmless, and were astonished that any man who had lost his faith in Christianity should have scruples with regard to fornication or adultery.” Then again, the influence of his wife, who never ceased to pray for him, was a

great blessing to him, as was that of his good old father and his godly old mother, who died while he was in Nebraska. His children also grew up believers to a great extent under the shadow of his unbelief—his two sons especially, both Christians, greatly helped to win their father back to God. He returns to England, and while there he begins to restudy the Bible. And the sight of Jesus which is there revealed to him exerts upon him also its usual transforming power. The sight of the Gorgon in Medusa's shield was said to turn all beholders into stone, but a view of the character of the adorable Redeemer made flesh of the stone that was in Mr. Barker's heart. Preaching the funeral sermon of an old Christian friend who had never given him up, before an immense congregation, he publicly declares himself again a believer in the Saviour. And great is the joy of multitudes in all the country round who had known him as he had been of old, and as he had wandered on the dark mountains of unbelief.

In one of his concluding chapters Mr. Barker gives some account of parties who contributed towards his return to Christ. He says, "After I fell into doubt and unbelief, the Church and the ministry generally appeared to look on me as irretrievably lost." Many spoke against him and wrote against him, but did not approach him in gentleness and love to try and win him back. But others took a more Christian course. One is described, a minister who never gave him offensive names nor charged him with unworthy motives, nor treated him with affected contempt. Regarding him simply as an erring brother, he strove with genuine Christian affection to bring the wanderer back to what he regarded as the truth. Particularly does he mention the Rev. Mr. Walker, a minister of Mansfield, Ohio, author of "*The Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation.*" That admirable book had been useful to Mr. Barker, and its author treated him with very especial kindness, which, though not known to Mr. Walker at the time, was producing good effects on the heart of our friend. So too he refers gratefully to the influence of the kind and respectful behavior towards him of the Rev. Andrew Loose, of Winchester, Indiana, and still more of that of Col. Shaw, of Bourtree Park, Ayr, Scotland, both of whom met Mr.

Barker in public discussions, and impressed him advantageously by their Christian courtesy.

And in his last chapter Mr. Barker tells us some of the lessons his fall has taught him. One is that there are devices of the wicked one of which you are not yet aware. Man is neither great nor wise nor strong, and there are terrible possibilities in his nature when left to itself. It has infinite weakness with regard to what is good, and fearful capacities with regard to what is bad.

“I indulged myself in mad experiments of unlimited freedom till appalled by the melancholy results. I did not become *all* that unchecked license could make me, but I became so different a creature from what I had anticipated, that I saw the madness of my resolution, and recoiled. I came to the verge of all evil. God had mercy on me and held me back, in spite of my impiety, or I should have become a monster of iniquity. Man was not made for unlimited liberty. He was made for subjection to the divine will and for obedience to God's law. He was made for fellowship with the good among his fellow-men, and for submission to Christian discipline. He can become good and great and happy only by faith in God and Christ, by self-denial, by good society, by careful moral and religious culture, and by constant prayer and dependence on God. I now no longer say ‘I will be a *man*,’ but ‘Let me be a Christian.’ I no longer say ‘I will be all that my nature working unchecked will make me,’ but ‘Let me be all that Christ and Christianity can make me.’ Let me check all tempers at variance with the mind of Christ, and all tendencies at variance with his precepts. Let the mouth of that fearful abyss which lies deep down in my nature, be closed, and let the infernal fires that smoulder there be utterly smothered, and let the love of God and the love of man reign in me, producing a life of Christ-like piety and beneficence. Let all I have and am be a sacrifice to God in Christ, and used in the cause of truth and righteousness for the welfare of mankind.”

Let us close by quoting our author's beautiful picture of Christ and Christianity :

“1. He is, first, holy, harmless, undefiled ; a lamb without blemish and without spot. This is the lowest trait in his character. Yet it is a great thing for any one to remain innocent in a world like this, with a nature like ours.

“2. But he was, second, an example of the highest moral and spiritual excellence. He was devout, pious, resigned towards his heavenly Father. He was full of benevolence towards men. He did good. The

happiness of mankind was the end and doing good the business of his life. He had no other object. He paid no regard to wealth, to power, to pleasure, or to fame. He was so fixed and single in his aim, that there is no room for mistake. To do good, to bless mankind, was his meat and drink.

"3. And he did good to men's bodies as well as to their souls. While he taught the ignorant, and reformed the bad, and comforted the penitent, he healed the sick, gave sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, bread to the hungry, and life to the dead.

"4. He enjoined the same way of life on his disciples. 'Freely ye have received,' said he; 'freely give.'

"5. While he lived and labored for the good of all, he paid special attention to the poor.

"6. Yet he never flattered the poor, nor pandered to their prejudices or passions. He never taught them to envy the rich, or revile the great, or to throw the blame of their sorrows on others.

"7. While kind to the poor, he was just and respectful to the rich. His conduct to Nicodemus and Zaccheus, to the young man that came to question him about the way to heaven, and to the Roman centurion, was courteous and comely to the last degree. He was faithful, but not harsh.

"8. He was good to all classes. He loved the Jews, yet he was just and kind to the Samaritans, to the Syrophenician woman, and to the Roman soldier.

"9. He was especially kind to women, even to the fallen ones. He showed none of that indifference or disdain for woman that the proud barbarian exhibits, or of that heartless contempt which the vicious sensualist manifests. He rose alike above the selfish passions and inveterate prejudices of his age, and conferred on the injured sex the blessings of freedom and dignity, of purity and blessedness.

"10. He showed the tenderest regard to children. 'He took them in his arms and blessed them,' and said, 'Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.'

"11. He was kind to the outcast. He was a friend of publicans and sinners. He went among the lowest, the most neglected, the most despised, the most hated and dreaded of mankind, and labored for their salvation. The parables of the lost sheep and of the prodigal son, speak volumes in his praise.

"12. He was always gentle, tolerant, and forgiving. He refused to bring down fire from heaven on the villagers that had slighted him, saying, 'The Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.' He commended the virtue of Samaritan heretics. He has nothing harsh even for the infidel Sadducee. He complies with the unreasonable wishes of the sceptical Thomas. He pardons Peter. He is

severe with the Scribes and Pharisees only who made void the law of righteousness by their traditions, and took the key of knowledge and used it not to open but to keep shut the door of the kingdom of heaven.

“13. As a reformer, he went to the root of social and political evils, and sought the reform of laws, institutions, and governments, by laboring for the instruction and renovation of individuals.

“14. He was patient as well as disinterested. He was willing to sow and let others reap; to labor and let others enjoy the fruit of his labors.

“15. He formed a Church, employing the social instincts and affections of his followers as a means of perpetuating and extending his beneficent influence in the world.

“16. He checked the impertinences and silenced the vanity of captious cavillers.

“17. He carried the truth into markets and seaports, as well as taught it in the temple and in the synagogues.

“18. He had the eloquence of silence as well as of speech.

“19. He could suffer as well as labor. He bore reproach and insolence, and at last laid down his life for mankind.

“20. He could make allowances even for his murderers. When they mocked him in his dying agonies, he could say, ‘Father, forgive them; they know not what they do.’

“II. He excelled as a teacher.

“1. He was very practical; seeking always to bring men to be merciful as their Father in heaven is merciful.

“2. He was very plain, using the simplest forms of speech, and the most natural and touching illustrations.

“3. He presented truth and duty in his parables in the most impressive forms.

“4. His doctrines about God and providence; about duty and immortality; about right worship and the proper employment of the Sabbath; about true greatness and the forgiveness of injuries; about gentleness and toleration; about meekness and humility; about purity and sincerity, as well as on a great variety of other subjects, were the perfection of true philosophy. His parable of the talents, his remarks on the widow and her two mites, and on the woman and the box of ointment, showing that nothing is required of us beyond our powers and opportunities, are striking, instructive, and impressive in the highest degree.

“5. He made it the duty of all whom he taught to instruct others. His words, ‘Freely ye have received, freely give,’ and the sentence, ‘It is more blessed to give than to receive,’ are among the divinest oracles ever heard on earth.

“6. He illustrated and enforced all his lessons by a consistent example. He practised what he taught.

“7. And he commanded his disciples to do the same. ‘Let your light

so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.'

"8. There can be nothing juster or kinder than his great rule, 'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them.'

"9. His doctrine that God will treat men as they treat each other, is most striking and important. 'Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.' 'With what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.' 'If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will forgive you your trespasses; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you your trespasses.'

"10. His remarks on riches and poverty, on honor and reproach, on suffering and glory, though regarded by some with shyness and distrust, contain a world of important truth.

"11. His lessons on spiritual or religious freedom, on self-denial, on the true mark of discipleship, on the great judgment, on the future of Christianity, and on the heavenly felicity, are all remarkable for their wisdom and for their purifying and ennobling tendency.

"But it would require volumes to do Christ and his doctrines justice. And I feel as if I were wronging the Saviour to speak of his worth and doctrine, when I have neither time or space duly to set forth their transcendent excellency. Every peculiar trait in his character that I have named, deserves a treatise to present it in all its importance and glory; and I, alas, can give but a sentence or two to each.

"But Christ has our devoutest love and gratitude and our profoundest reverence. And the more we contemplate him, the more constrained we feel to regard him, not only as the perfection of all human excellence, but as the revelation and incarnation of the eternal God. And we feel it a great honor and unspeakable privilege to be permitted to bear his name, to belong to his party, and to labor in his cause. We are indebted to him for every thing that gives value to our existence, and we give him, in return, with cheerfulness and gladness, our heart, our life, our all.

"Ah! why did I so late thee know;

Thee, lovelier than the sons of men?

Ah! why did I no sooner go

To thee, the only ease in pain?

Ashamed, I sigh and inly mourn

That I so late to thee did turn.'—(Pp. 433-437.)

ARTICLE V.

THE BALTIMORE CONFERENCE.

In May, 1874, the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in the United States and of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America appointed committees to confer with each other with reference to opening a friendly correspondence between the two bodies. These committees were composed as follows, viz. : On the part of the former, commonly known as the Southern General Assembly : Rev. William Brown, D. D., Rev. R. P. Farris, D. D., Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D., Hon. J. A. Inglis, and Hon. B. M. Estes. On the part of the latter, commonly known as the Northern General Assembly : Rev. Samuel J. Niccolls, D. D., Rev. Henry J. Van Dyke, D. D., Rev. Henry Darling, D. D., Rev. Thos. H. Skinner, D. D., Rev. Ebenezer Erskine, D. D., Rev. Edwin F. Hatfield, D. D., and Messrs. Benjamin Whitely, James K. Morehead, Joseph W. Edwards, and Samuel M. Breckinridge.

The Conference was held in the city of Baltimore, beginning its sessions on the 7th and terminating them on the 15th of January, 1875. Four members of the Northern Committee were absent from unavoidable hindrances, viz., Dr. Hatfield and Messrs. Whitely, Morehead, and Edwards. Our entire Committee was present.

It was an occasion of grave importance, and elicited very general and profound interest. The eyes of the whole Presbyterian Church, North and South, were turned to this meeting with lively expectancy, not unmingled with deep solicitude concerning the result. It was plainly seen that the attitude of the two bodies towards each other presented an unseemly aspect in the view of the world. Many looked upon it as an obstinate and bitter church quarrel, or still worse, as a wicked persistence in an old political quarrel, and declared that it evinced a sad want of Christian charity. We suppose that a large proportion of persons outside of the two Churches regarded the points of difference which kept the two bodies asunder, as either of trivial

importance or involving mere feeling. They saw no great principle, no serious question of duty or even of ecclesiastical law, nothing affecting the purity or honor of the Church, the integrity of the truth, or the ministerial or Christian character of the parties. It was a common remark, that it was a needless and wicked dispute over dead issues, about proceedings or mere words that have no bearing upon the present or the future; that it was the product of unreasonable prejudices, and was keeping up an old grudge that ought long since to have been buried in the bottomless waters of oblivion.

Besides, a wonderful spirit of union had been extending itself amongst the Churches of America and Great Britain. Bodies of Christians, which had long been kept apart, were laying aside their differences and coming together in organic union, or at least drawing nearer to each other in some kind of alliance. This spirit had become *enthusiastic*, and was tending to the entire disregard of all history, all doctrine, all the safeguards of truth. It was considered enough that a spirit of love, or at least of fraternity, seemed to dictate these movements, and that the forces of Israel were putting on the semblance of Christian unity! And it was regarded as a plain sign that the Spirit of God was present, and that the smile of heaven's approval was upon them, when men of different communions ignored their differences, and with flowing tears and joyful songs shook hands over all the buried testimonies of the past. The public opinion was, that the mediatorial prayer of Jesus was being literally answered, that all his people were becoming *one*, as never before, and that this was at least the early dawn of the millennium. When the right hand of fellowship had become so visible, was seen stretched out in every direction to every church claiming the Christian name, and was now even reaching over the "bloody chasm" to grasp the hand of our little feeble Church, for years condemned, outcast and outlawed, but still living and working in this subjugated and despised Southern land, it seemed to many the very consummation of Christian unity, the climax of Christian charity, and a sublime exhibition of magnanimity. When, therefore, we declined to give a hasty and unconditional response to this pro-

posal, many professed to be shocked by what they regarded our destitution of this now widely extended feeling of unity and love; and many accused us of cherishing a bitter and unrelenting hostility to the Northern Church. This popular spirit of unity became at once intolerant. This boasted charity borrowed the language of vituperation. The fraternal hand wrote our sentence of ostracism from the Christian world.

It is true we pointed to the records of the past, both theirs and ours, and showed that real and serious hindrances stood in the way of any genuine and proper fraternal intercourse, which they alone could remove, and hence that the blame did not rest with us. At the very beginning of our separate existence as a Church, in the address of our General Assembly, in 1861, to "all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the earth," including, of course, the Northern Presbyterian Church, we said, "We greet you in the ties of Christian brotherhood. We desire to cultivate peace and charity with all our fellow-Christians throughout the world. We invite to ecclesiastical communion all who maintain our principles of faith and order."

Again, at the close of the war, and after most of the hostile proceedings and offensive deliverances of the Northern General Assembly, in our Pastoral Letter of 1865, we declared, "concerning other Churches, in the most explicit manner, that, in the true idea of 'the communion of the saints,' we would willingly hold fellowship with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; and especially do we signify to all bodies, ministers, and people of the Presbyterian Church, struggling to maintain the true principles of the same time-honored Confession, our desire to establish the most intimate relations with them, which may be found mutually edifying and for the glory of God."

Then, in 1870, in answer to the overtures from the Northern General Assembly for establishing cordial fraternal relations with us, we distinctly affirmed that "no act of aggression or hostility had been or was then assumed by us toward the Northern Church;" admitted that "no grievances experienced by us, however real, would justify us in acts of aggression or a spirit of malice or retaliation against any branch of Christ's visible king-

dom;" and said further, "We are prepared, therefore, in advance of all discussion, to exercise towards the General Assembly North and the churches represented therein, such amity as fidelity to our principles could, under any possible circumstances, permit." And then, "in a spirit of conciliation and kindness," as we expressed it, we appointed a Committee of Conference to meet a similar one from that body, with instructions, however, "that the difficulties which lie in the way of cordial correspondence between the two bodies must be distinctly met and removed." This conference was declined by the Northern Assembly. Again, in 1874, when the committee to the recent Conference was appointed, our General Assembly said, referring to the proposal to have this Conference: "To any proposal of this kind for removing causes of alienation among churches, and looking toward more fraternal relations, the Southern Presbyterian Church is now, and has been at all times, prepared to give a sincere and hearty response in the affirmative." In referring to these former expressions our Assembly said, and we affirm, *truthfully*, "These and similar declarations, made in the most solemn periods of the history of our Church, and published to the world, were intended to be a clear and abiding avowal of the spirit of our successive Assemblies, and of our people represented in them."

When, therefore, we see not merely exceptional persons, but our Church in general, charged with an unrelenting, unforgiving, unbrotherly spirit, we have no hesitation in pronouncing the charge unfounded. We freely admit that we have no sympathy with that indiscriminate, latitudinarian charity, which, for the sake of the one end of outward unity and seeming fraternity, is willing to sacrifice the most sacred principles and the honor of the kingdom of Jesus Christ. But we do not admit that our Church, as a body of Christians, or in their delegated Assemblies, is at all open to the charge of peculiar uncharitableness. We claim that, like other Christians and Christian Churches, we are spiritually and sincerely one with the whole body of Christ; that we do love all the brethren; that we try to live in charity with them all; that we freely forgive any trespasses they have committed against us, and that it is our honest desire to keep the

unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. We solemnly aver that we deplore all needless divisions of Christians, all alienation and all appearances which mar the influence of the Church of him who is the God of peace and love. We lament the events which compelled our Church to separate from the Northern Assembly, and the continued existence of those causes which perpetuate that separation. Nothing would give us higher gratification than the entire removal of those causes, so that there should be not only cordial fraternal intercourse, but the establishment of the closest ties which ever bind Christians together. We are fully aware that this profession of ours will not be believed by those whose ignorance of us has been confirmed by misrepresentation, and especially by those who hate us because they are conscious of having deeply wronged us. We are constrained, nevertheless, to record and proclaim to the world this testimony to the spirit of our Church.

Such being our feeling, it was our desire and prayer that the recent Conference might be the occasion for the removal of all hindrances to fraternal correspondence; and hence it was with renewed sadness that our people received the tidings that the Conference had failed to reach that result. That very many who sincerely shared this feeling were not disappointed, is due to the fact that they had never seen on the part of the Northern Assembly a disposition to remove those grievances which have compelled us to decline their proffered hand.

It is very proper to institute the inquiry why the Conference failed to reach the proposed result. Both parties have a responsibility in the matter before God and his Church, and it ought to be determined where the blame should lie.

Some have tried to settle this question in a summary manner, without considering the merits of the case, by ascribing the failure to the method of communication between the committees: that it was in writing, and not by conversation, face to face. On this we remark: 1. Though this method was proposed by our committee, it was unanimously approved by the other. 2. The authority and responsibility of each committee was not several, but joint. No one member could speak for the whole committee, and

much less for his Assembly. Each committee was empowered to act together, and could do this only after deliberation and comparison of views, which could not be had in an open and promiscuous conversation between all the parties. An unconsidered remark by one member, or an expression of sentiment peculiar to himself, might have seriously complicated the whole question, or improperly committed or embarrassed the other members of his own committee. 3. The matters under consideration were not only of grave importance, but involved a great many points directly or indirectly, and much of the discussion turned, as usual in such matters, upon words and expressions. There had been much misunderstanding and diverse constructions. Hence, what each party said or proposed, needed to be clearly and definitely expressed. In no other way could they expect to avoid misunderstanding. 4. A written correspondence secured an undisputed record of all that passed. It was impossible to give an equally trustworthy report of an oral conversation. The value of this method has already been demonstrated as a means of correcting the many one-sided and false representations that have been published of this Conference.

It seems to have been expected that these committees would come together in an informal way, give full vent to their kindly feelings as brethren, avoid all discussion, and, amid the amenities and pleasantries of social chat, in the exuberance of good feeling, agree to disregard all the acts and deliverances of the past, to proceed as if there were no permanent record of them, and then report to the Assemblies that the whole matter was settled, and the way open for fraternal correspondence. We think both committees showed sound wisdom in declining to do any such heedless thing. They distinctly provided that they should unite together as Christian brethren in social worship, and that there should be oral conferences whenever desired by either side.

In view of the antecedents, it was passing strange that the Northern committee, at the very beginning of the Conference, before anything had been done or a single point of difference inquired into, proposed that our committee should join with them in recommending to their respective Assemblies the interchange of

delegates, thus recognising each other as already corresponding bodies, and gravely declared that they did not know of any reasons why this should not be done. We say this was strange, because so entirely inconsistent with all the facts connected with this Conference—yea, with the fact that there was such a Conference. It quietly ignored all the hindrances which had for years prevented the intercourse now sought. They knew perfectly well that there were wide differences between the two bodies, and that in express terms our Committee was appointed to confer with them concerning the removal of the causes which have heretofore prevented fraternal correspondence. This proposal, therefore, was a virtual begging of the whole question, by assuming that such causes had never existed, or were now already removed; or else it contemplated putting the parties in an attitude most favorable to such removal. That they did not intend the latter is plain from the fact that they express the hope that this step would “speedily lead to an equitable adjustment of matters of equal interest to both bodies” (not, however, those matters which we urge as hindering the proposed correspondence, but) “in the mission work of the Churches, both at home and abroad, and to coöperation in the great work of evangelisation.” Then, they did not propose this interchange of delegates as a means of removing grievances. Such an object was not to be sought before nor after the opening of the correspondence. It was to be left out altogether. If they had in view the agency of this correspondence as a means of removing grievances, it will naturally occur to any one to ask, What if this means fail? Must this intercourse be suspended?

If, however, the proposal was intended merely to open the way for our Committee to bring forward at once a full and frank statement of our alleged grievances, it found them ready to make just such a statement. In doing this they were careful to adhere strictly to the official records of the Northern General Assembly. They represented these grievances to consist, *first, of unjust and injurious accusations; and second, of the course pursued by the Northern Assembly in regard to church property.*

Under the first, they specified, 1. “The charge that the South-

ern General Assembly was organised in the interest of, and to subserve the ends of, the Confederate Government." 2. The charge "that the Southern Church had changed its ground on the subject of slavery, so as to hold opinions which were *heretical and blasphemous*." 3. The charge *that the Southern Church was guilty of schism*, viz., that our separation from the Northern Church was "unwarranted, schismatical, and unconstitutional;" that it was a "wicked schism;" they called us "the schismatical sect;" they spoke of "the wicked conduct of the authors of that schism," and declared that they, as a Church, "have no alternative, consistent with safety, with self-respect, with the righteousness of its own past conduct, with fidelity to divine truth or Christian duty, or with obedience to God, but to accept the renunciation of these deluded men, to testify against their sinful acts, and to keep her skirts clear of their miserable doings." It is wholly unnecessary to repeat, as it would be impossible to strengthen, the exceedingly luminous, conclusive, and triumphant vindication of our Church, given by our Committee. It covers the whole ground, proves these accusations to have been made by quoting from the Minutes of the Northern Assembly, and then shows how completely without foundation they all are.

Our Committee recited various political proceedings of the Northern Assembly; not with a view to demand their repeal as a condition of restored intercourse—but inasmuch as many things contained in them were aimed at our people, and as they involved fundamental departures from our common standards, they constitute a weighty grievance to us, and a serious hindrance to fraternal intercourse. Still our Committee did not interpose this part of their proceedings, as has been incorrectly stated. They distinctly disclaimed asking the rescinding or repeal of these acts, considering that they belong more properly to the question of organic union. They simply proposed that these *dishonoring accusations*, so sweeping and severe, so injurious to our good name, and so unjust, be, in some way, *removed*. They did not assume to prescribe the method or terms of their removal, but proposed only that they lift the reproach which they had cast upon us as a

Church, by some expression which directly and fairly covers the case.

Apart from the question of church property, this became the *one distinct point* on which the whole Conference turned. Our Committee carefully separated it from all side issues, and threw out all matters, however important in other respects, which were not directly involved in the removal of these accusations. To indicate their meaning so clearly that it could not be misunderstood, they put it in this form: "If your Assembly could see its way clear to say, in a few plain words, to this effect, 'that these obnoxious things were said and done in times of great excitement; that they are to be regretted; and that now, in a calm review, the imputations cast upon the Southern Church are disapproved'—that would end the difficulty at once." The Northern Committee distinctly refused to propose to their Assembly any such acknowledgment or declaration. Here is the whole matter in a nutshell. And we call the attention of our people, and that of the Northern Presbyterian Church, and of the whole Christian public, to this fact—that we made this the one condition (apart from the question of church property) of fraternal intercourse, and it was refused.

The Northern Committee gave as the reason why they could not make this recommendation, that "we are still of the decided conviction that its actions for the last four years, so fully recited to you in our last communication, constitute a sufficient ground for fraternal correspondence." Now observe that they did not pretend that those actions of their General Assembly, in form, intent, or spirit, express any disapproval of those accusations, and certainly no regret. They could not say this. Their Assembly had too fully reaffirmed their whole proceedings on these subjects, having, in 1866, declared that, in regard to these proceedings, "they had nothing to change, nothing to explain, nothing to modify, nothing to take back, nothing to amend in any way, shape, or form whatever." This language is strong and comprehensive enough to require an explicit statement of any exceptions, had any been intended, with reference to *accusations*. This, it is true, was eight years

ago. But one member of this Committee, Dr. Van Dyke, as lately as 1870, frankly told our General Assembly that they did not and could not say, with reference to any of these proceedings, "*Peccavi.*" And in no part of this correspondence do they say that their Assembly has ever expressed even the slightest disapproval of these accusations.

To what other conclusion, then, could we come, than that the Northern Assembly, if fairly represented by their Committee, still stand by all these accusations *and still approve them?* This is plainly equivalent to a *repetition* of them. It can mean nothing else; and a repetition, after the lapse of years, aggravates the offence.

It is very true they express confidence in our present Christian character. That is, they do not say we are *now* guilty of using our organisation to uphold the rebellion and the Southern Confederacy, and to perpetuate or even conserve the institution of slavery. They do not say we are now guilty of sinful schism, of heresy, blasphemy, or in general of "sinful acts" and "miserable doings." There is no occasion nor opportunity for our repeating such crimes now. But by the very terms of their explanation they do affirm *now* that we *were guilty* of these crimes a few years ago. We wish to call attention to the very cautious and guarded language of the fourth letter of the Northern Committee and to ask a careful scrutiny of its phrases. A hasty and careless reading of Section 2 of that letter has led numbers to interpret it as meaning that the Northern General Assembly have really expunged or virtually withdrawn these charges. The Assembly has never done any such thing, and the Committee does not say they have. The most favorable construction of the words of both goes no farther than the admission that *at present* we are not committing these abominations. They know as well as we do that the expressions "null and void," and others like them, in their more recent proceedings, have no application nor reference to the accusations of which we complain.

We are therefore given to understand that this invitation to fraternal correspondence has been made possible only by our having ceased the commission of the enormities charged against

us. Manifestly, then, for us to accept this invitation would be to *confess* that we were guilty as charged—that these dreadful accusations are true as applied to that period. Are we prepared to make this confession? If so, then let us write *infamy* upon the graves of our departed brethren who shared in all our proceedings as a Church—some of them as leaders—and let us who survive repent in dust and ashes.

Indeed, it would appear that the proposal of fraternal intercourse, as explained by the Northern Committee, is based upon the assumption that we have repented. So then, we are invited to enter into this correspondence as *penitent prodigals*, forgiven and restored purely through the leniency and compassion of our Northern brethren. If, indeed, it can be shown that our Church is verily guilty in the matters whereof we are accused, we will pledge our repentance. But that has never been shown, and we fail to see it.

Nor are we in this refusing to grant what we ask of the Northern Church. We have never brought a railing accusation against them. And, though we disapproved their views and proceedings during the war as strongly as they did ours, they cannot find in all our records any imputations against their Christian character, such as are found in their records against us. If they can, we are ready to disapprove them. Now we put it to the candid judgment of men: Is it right to expect our Church to accept a correspondence which by its terms fastens upon us the charge of gross offences which we utterly deny, and then to condemn us as uncharitable and obstinate because we refuse such conditions? It should be remembered that these accusations were adopted with all the forms and solemnities of ecclesiastical action, and were *recorded* in their Minutes. They stand out before the world and will go down to posterity. And yet they come to us and say: You must lie under these accusations forever; we can never withdraw or condemn them; they will go down to posterity and be read by your children; but your guilt was in the *past*, and we have confidence in you in the *present*, and we now invite you to a *fraternal* correspondence.

If we are torturing language by putting these constructions,

if the Northern Committee did not mean to imply any such things, and especially if they and their Assembly really do regret and disapprove these accusations, it would have been the easiest thing in the world for them to say so; for we take them to be honest and Christian men, ready to say even disagreeable things if they think them to be true. Why still insist that the acts of their Assembly during four years past constitute a sufficient ground for fraternal intercourse, and urge that we do not understand them correctly? If those acts were intended to remove the accusations, and we are not in a state of mind to see it, then let them make that meaning so plain that even we can see it. But if they were not intended to convey that meaning, then all we have to say is that they are not, in our view, a satisfactory ground for the step proposed.

We have examined "the concurrent declaration" and all the deliverances of the Northern Assembly on this subject, and we cannot find a single expression which can fairly be considered as even referring to the one point which stands in the way. Our Committee have shown most conclusively that this point is left out of them all. We need not repeat what they have said with so much clearness on this subject. But it does seem to us very strange that our Committee is blamed for the failure of the Conference because they could not accept the construction which the other Committee placed upon these deliverances, when it was so easy for them to recommend to their Assembly to say that *these deliverances were intended as a withdrawal of the offensive charges*. We venture to say that if their next Assembly will say this, it will be satisfactory to our Church. We do not ask that they shall make a second withdrawal, if they, in plain terms, assure us that they have withdrawn these charges, of course as referring to the past.

But is it right for us, before God and the Christian world, to insist on this condition? We admit the propriety and gravity of the question. If it were a sentiment of mere worldly honor or personal pride that animates us, we could not justify the demand. We claim a higher motive. We invoke the application of a more sacred standard. We do not condescend to answer the rude im-

putations of arrogance, obstinacy, and political prejudice and rancour, which have, from some quarters, been hurled against us. We expect this from partisan bitterness and intolerant fanaticism. But we are concerned to exercise the spirit of the gospel appropriate to the circumstances in which we are placed. We would please our Master, and have a conscience void of offence towards both God and man. Nor are we indifferent to the opinions of the Christian world or of posterity. We are willing to sacrifice private feeling for the public good, and sincerely long to be on the most amicable terms with all mankind, and especially with all them that are of the household of faith. We are not conscious of any desire to humiliate our brethren of the Northern Church. By far would we prefer to humble ourselves for every act or word of conscious or remembered offence. We claim no right and harbor no feeling of resentment. Our desire is, not to curse, but to bless; not to injure, but to benefit; not to punish, but to forgive. If we have taken a wrong position, we wish to know the fact, and at once abandon that position. But we cannot even indirectly confess crimes of which we are innocent. We cannot enter into any alliance on terms which fix a foul stain upon ourselves and our departed brethren, and thus become parties to a grievous injustice. If others affirm and reaffirm, however sincerely, what we feel to be untrue, we cannot consent to lend our sanction to that affirmation. If the Northern Church come to the fixed conclusion that these accusations against us were not only true, but that it was right to express and record them, then we cannot expect them to withdraw or disapprove. We can only accept the painful fact that the wall of separation is really impassable, and that we cannot even on this one point see eye to eye.

But beyond and above all considerations which apply to the protection and maintenance of personal character as Christian men, we claim that we are a part of the Church of Jesus Christ, and all acknowledge this. We hold that the honor of our Church, as one part of his kingdom, is as dear to him as that of any other part, and that it is our most sacred duty to guard that honor with tender and jealous care. If we could suffer our personal characters to be maligned, never could we consent to see any

unjust aspersions cast upon her character. If, indeed, we have ourselves really compromised the honor of the bride of Christ by such guilt as has been charged, or by charging similar guilt upon other parts of the Church, we are ready to take shame to ourselves, and at once by confession and repentance make all possible amends. We are aware that the obligation is mutual between the different branches of the Church, and the liability to commit this grievous wrong is not confined to either party. But believing, as we most firmly do, that the charges we have been considering are unfounded and injurious to the Church—yea, to both branches of it—we regard it as our solemn duty to the kingdom and its Head still to insist on the removal of this odious brand. We think our Committee went as far as they could in the interests of peace and good will in the way of concession—that in fixing the condition of fraternal intercourse, they reduced it to the lowest point consistent with justice and fidelity to the great interests committed to them. May we not hope that after all, when the real nature of our proposal shall be dispassionately considered, the Northern General Assembly will see its reasonableness, and in the spirit of a manly Christian candor accede to it? We do not forget how differently such things are generally regarded from opposite stand-points—yet we cannot refrain from saying that in our view, and we believe in the view of the great mass of Christian men, so far from its being a humiliation, it would reflect the highest honor upon them. We sincerely pray that the God of all peace may guide both Assemblies to what is right in his sight.

If, however, our proposal shall still appear to demand too much, we trust it will be remembered that we have not obtruded our demand upon them, but gave it as the most favorable response we could offer to the overtures of the Northern Church. But we do not regret that the occasion has called out this correspondence, and has thus brought out our real position before many eyes which have never before seen it. The publication of the correspondence was proposed first by the Northern Committee, and was gladly agreed to by ours, with the express stipulation, however, that all, if any, should appear. We cannot add that the

Northern Presbyterian press has been the first to publish the whole. They have given brief extracts with voluminous commentaries. We hope the Northern Committee will yet see to it that all their people have access to these important documents.

We do not propose to discuss the question of Church property. But we must express our regret that the exceedingly fair proposition of our Committee to open the way for an amicable adjustment of that difficulty, by the adoption of a plan in itself already endorsed by the Northern General Assembly, was, for the time, declined by the other Committee. Can it be that their willingness to have such a settlement was suspended on our consent to *their* terms of fraternal correspondence? We do not see the connexion. We certainly were not asking for favors or gifts, but for simple justice. It does seem to us that this Conference afforded exactly the right occasion for the consideration of this subject. Surely there was a reasonable prospect of settling this property question, if they had consented to take it up. Such a result would also have aided in removing causes of alienation and in promoting fraternal feeling between the two Churches. Fraternal feeling rather than outward fraternal correspondence is the great thing to be sought. Without that, the exchange of delegates would be a mere hollow pretence; and surely no one desires that these two bodies of professing Christians should become parties to a mere sham.

ARTICLE VI.

"UNTHINKABLE" PROPOSITIONS AND ORIGINAL SIN.

Nescire velle, quae Magister optimus
Docere non vult, erudita inscitia est.—SCALIGER.

"It is an astonishing thought," says the profound Pascal, "that the mystery farthest removed from our apprehension, the transmission of original sin, is a fact, without the knowledge of which we can never satisfactorily know ourselves! For undoubtedly nothing appears so revolting to our reason as to say that the transgression of the first man imparted guilt to those who, from their extreme distance from the source of evil, seem incapable of such a participation. This transmission seems to us not only impossible, but unjust. . . . And yet, without this mystery, of all others the most incomprehensible, we are incomprehensible to ourselves. *The complicated knot of our condition has its mysterious folds in this abyss*; so that man is more incomprehensible without this mystery, than is the mystery itself to man."*

The late Dr. F. C. Baur of Tübingen has undertaken, by a very summary process, to explode this doctrine of transmission and participation; and as our purpose is to examine the position which he has assumed against it, it will be quite in place to offer at the outset a remark or two defining the position he assumes in relation to evangelical doctrine. He was the founder and Coryphæus of the most destructive school of German neology, of which Strauss also (author of the *Leben Jesu*,) was both a disciple and representative; and having embraced the Pantheistic views of Hegel, labored incessantly during the last thirty years of his life to subvert and destroy the faith of the Church of Christ.† No man ever cast so much bitter contempt and ridicule upon all the Christian activities of the present century—its missionary

* Thoughts on Religion, Part II. Chapter V.

† Dr. Baur was born in 1791, was elected Professor of Theology in Tuebingen in 1826, and died there in 1861.

operations, Sabbath schools, the Evangelical Alliance, etc.—as did he in his lectures; and no one in Tübingen exercised so strong a personal influence over the students, nor deprived so many of the most precious treasures of their heart—the faith of their childhood, the fruit of the prayers and tears of godly parents, and the tranquility of the whole future of their life.* He denied that he was an Atheist; but only meant by this denial that he was a Pantheist. With him all history is simply a development of ideas; so that the history of the world is only a history of God, who, in and of himself, is not a self-conscious Spirit, but comes to consciousness only in humanity. It is proper to add that, though no one had ever looked upon the idea of a personal God-man with greater contempt than Baur, he yet, in his last moments, deeply felt that there was no salvation except in Jesus. And a day or two before he died, he was heard to utter the prayer: “Grant me a peaceful end, O Lord!” (*Herr, gewähre mir ein sanftes Ende!*)

The views of Baur on the great cardinal doctrine of original sin have become important to the Augustinian churches in this country, only because his reasoning on the subject (to which we shall advert presently,) has been recognised as valid by some who purport to be Augustinian in doctrine, and the conception is widely extending. That doctrine, as presented in the Confessions and defended by the representative divines of the Augustinian Church, seemed to awaken his peculiar aversion. That the race itself should have participated in the first sin, *i. e.*, should have sinned when Adam sinned, he treats as utterly nonsensical, and pronounces the proposition affirming it “unthinkable;” since, as he says, we can attach no definite conception to the announcement that a non-existing will should, in any sense of the terms, have contracted subjective guilt.† With him the testimony of Scripture, of course, goes for nothing; and the

* News of Churches, for 1861.

† The reader, by turning to Dr. Hodge's Theology, Vol. II., pp. 178, 179, 216, 223, 224, 244, may find references to the views of Baur on the subject, sufficiently explicit to render unnecessary here any formal citations from his writings.

views of men like Pascal, and Lord Bacon, and of the representative Church theologians on the subject, are regarded as deserving only of ridicule. And as our purpose in this article is to join issue with him on the ground which he has assumed as justifying his conclusion against the Augustinian doctrine, we shall first state briefly that doctrine itself, and then show, on scientific principles, (for he professes to be completely at home therein,) what weight can be allowed his assertion that the proposition affirming our participation in the sin of our first father, and that we *really* and not merely *putatively* "sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression," is to be regarded and treated as an "unthinkable" proposition.

In considering this whole subject, it is a matter of no small importance to us as Presbyterians, that there can exist no reason for doubt as to the meaning attached by the Westminster Assembly to the language they employ in their answer to Question 18 of the *Shorter Catechism*: "The sinfulness of that estate wherinto man fell, consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature," etc.; for, as every theologian well read in the theology of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries knows, it is only a reproduction of the formula which, in the time of the session of that Assembly, and long anterior thereto, was current with our theologians, both in England and on the continent. A reference to this interesting fact will be in place here, as illustrating the discussion itself, and its bearing upon the present aspect of our theology. But we shall make it as brief as the necessity of the case will allow.

We find this little formula (with unimportant variations) sometimes fully and sometimes more briefly expressed from the very beginning of the Reformation. The *Confessions* constantly bring it to view; but as these are easily accessible, we shall cite it as expressed by a few of our representative divines. Beza, for example, in his work on Justification, presents it in the following form: "There are three things which constitute a man guilty before God: 1. *The sin flowing from this, that we have all sinned in the first man.* Rom. v. 12. 2. Corruption. which is the pun-

ishment of *that sin*, which fell upon Adam and all his posterity. Heb. ix. 27. 3. The (actual) sin which adult men commit," etc. Danaeus, the contemporary of Beza, (and Professor of Theology in Leyden,) repeats the same, *verbatim*, in his Apology for Justification, etc.

Isaac Junius (of Delft) thus presents it as a brief summary of the teaching of all the Reformed churches: "In the sum of the matter, all the Reformed churches *agree, and teach with unanimous consent*, in accordance with the Sacred Scriptures and the universal agreement of antiquity: 1. That the sin of Adam *was not a personal sin, but of the whole human race*, inasmuch as they were all included in the loins of Adam, and in Adam they sinned. 2. There was transfused a principle contrary to original righteousness, contracted from Adam in the first transient act of his sin, *and propagated by means of generation* to all his posterity." (Antapol. Posthum., c. vii.)

Laurentius (on Rom. v. 12) presents it thus: "The true and genuine sense of these words is, that all sinned in Adam as in their common stalk and mass, and so in him and by him. *It is altogether a different thing to sin in Adam and to derive sin from him. And we should carefully distinguish the sin which all committed in Adam, from original sin; namely, as the cause from the effect. For all sinned in Adam at the time that he sinned.*"

Pareus presents the formula sometimes very fully, and then more succinctly, and almost in the words of the answer to Question 18 aforesaid. After remarking that the first fall brought upon Adam himself *culpa actualis, reatus legalis, pravitas naturalis*, he remarks that "they at the same time come upon his posterity in a threefold manner, to wit: *participatione culpae, imputatione reatus, propagatione naturalis pravitatis*—by participation of the fault, by imputation of the legal guilt, and by the propagation of natural depravity."

Benedict Turretin, (father of the theologian,) in his remarks on Rom. v. 12, presents the same summary, as follows: "Our Confessions include under original sin the participation (or communion) which we have in the first sin, and the loss of original righteousness and purity which we have sustained, and the in-

herent corruption of the soul." The answer to Question 18 of our Catechism is obviously only a reproduction of this. And Poole has taken the fuller statement as given by Pareus, (which our readers may find in his *Synopsis Criticorum* on Rom. v. 12,) as presenting the acknowledged Calvinistic doctrine on the subject, and repeats from him that the three things in original sin are: 1. Actual guilt (or criminality) *by participation* (*culpa participatione*.) 2. Depravity by propagation, (*pravitas propagatione*.) 3. Legal guilt by imputation, (*reatus imputatione*.) And our readers will observe that during the Commonwealth and many years anterior thereto, no commentary on the Scriptures was so popular (and justly so,) with the Puritans as this of Pareus on Romans—a popularity in no way lessened by the fact that James I. had ordered it to be burned by the hangman at Oxford, on account of its stern advocacy of the principles of civil liberty, and of the right of subjects to resist tyrannical rulers.

The Church exposition, therefore, of the phrase, "the guilt of Adam's first sin," that is, as imputed to his posterity, is *culpa participatione*, and not his merely *personal* guilt or criminality. Or, as Dr. Thornwell (in *SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW*, for April, 1860,) expresses it, "We agree with Dr. Baird, that the imputation of guilt is simply the declaration of the fact. To condemn a man is to find or pronounce him guilty, and not to make him so. It is a verdict upon the case as it is, and introduces no new element." P. 188. "Our depravity of nature is the penal consequence of our guilt in him" (Adam). P. 202.

This, which was always the doctrine of the Church, and which is asserted by every Calvinistic or Augustinian theologian whom the Church regards as representative, has awakened from the first the envenomed hostility of the Pelagian and Socinian schools, and now of Baur, who, in view of it, exclaims with ineffable contempt, "What is an act of a non-existing will, an act to which the nature of sin is attributed, although it lies entirely outside of the individual consciousness? Can any meaning be attached to such a representation?"* And he

* See the foregoing references to Dr. Hodge's Theology.

pronounces the whole doctrine "unthinkable," *i. e.*, that of which no intelligible conception can be formed. He is, however, merely repeating after Socinus and his school, who sought to destroy the doctrine of our participation in the first sin, that so, by making this sin of the posterity of Adam merely putative and not real, they might prepare the way for abolishing the doctrine of a real satisfaction through Christ. For they well knew that a merely putative guilt or sin can be expiated by a merely putative satisfaction, which any holy or unfallen creature might accomplish. And hence the necessity that our Redeemer should be truly God, is at once set aside, and along therewith the doctrine of the trinity and its correlated truths. And thus, too, Baur treats the conception, though entertained and affirmed by every representative divine of the Church, from Augustine until now; and who, though fully aware of all the alleged grounds on which he and his followers denounce it, yet, *una voce*, affirm the subjective guilt of the race as the ground of the imputation to it of the first sin. They regard this as a fundamental feature of Augustinian doctrine; and no point in our theology was more frequently and more directly inculcated than this; and no error more decidedly rejected than the opposite view, asserted by Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians, and Socinians, as is susceptible of the clearest demonstration.

The Church has never claimed to understand *how* we sinned when Adam sinned, but simply accepts the divine averment that "*all sinned*" (Rom. v. 12, 18, 19,) *as an explanatory principle*, akin to other inexplicable announcements of truth from the Holy Spirit; *e. g.*, that of the two natures in Christ, and the triunity of personality in the Godhead. But Pelagians, Socinians, and now Baur and his followers, have discovered that the announcement is unintelligible and nonsensical; and as he has directed the whole force of his learning and ratiocination against it, we shall proceed to consider his argument.

From the course of his speculation, and of those who follow him therein, we learn that not only must the sense or meaning of a proposition be clear in order to be intelligently received, (in which all, of course, concur with them,) but that the subject

matter, if we may so speak, must be such as is not only not contradictory in and of itself, but such as we can form an intelligent conception of, since otherwise, say they, it is impossible to assent to it. Now we shall not here stop to press those who have adopted this speculation of Baur with the necessity which such a position lays them under to reject also many others of the averments of revelation in the application to which this principle has been wholly discarded by all evangelical Christians, but shall consider the question simply as to the alleged correctness of the principle itself.

The basis of Baur's ratiocination is that words must stand for precise ideas; so that, when properly or definitely employed, that is, as signs of actual ideas, they must express a definite and intelligible meaning. For, if not thus used, they convey no meaning, and are therefore employed without meaning, that is, nonsensically.

For example. You resolve a proposition into the terms by which it is expressed; examine the words; and ascertain what ideas they convey. And if, as united in the proposition, they express an "unthinkable" announcement, that is, combine to express somewhat of which we can form no clearly intelligible conception, then, of course, that proposition conveys no meaning to the mind, and is necessarily "unthinkable" or nonsensical. The words subserve no purpose whatever, so far as concerns the conveyance of knowledge, which consists in the perception of the connexion or disagreement between ideas. But such a proposition conveys no idea; and how, then, are we to compare its announcement with actual ideas? And then, further, a man cannot assent to such a proposition, for he knows not what to assent to, there being in fact nothing to which he can yield assent. Such seems to be the argument in full, and it is applied to the subject matter in hand as follows: To say that a man's "non-existing will" committed sin thousands of years before the man himself personally existed, is a proposition of this character, and is simply nonsense; for it predicates coetaneous existence and non-existence of one and the same object; that is, it affirms that the thing exists, and that at the same time it does not exist, and

is simply to assert that the man acted before he could act, and existed before he could have existed. You can therefore yield no assent to such a proposition, and of course cannot believe it.

But, passing for the present the sheer folly of attempting to apply such ratiocination to the direct disclosures and affirmations of divine revelation, whose author can neither lie nor deceive, we ask, Is such a conception of the use of language the true one? If it be, then certainly Baur and Dr. Hodge (who, we regret to say, has endorsed his statement,) have, in thousands of instances, set it at naught. And we think it demonstrably certain that no man who has ever employed language intelligibly has *practically* so regarded it, whatever his theory might be. The principle that words may be significant, even when they do not stand for abstract ideas, is a principle which, ages ago, has been so thoroughly settled by science herself, that no well-informed mind would, upon adequate reflection, even think of calling it in question. And it is conceded to be a puerile absurdity to pretend that even every substantive name clearly exhibits to the mind a definite and separate idea. But we have no space for generalising, and will therefore come at once to particulars, in their direct relation to the matter before us.*

Take, for example, out of a thousand words which might be specified, the term *number*. Every person employs it, and claims, moreover, to employ it intelligibly. But take the term and separate its meaning from the signs, words, and things numbered, and what conception does it convey to the mind? To conceive it is utterly out of the question and impossible; and it is as "unthinkable" as Baur and Dr. Hodge would have the proposition to be which they have united to condemn. You can form no abstract conception of it whatever; and yet of what incalculable use are the numerical names? What would trade, commerce, or, in a word, human intercourse be, without those "unthinkable" terms, or their equivalents? Yet, according to the ratiocination referred to, a proposition which should contain

* The reader may find in the works of Bishop Berkeley, and especially in his *Minute Philosopher*, this whole matter treated with great force and clearness.

the word *number*, could not possibly be understood or believed, because you can attach no definite or separate conception to that term, and are compelled to view it as inseparably associated with the often incongruous objects enumerated. These two things, therefore, are demonstrably true: 1. That to obtain a simple, precise, abstract idea of *number*, is impossible; and 2. That the term, as an explanatory principle, is of indispensable necessity to human intercourse.

But let us take another equally common term, the word *force*.* Like *number*, it may be defined as "*that which*," but the definition stops short of conveying any definite, abstract conception whatever. It is "*that which* produces motion and other perceptible effects," and is of course distinct from those effects, unless we would make cause and effect the same. What, then, is that *something*, as to its own precise idea? The question is unanswerable; for to form any such abstract conception, is simply impossible; and yet, for how many speculations, subtle reasonings, profound arguments, in mental, moral, and physical science, is it an explanatory principle, or an admitted or necessary first truth? We have the *vis inertia*, *vis mortua*, *vis viva*, *vis impressa*, *impetus*, *momentum*, *gravity*, *reaction*, and the like. And then what earnest and subtle controversies have arisen amongst the really learned, about the true meaning or definition of these terms; though in no instance could the controvertist claim to possess a definite or abstract idea of the term *force* itself. Were these *savans*, then, acting foolishly, and talking nonsensically, as they must have been according to Baur's application of his principle? Or, were they acting rationally? And, on the contrary, would not he be acting irrationally who, on such grounds, should charge folly upon them? We have, moreover, erudite treatises on the *Proportion of Forces*; that is, on the proportion of things which no one can pretend to define—a proposition which, according to Baur, must be wholly "unthinkable," until we can form a clear conception of what forces really are. And

* See, in the *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* of January last, an article touching the use and application of this term.

then, still further, we have propositions relating to force which are of very great practical use ; as, for example, that a body with conjunct forces, describes the diagonal of a parallelogram in the same time that it would the sides with the separate forces. And by considering the inexplicable doctrine of force, how many useful inventions in mechanics have been suggested ? And thus, as an explanatory principle, the term is of incalculable use ; though in none of its multitudinous usages does it ever convey an abstract idea of the thing itself.

But it surely is needless to dwell further upon a point in the elucidation and confirmation of which all science could be appealed to. The very basis of Baur's ratiocination, therefore, is as preposterously absurd as he would represent the proposition to be that we participated in the first sin, or sinned when Adam sinned. And of course the argument he would erect upon it is of no validity ; since it is simply absurd to claim that it is impossible to assent to the truth of a statement or proposition without being able to frame in the mind definite or even intelligible ideas of all its terms—a statement equally in conflict with science and common sense.

These things being so, it is too obvious to require proof that since a single term may thus serve as an explanatory principle, though it be impossible to form any abstract conception of its meaning, a statement of fact clearly announced by divine revelation may be employed in the same manner and for a like purpose, though the fact itself so far transcend our intellection as to be even *unthinkable* ; *i. e.*, a fact as to the mode of which we can form no abstract conception ; as, for example, the announcement of the fact of a tri-personality in the divine unity, and of the two natures in Christ's person ; and that all sinned and became veritable sinners when Adam sinned ; and a score of other averments, which, lying clearly beyond the range of our intellection in the present stage of our being, God has communicated to us as facts. All that is needed in order to their intelligent reception by us, is to be authoritatively informed by God, who cannot err, that the thing announced is a fact, in order to justify our employing it for the elucidation of other statements which would

be inexplicable without it. Such a use of such a fact is perfectly legitimate, and in strict accordance with scientific usage, of which a single illustration may suffice. But that the design of the illustration, however, may not be misconceived, we here briefly restate that the position of the Church on the subject in question is, that the whole race of man became veritable sinners in the fall; that this is a matter of fact made known by divine testimony, and is therefore to be accepted as an undoubted truth. It is not necessary to contend that the *modus* of the fact is incapable of ultimate solution; but while we concede our inability to explain it, and have no hypothesis, either Realistic or Nominalistic, to offer for its solution, we do affirm that our inability to explain the fact itself, furnishes no rational ground for its rejection; and further, that so far as the doctrine of original sin and the correlated doctrines in theological science are concerned, the inspired announcement of the fact referred to, answers every doctrinal and every ethical or practical purpose, quite as well as a knowledge of the *modus* would, if it were really known, or were susceptible of the clearest scientific verification. This is our position. Is there, then, either in or about that position, anything which may justify a man who lays claim to but ordinary intelligence, in denouncing it as unphilosophical, unscientific, and nonsensical? Let us see.

When Sir Isaac Newton announced to the scientific world that gravitation was an action between two distant bodies, and demonstrated the fact, but declared his inability to explain it, a number of scientists at once applied themselves to the task of solving the question as to the *modus* of that action; whereupon Leibnitz (basing his censure, however, upon those attempted explanations) denounced the whole doctrine as absurd, or, in the philosophical sense of the term, *supernatural*; precisely as Baur and those who adopt his argument, base their denunciations in general, and their attempts at a formal refutation of the doctrine before us, upon unauthorised endeavors to explain what the Church has ever conceded to be inexplicable.

Sir Isaac Newton, however, had taught no theory on the subject; nor had he, in relation to it, even attempted to project any

hypothesis. He had, as above stated, demonstrated the law of gravitation, and had accepted it as an explanatory principle; but, as to those hypotheses which had been invented to explain the fact itself, he did not feel called upon to express an opinion, or either to accept or reject them. And moreover, he neither affirmed nor denied that some medium of communication must exist between the bodies referred to. And, therefore, when Leibnitz and others said: "We cannot understand this; for how is it possible that attraction should exist at such incalculable and inconceivable distances? We will not believe till we can understand the matter"—Newton merely answered that the fact existed; that its existence is demonstrable and had been demonstrated, and was not dependent upon their ability to understand and explain it. He would not deny that it may be ultimately explained, but insisted that he was not called on to explain it, in order to justify either his announcement or their reception of it as a fact.

This position, as every thoughtful mind must admit, was eminently philosophical and reasonable. And it is our own precisely in relation to the great fact upon which is based, so to speak, the church doctrine of original sin. God himself, in an inspired announcement, has given, as an explanatory principle, the fact of the synchronousness of Adam's sin with the sin and corruption of the race, and the synchronousness of our subjective ill-desert and the imputation of Adam's sin—truths with which no human intuitions can pretend to deal, without the most deplorable arrogance. We are, however, entirely willing that the Nominalists (if they can attempt it without imperilling gospel truth,) should explain, if they are able, the *modus* of the natural and moral connexion subsisting between Adam and his posterity. But their principle of representation must not, in that attempt, be carried beyond the limits allowed it in our recognised theology. Sin, on their own admitted principles, cannot be imputed to the represented until *after* it has been committed by the representative; and if imputed to them *after* it has been committed by him, it will hardly do to claim that this is reconcilable with the church theology; *e. g.*, with the statement of our standards that

"we sinned in and fell with Adam, in his first transgression;" for that explanation makes us not to have sinned until *after* he had sinned—a notion the Church has always repudiated. Or let the philosophical Realists solve the problem, if they can, on their hypothesis of identity. But for ourselves, having abundantly witnessed the disastrous effects resulting from such endeavors in the past, we, along with the Church, abjure them; and irrespective of any hypothesis on the subject, or of any attempted explanation, accept the fact as divinely announced, *that all sinned when Adam sinned*. And we claim, moreover, that no exigency exists, or has ever existed, which demands such explanation. It is not needed in order to the intelligent admission of the divinely announced fact; nor is it at all necessary in order to apply that fact to all purposes, both doctrinal and practical.

A late able writer, referring to the aforesaid position of Sir Isaac Newton, in relation to the antagonism of Leibnitz, offers the following impressive remark: "The law of gravitation, *considered as a result*, is beautifully simple; in a few words it expresses a fact from which most numerous and complex results may be deduced by mere reasoning—results found invariably to agree with the records of observation; but the same law of gravitation, looked upon as an axiom or first principle, is so astoundingly far removed from all ordinary experience, as to be almost incredible."*

There is, however, another and most instructive lesson to be learned from the example of Newton in this same connexion. While he occupied the aforesaid ground, he stood firmly, and his position was impregnable. But later in life he began to imagine that an explanation might be devised, and finally permitted himself to seek a philosophical solution of the *modus* itself. The result was precisely what might have been expected. But we will state that result in the language of Burke, who united with the philosophical world in deploring the mistake of this truly great and good man. He says: "When Newton first discovered the property of attraction and settled its laws, he

* North British Review, for March, 1868, p. 125.

found it served very well to explain several of the most remarkable phenomena in nature; but yet, with reference to the general system of things, he could consider attraction but as an effect, whose cause at that time he did not attempt to trace. But when he afterwards began to account for it by a subtle, elastic aether, this great man (if in so great a man it be not impious to discover anything like a blemish,) seemed to have quitted his usual cautious manner of philosophising, since, perhaps, allowing all that has been advanced on the subject to be sufficiently proved; I think it leaves us with as many difficulties as it found us."* True philosophy and science, therefore, fully sustain the position which the Church has always taken in relation to the doctrine before us; and the attempt, by denunciation and ridicule, to set that position aside, can, as it seems to us, have no effect upon the really candid and intelligent.

And then, in regard to the explanatory principle itself, given by the Holy Spirit in the announcement that all sinned when Adam sinned, a volume could be easily occupied in evincing how immense is its importance in explaining the ground of the divine treatment of our race; the evils and disorders of earth; the divine interposition on our behalf, and in freeing the divine character from all imputation of the authorship of sin. But we cannot here dwell upon this matter.

The *πρώτον ψεῦδος* of the aforesaid false method of treating the subject, is in regarding the intellect as the receptive faculty of divine truth, to the exclusion of the moral nature—a point which we shall discuss on another occasion. And hence the explanatory principles that Christ possesses a human and a divine nature in one person, and that in the divine unity there is a tri-personality, have met the like reception with the aforesaid. Those truths, while sound reason receives them on the sure and certain ground that God can teach nothing false or impossible, are pre-eminently adapted to the moral nature, whose inner consciousness realises their truthfulness and efficacy in their wonderful adaptedness to its condition and necessities, while the mere intel-

* Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful, pp. 194, 195.

lect, in its clumsy efforts to seize and subject them to scrutiny or analysis, that is, to precise, definite, and abstract conceptions, finds them wholly to elude its grasp. It is in this deep and sanctifying and saving sense that these divine mysteries have ever been potentially and practically realised in all their saving efficacy, by multitudes of the poor, the uneducated, and the illiterate of Christ's flock, with whom so many of the highest and brightest examples of the divine power of religion have appeared.

The student of ecclesiastical history will not need to be informed that the word *person* was introduced into the ancient creeds simply as an explanatory principle. It was not that the Nicene fathers, for example, professed to have any distinct conception whatever of the term in its application to the trifold distinction in the Godhead. They never pretended to any such absurdity; and their aim was to give expression to the disagreement of the Church with the errors of those who deny that there is any *real* distinction in the divine nature, and who affirm the sentiment attributed to Sabellius, that Father, Son, and Spirit, are merely the names of the different methods which God had adopted in revealing himself to man. In order to discard fully and effectually all such notions, they employed the word *person* to show that the distinction was not merely nominal, but *real*, though inexplicable; and so the Church has ever since employed it. And it is as unreasonable to require of us a clear, abstract definition of the term in this connexion, as it would be to demand of science herself such a definition of *number* and *force* as a necessary prerequisite to the reception of her utterances.

We find in the divine word that both faith and unbelief are predicated of the *heart*, and not of the intellect alone. And man being a moral not less than an intellectual being, it is as contrary to true science as it is to true religion, to predicate of his knowledge that it can consist only of precise, abstract, intellectual conceptions. A broad field lies open here for remark and illustration, but we cannot now enter it. But of those who assume this position, we ask directly, Is it the abstract ideas of *force* and *number* that are the foundation of true science? Or is

it the concrete ideas with their adjuncts? Every one understands the latter; but no man has ever comprehended the former. Is it, then, fatuity, or is it intellectual fanaticism, to insist upon precise, definite, abstract conceptions as essential to religious belief, when true science spurns the very notion of such a thing, even in respect to her very foundation itself, and when both alike require our assent to what we are wholly unable to explain, and the *modus* of which we cannot without folly even pretend to comprehend?

Our discussion has rendered it imperative that we advert to the fact that Dr. Hodge, in his *Theology*, (as may be seen by consulting the foregoing references,) indorses the argument of Baur against the doctrine of our participation in the first sin; and it may be added, that in consequence of this indorsement, that view is widely extending itself through the Church in our land. We leave to the Doctor to explain his reason for the procedure, and have no wish to intimate that it cannot be fully explained. But as we are unable to reconcile with our sense of duty an omission to call attention to the subject in this connexion, we cannot pass it wholly without remark. The indorsement is patent, and has been brought before the Church and the world as an accredited exposé of Augustinian doctrine; and this, of course, presents the alternative either of silently acquiescing in what we cannot but regard as a fatally erroneous representation of a vital doctrine, or of stating the reasons why that representation cannot be accepted. We have no room here to go into detail, but shall very briefly present the result of an extended and thorough investigation.

The Reformed theologians, from Calvin down, affirm the doctrine of the imputation to us of the first sin on the ground of our participation therein, and maintain it in the most decided manner. And it is important to observe in this connexion, that the Reformed Confessions draw no line of demarkation between original sin *imputed* and original sin *inherent*; nor has the terminology of *immediate* and *antecedent imputation* any expression in our theology anterior to the latter part of the seventeenth century. But while our theologians affirm the doctrine as thus

expressed, they, on the contrary, just as decidedly reject, refute, and denounce as fatal to the whole system of grace, the doctrine of the *gratuitous imputation* of Adam's personal guilt to the race for condemnation, and maintain (as our preceding extracts evince,) that the first sin was not Adam's personal sin alone, but also ours, by participation, and *therefore* imputed to us for condemnation; that is, there was in the race itself a moral and objective ground for the imputation. This doctrine, however, was bitterly assailed by the Socinians and Remonstrants, from the stand-point of *gratuitous imputation*, which they assumed in order to refute and subvert the church doctrine of original sin; maintaining most peremptorily that it was nonsense to suppose that the race could have participated in the first sin; and that that sin was, therefore, imputed to them only by a forensic or juridical imputation; and further, that it was not *the common sin* of the race, and *therefore* imputed, as the Church maintained, but *became* the common sin of all by being imputed to all. These speculations the Reformed theologians, both Infralapsarian and (for the most part) Supralapsarian, refute and reject, and insist that they are subversive of the whole evangelical system. Volumes can be easily filled in illustration and confirmation of these facts.

Now Dr. Hodge not only denies totally the doctrine of participation, but employs the terms *imputation* and *immediate* and *antecedent imputation*, interchangeably with *gratuitous imputation*,* as conveying the true idea of the doctrine of the Reformed, and thus represents *gratuitous imputation* as the very doctrine they taught as *imputation*, and subsequently as *antecedent* or *immediate imputation*; and this the Doctor does invariably. And then, from the stand-point thus assumed, he assails in the strongest manner the doctrine of our participation in the first sin, and so is led to adopt the foregoing language of Baur as expressing his own views on the subject; and hence, too, in his Revised Commentary on Romans, (and very often elsewhere,) he pro-

*See, for example, besides his Theology, his three essays on Imputation, his Commentary on Romans v. 12-21, and his Review of Dr. Baird's Elohim Revealed, in the *Princeton Review*, for April, 1860.

nounces the doctrine an absurdity which does not rise to the dignity of a contradiction, and has no meaning at all, but is mere Pantheistic nonsense and impossible. (P. 236.) As these things have been again and again repeated, and published to the world, we could of course do no less than advert to them in connexion with the subject before us; and we say, in great kindness to Dr. Hodge, that they certainly seem to present the alternative of either rejecting his representation wholly and in all its parts, or of accepting it, and so of conceding that, in relation to this vital doctrine of our theology, we stand on common ground with Socinians, Remonstrants, and Neologists; and consequently, that the Church view has been from the very beginning erroneous. Whether an escape from such a conclusion is possible, our readers must judge for themselves. But such are the facts in the case, and they can be fully verified if called in question.

In conclusion: If philosophy be, as is said, the science of causes and principles, it is of course obvious that she must possess, if not an *actual* knowledge of the causes and principles themselves, the *material* from which such knowledge may be derived in relation to any and every thing on which she would either form or utter a determination. For without this, her attempts at the development or explanation of either causes or principles can arrive at no result that is at all available. If true to herself, she can no more attempt to create her material by mere assumption and hypothesis, than would the natural sciences themselves. She has been defined as the exercise of reason to solve the higher problems of which the human mind can form a real conception; or, more happily, the investigation of the principles upon which knowledge and being rest, so far as those principles are ascertainable. But if she would deserve the name of philosophy, the domain of her investigations must ever be limited by the never-to-be-forgotten queries: *How* do we and *what* do we *really* know? For beyond the limit thus defined, she cannot venture, if she would be entitled to a moment's serious regard.

ARTICLE VII.

MODERN DOUBT.

Modern Doubt and Christian Belief: A Series of Apologetic Lectures Addressed to Earnest Seekers after Truth. By THOEDORE CHRISTLIEB, D. D., University Preacher and Professor of Theology at Bonn. Translated, with the author's sanction, chiefly by the Rev. H. U. WEITBRECHT, Ph. D., and edited by the Rev. T. L. KINGSBURY, M. A., Vicar of Easton Royal, and Rural Dean. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1874. 1 Vol. 8vo. Pp. 549.

It has long been customary to divide the human family, in sermons and essays, into two great classes, such as saints and sinners, believers and unbelievers, saved and lost; and in fact this simple antagonism between the children of God and the children of the devil, is the only difference formally recognised in Scripture, and the only difference that will obtain when the great white throne shall be erected and occupied. Nevertheless, the ecclesiastical literature of modern times is largely builded upon the hypothesis that partitions the race into three classes: the positive believers in revelation, the positive deniers of revelation, and the great multitude whom no man can number, doubting or indifferent, and from which new accessions to those opposing ranks are daily drawn. In this multitude there are many subdivisions, from the unreached Pagan, content in idolatrous worship of stocks and stones, to the cultivated scholar, content with no worship whatever.

The believers are likewise divisible into classes. And the fact that the most untutored peasant and the master of many sciences hold to the same faith with equal tenacity, has never been explained by the deniers. It is a fact of prime importance, and adds to the volume of evidence in favor of Christianity. The rank attained by the author of the book under review, is a positive assurance of profound scholarship; and his unquestioned elevation to the first place among the scholars of the Evangelical Alliance, assembled in New York eighteen months ago, proves the

possession of distinguished mental powers. A critical notice of his work having been already presented in this REVIEW, (Vol. XXV., pages 570, 571,) the present purpose will be served by following to a certain extent the line of his argument, and offering such additional hints as may be suggested by the discussion of the general subject. Within the present limits, nothing more than this can be attempted, and the reader is earnestly commended to the work itself. The translation is said to be admirably accurate, and the book is printed in beautifully distinct type, on clear, white paper, and gotten up by Messrs. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., in very neat and attractive style. It is a work which will make its way into the libraries of all thinkers who are interested in the present contest between Religion and Rationalism.

Concerning the latter, as has already been intimated, the class is divisible into sub-classes. Yet the rule that is in force among believers and doubters, is not so regular in its working among the deniers. There is positive agreement among them only in their negations. They are unanimous in pronouncing religion a delusion, and revelation a sham, and here their unity ends. For example: The modern denier usually abstains from reference to the more flippant and brutal of the Atheists of a past generation, such as Voltaire and Paine. There is a sort of politeness about the later assaults upon divine truth, partly due to more extensive scholarship in the assailants, and partly due to the more defiant attitude of the assailed. The sharp wit of Voltaire and the blunt roughness of Paine are not suited to the age. They do not survive, because they are not the fittest. It is but fair to admit, however, that there is a *quasi* recognition of the more ancient worthies in the writings of modern infidels. One of these, a few years ago, printed an article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, upon the Life and Works of Paine, and seriously proposed to "dig up the bones of the dead brute," and (figuratively, of course,) "re clothe them in flesh, in order that his excellences of character and animus might be shown to the world, which now chiefly remembered his drunkenness and vagrancy!"

But the New England forms of doubt and denial do not come

under the category of "modern" unbelief. In so far as they are pronounced and scholastic, they are Brahminical, which form of heresy is not modern. The peculiar advantage of this doctrine is in its novelty, as no scientific unbeliever of the old world has propounded this special sort of philosophy. Ralph Waldo Emerson is perhaps the only teacher in that land of teachers, who has formally enthroned the trinity of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva; but he has followers, no doubt, and among them no less a personage than the late Charles Sumner was enrolled. Brahminism is undoubtedly antagonistic to Christianity; yet a theologian who should attempt seriously to controvert this doctrine in this age of the world, would be a promising candidate for an insane asylum. It is to be noted in passing, that Professor Christlieb puts Emerson at the end of a list headed by Immanuel Kant, and bearing such names as Hegel, Schiller, Heine, and Carlyle. The classification is a slander upon the European unbelievers, who have, in greater or less degree, manifested originality in their scepticism.

In enumerating the causes of the breach between "modern culture and Christianity," Dr. Christlieb begins with apostolic times, and quotes the concluding history of the Acts of the Apostles, where the testimony of the Jews in Rome—"concerning this sect, we know that every where it is spoken against"—is aptly presented, as revealing the antagonism the gospel encountered from the beginning. The first conflict noted is that recorded in the 17th chapter of the Acts, where the cultivated heathen of Athens are formally confronted with the revelation of God. As this is the first case in the world's annals wherein Christianity and culture contend for the mastery, it may not be amiss to study the history of this initial encounter a little more elaborately than Professor Christlieb has done in his opening lecture.

So many sermons have been delivered upon the suggestive texts that abound in this narrative, that most Christians are tolerably familiar with the incidental history of the time, the place, and the actors. Concerning the mental status of the man who boldly assaults the Athenian philosophers in their chief stronghold,

there is not much dispute among scholars. None of the other writers in the New Testament—and all of them writing as they were moved by the Holy Ghost—wield his weapons. In one we find fervent zeal; in another, rugged force of invective; in another, the exquisite pathos of the loving saint; but in Paul alone is manifest the accurate, incisive power of relentless logic, always present in his preaching of Christ crucified—as the power of God, although a stumbling block to the Jew; and the wisdom of God, although foolishness to the Greek. And the “separation” of this extraordinary man for this special work, is one of the strong internal evidences of divine inspiration. From the 9th chapter of the Acts to the end of the Epistle to the Hebrews, this man, by sheer force of character, by scholarship, by fiery eloquence, stands prominently forth as the very prince of debaters. Aside from his inspiration, it is probably safe to say his equal has not appeared among men, in sacred or profane history. He was a chosen vessel.

It was not for nothing, it was not by accident, that Paul opened the debate that has extended through the ages and down to the present time. And as the story of Redemption has not been amplified since the close of the apocalyptic vision, neither has the attitude of unbelief undergone any organic change. The progenitors of Spencer, Tyndall, Mill, and Darwin, were doubtless on Mars' Hill eighteen centuries ago. Possibly they were more courteous than their descendants, as they gave Paul a patient hearing, and some of them even promised to hear him again. But the point suggested is, that the utterances of the Holy Ghost in that day were precisely the utterances that are applicable in this.

The unbelievers he encountered were composed of two sects, the Stoics and the Epicureans. The former seem to have had more distinct glimmerings of truth than the others. They had a sort of faith in divinities, though they placed these gods under the power of inexorable fate; and, curiously enough, they had exalted ideas of the power of virtue as something superior to the power of the gods, and actually inculcated rectitude of life for its own sake, as recognising the moral distinction separating right

from wrong. And although they did not specifically build their philosophy upon the doctrine of a future state of being, they did not deny this cardinal doctrine. Accordingly, among the later generations of doubting philosophers, there is still found some dim acknowledgment of the possibility of another life beyond the grave; and still more frequently there is found a sort of acquiescence in the possible delusion as a harmless superstition, respectable on account of its prevalence among enlightened nations.

But these ancient philosophers who confronted Paul, went a step beyond all this. One of the followers of Zeno, and probably the most distinguished of Stoical teachers, had erected a system three hundred years before, in which the inexorable fate was admitted, and defined as the inevitable law of relations; and yet, while inexorable and inevitable, neither interfering with the exercise of divine providence, nor with the essential freedom of man. He announced another dogma, still more astounding in a philosopher of that sect. He asserted in his system of morals, that all positive obligations derived their authority from the relations subsisting betwixt creatures of the same nature; thus, by implication, teaching the unity of the race, and hinting at the unity of the Godhead. And among the debaters upon Mars' Hill on that day, it cannot be doubted that many disciples of Chrysippus were found, and that Paul knew it, as appears from his argument.

The other sect, the Epicureans, were the undoubted progenitors of the modern philosophers who build their systems upon protoplasm, fire-mist, star-dust, and the like. The ancient axiom, *ex nihilo nihil fit*, was the cardinal doctrine of Epicurus; and his "first causes"—for he had two—were space and atoms. Really the moderns have not improved much upon the old philosophy, as the idea of infinite space, and the idea of an infinite volume of indivisible particles, are far more comprehensible than the theories of natural selection. That is to say, these propositions do not meet so prompt a rejection in the mind of the thinker. The revival of these unsatisfying hypotheses of Epicurus by Tyndall, Darwin, Mill, Huxley, and others, is no more sur-

prising than the revival of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, by the less scholarly philosophers of New England.

The Epicureans also held to a system of divinities, a family of gods, who reposed complacently in their own happiness, and gave no thought to terrestrial concerns. It is not at all clear that they taught the existence of relations betwixt these deities and the sons of men, and consequently they could teach no system of duties as flowing from such relations. They did, however, insist upon virtuous living, simply because vice entailed suffering, and not because of its inherent ugliness; as the objective point in their philosophy was the attainment of happiness. There is something more elevated in the whole system of Epicurean philosophy, with its recognition of gods tranquilly existing in their isolation, than can be found in the theories that give no place to divinities even of this ignoble status. For the material prosperity of the race, irrespective of eternal retributions, it were perhaps better to believe in the deified myths of the heathen, than to say with the fool, "No god."

These were the people who invited Paul to the discussion upon Mars' Hill. This was the highest scholastic tribunal in Athens, and Athens was the "university of the Roman Empire." It was a formal encounter between "Christianity and culture"—between unshaken faith and scientific doubt, so far as scientific doubt was formulated in that day; and while the latter has been more accurately defined as the ages have rolled away into the past, there has not been added to the divine faith a jot or a tittle. The Christian to-day faces the unbelieving world, clad in the identical panoply that Paul wore on Areopagus.

The authorised version is somewhat faulty in the rendering of this discourse. The Apostle's opening address in the English translation, appears harsh and abrupt; whereas it is eminently courtly. He refers to their *quasi* worship of invisible beings, apparently to give force to his later announcement of the unknown and unseen God, whose altar he had found in the midst of their idolatry. And the "passing by" was really a careful scrutiny of their systems, and a cautious examination of the claims of the "gods whom they worshipped." Therefore, his

succeeding arguments were the more telling, because they were based upon truths which, if not formally admitted by his hearers, were at least not formally denied.

His first postulate declared the being of the unknown God, his wisdom and power, and the consequent insufficiency of their forms of worship. The disciples of Chrysippus and the disciples of Epicurus were both silenced by this announcement. The fact of God's existence was as probable a fact as that which clothed a universe of inanimate atoms with "all the potency of life." And as one of their teachers had affirmed that the "Creator of chaos" was the First Cause, how much more certainly was the Creator of cosmos entitled to this rank in the universe? These suggestions appear upon the face of the narrative.

Precisely the same argument is applicable to-day in controversies with deniers and doubters. The necessity for belief in a First Cause, is one of the inevitable necessities of humanity. Except by the technical results of logical analysis, either physical or metaphysical, this necessity cannot be evaded. It is a thing that cannot be tested by syllogisms. It is an instinct. It cometh not with observation, and the conviction of its truth cannot be banished from the mental organism. The philosophers who reach the fire-mist by accurately measured steps, do not find a resting place there. And although they profess to rest their case with this attainment, they are forbidden by the laws of logic to pronounce this the final point, and the conclusion will not endure cross-examination. In the argument of Paul, there is no allusion to the authority of revelation, but a cold, remorseless, and resistless logic, proceeding upon a postulate *sine qua non*.

Therefore, man does not attain to the apprehension of deity, in its lowest manifestations, by sensuous perception or by logic. It would seem to be the necessary apprehension of a prerequisite, the instinctive mental vision of an object, as soon as the mind works. The outward organs see only the visible qualities of matter; the inward organs see the invisible qualities of spirit, and doubtless man comes to recognise deity by these mental faculties; but below this mental process there is a spontaneous act of the intuition, that accepts the "needs must be," and apprehends the

cardinal fact of God's existence. The same fact is demonstrable by pure logic, and is also a matter of simple faith. In one form or another the conviction, or rather the apprehension of God, of some sort of a god, is woven into the texture of human consciousness, though there may be no positive manifestation of the experience. And, as in this argument intuitive perception is contended for, an illustration drawn from the lower creation may not be inapplicable. You may take a setter pup, that has had no training whatever, and place it suddenly in a field where the partridge is hidden in the stubble, and the odor of the game-bird awakens in the dog a cognition that had had no previous exercise, and he stops and points. The instinct is the first thing; the after-training is builded upon it. There is not wanting evidence that the ancient philosophers admitted some sort of universal consciousness of deity in man.

“Whom, therefore, ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.”

The first step upon this foundation is the apostle's logical deduction. Given the being of God, then God made the world and all things. Better than protoplasm, the First Cause is a Creator. And as every thing else in the infinite space falls inevitably into the category of creaturehood, there is at once established a relation which involves obligation. The creature must needs be subordinate and obedient to the creator; and the duty growing out of the relation is necessarily operative wherever duty is predicable. You cannot enjoin duties upon dead matter; but upon rational creatures the duty is incumbent, from the fact of creaturehood, and therefore man's chief end is to glorify God. The objection to this doctrine, which is common enough in the world, is not well taken. It dishonors the Creator, say the unbelieving philosophers, to charge him with the creation of intelligent man for his own glory; surely some nobler motive might be imagined. Whereas, in point of fact, if you exclude all other ideas and all other relations from your thought, a Creator could make a creature for no other purpose. And as this is the primal relation, the obligation to glorify God is the primal obligation.

The next point the disputant reaches suddenly discovers a new relation. This Creator, from the necessity of the case, is

Lord of heaven and earth, and the creatures of his hand are necessarily his subjects and servants. The Epicurean gods were invested with certain powers, but being indolent deities, totally indifferent about the petty concerns of earth—their power was neither invoked nor deprecated. These polished heathen were logically inferior to the ruder savage, who threw a fragment of yam to the fetish he recognised in the echo. Because the apprehension of supernatural power, which might be exercised to his hurt, was the natural experience of the creature endowed with mental perceptions, and any inexplicable phenomenon induced the prompt apprehension of the possible propinquity of deity. And not being hampered by the Epicurean philosophy, the untutored savage obeyed the normal impulse, and offered propitiation. Herbert Spencer uses this fact to show the readiness with which humanity falls into superstition. Because the known laws of acoustics reveal the echo, therefore the savage needed only culture to annihilate the fetish. But no amount of culture will annihilate the instinctive apprehension of existent deity, and the consequent sovereign lordship. Fetish is a nobler superstition than fire-mist. From the intuition that cognises godhead, the logical process is to postulate creative power, first, and universal domination, second. Thus far then, the great apostle proceeded upon secure foundations. God is—God is the creator, and therefore the Lord of heaven and earth.

The infinitude of God is now indicated. The being of God is the only “original” suggestion. His power, manifested in creation, is ascertained by the syllogism. His universal domination is co-related to his power, and Paul having invested the First Cause with these attributes, postulates infinity. He dwelleth not in temples made with hands. The Stoics affirmed the potency of the law of relations, calling it “The Inexorable Fate.” The Epicureans had opened the way to the apprehension of infinity, in their deification of space. They also deified the atoms—having no qualities but form and gravitation—wherewith they peopled space in the chaos, and Mr. Tyndall has added very little to these deductions. But the force of Paul’s argument is found in his seizure of the idea of infinity which was predicable of

space as of duration, and having discovered the nonentity in proclaiming the deity, he invested this being with the attribute that was implicitly predicated of the nonentity. The God who made the world was surely entitled to all that could be claimed for space from which chaos was evolved. The materialist who finds all potency in matter, not only annihilates God, but also annihilates man, by ignoring all the intuitions and deductions herein enumerated. And even the attenuated mental exercise—doubt—is logically invested by the materialist with the power that rends a continent in the earthquake.

Thus far the argument has proceeded upon the assumption that the being of God is an intuitively cognised fact which man cannot escape. It is not easy to define the limits of intuitive perception. Says Thornwell:

“The theory of innate ideas in the sense of formed and developed propositions has been long since exploded. So far as any objective reality is concerned, the child is born with a mind perfectly blank. Consciousness is dormant until experience awakens it by the presentation of an object. But though destitute of formed knowledges, the mind has capacities which are governed by laws that constitute the conditions of intelligence. Under the guidance of these laws it comes to know, and whatever knowledge it obtains in obedience to them is natural. Now, as the knowledge of God necessarily emerges from the operation of these laws as soon as our faculties are sufficiently matured, that knowledge is natural—as natural as that of the material world or of the existence of our own souls. We cannot think rightly without thinking God. In the laws of intelligence, of duty, and of worship, he has given us the guides to his own sanctuary, and if we fail to know him, it is because we have first failed to know ourselves. This is the conclusion to which we are legitimately conducted.

“This view of the subject dispenses with the necessity of postulating a presentative knowledge of God, *through a faculty of apprehension adapted to the cognition of the Divine Being, as perception is adapted to the cognition of external objects.*” (Vol. I., page 72.)

This is precisely the point. “The faculty of apprehension” by which the being of God is cognised is the innate faculty, and is intuitive. Dr. Thornwell says: “Man cannot justly be said to know at all without the recognition of the First Cause.” (P. 74.) And he concludes his Lecture on the Being of God in these emphatic words:

“Men have felt, with irresistible certainty, that he exists. The fact being indisputable, when they have been driven by sophistical objections from one method of certifying it, they have immediately resorted to another. When they have been unable to vindicate it as an inference, *they have resolved it into immediate perception*; when they could not ground it in discursive reason, they have grounded it in faith, and made faith a faculty instead of a mental function. The import of all is, that the notion of God cannot be expelled from the human soul. He is, and our nature proclaims that He is, however we may explain the manner of the fact.” (Page 73.)

The explanation of the manner of the fact is found in the sentence italicized in the above paragraph. Up to this point the controversy has tended. The postulate accords with human consciousness. The old Greek found his space-god *there*. The African found his fetish *there*. The Stoic found inexorable fate *there*. And all these notions are caricatures or distorted reflexions of the one substantial verity—Jehovah; and Paul in proclaiming him, appealed to man's nature with the confidence that presaged victory. That God was creator, he inferred; that God was Lord of heaven and earth, he inferred; and that this reigning Creator was infinite, he inferred. But the first proposition commended itself to the secret consciousness of every man that heard his voice.

Going back once more to the starting point, look a little more particularly at the process of thought. If there is a First Cause, the step from causation to creation is a short step. The primal intuition that inexorably demanded the cognition of a Beginner, probably terminated there. But a Beginner cannot be impersonate, and personality implies activity. A cause that produces an effect without the exercise of volition must be a secondary cause, inasmuch as the effect must be the result of a *property* in the contiguous cause, which property is itself an effect. It is not necessary to argue here for a chain of causation, tracking back from the present effect to the utmost limit of finite apprehension in the dim abyss of the unfathomed past. And, with due deference to the ability displayed by the unchristian debaters, it may be said that the star-dust, which is their last ditch, is little better than the desert sands in which the ostrich hides his head to

escape his pursuers. The thinkers who deified the "eternal atoms," and attributed all the phenomena of nature to chance, had in reality deified chance as the active creator of the universe. Because, after investing the eternal atoms (agreeing with Mr. Tyndall in his latest deliverance,) with all the potency of life, they put these atoms in motion; causing them to gravitate in curved lines, so that they would impinge, and from logical necessity made chance the motive power.

The others placed all things existent under immutable law. They acknowledged the existence of gods, but they were gods under the control of this law. So that, logically, their supreme deity was law. But law is not conceivable without a lawgiver, and the Stoic potentially affirmed the absurdity of the Epicurean with a mere change of name. And as inflexible law is the opposite of flexible chance—no chance being predicable of unchanging stability, and no stability predicable of unhampered chance—these two schools of philosophers fell into ranks under the differing names. And therefore the announcement of Paul that God who made the world—the cosmos—the universe and its order, manifesting the operation of law in diurnal changes, regularly recurring, was *ipso facto* the Lord of the heavens where the sun abode and the earth upon which it shone, was an unanswerable proposition.

And so the theory of infinite space on one hand, and of universal law on the other, readily gave place to the infinite entity who filled the space and ordained the law.

Now this Infinite Creator cannot be worshipped with men's hands, or the works of their hands, for two reasons that are self-evident propositions. First, that he is independent of all creatures, in the nature of the case. The Maker cannot become subordinate to the works of his hands; and the recognition of this fact deified the resistless law in one school, and banished the Epicurean deities beyond the reach of human influences in the other. Second, he is the giver of all good—life, breath, and all things to all. It is his royal prerogative to *give*. And if a giver—which he must needs be—then a life-giver; and therefore the living God—infinite in being, power, and dominion, maker

of the cosmos, and therefore infinite in beneficence and infinite in wisdom.

The rapidity with which the great apostle reached these conclusions, at the very outset of his argument, is very remarkable, in view of the mental status of his audience. The philosophers who heard him were by no means deniers—they were doubters, and eager to have their doubts resolved. The unsatisfying character of the multitudinous gods of Athens, made them suspicious of the claims of any new god; and Paul, seizing upon the highest postulates of their philosophy, constructed his argument upon them, without the slightest reference to revelation. Before this august court, he, step by step, presents the foundation truths which man must know to commune with God, and having their acquiescence doubtless, so far as he had gone, he had established the relation subsisting betwixt Jehovah as the infinite King, Maker, and Giver, and his subjects, creatures, and receivers of his bounties.

Instead of deducing the duties flowing from this relation, he suddenly introduces a new one. This Maker of all things, he asserts, had made of one race all the families of men. Up to this point, the second table of the law had not been touched, and now the relations subsisting betwixt brethren of the same race are thus introduced. The prompt response of the courtly heathen was doubtless a denial of this identity. The difference between the polished Greek and the rude Scythian would instantly occur to the minds of the Areopagites, and the tacit admission of the unity of the race, in the admission of the unity of the Creator, would not avail to overcome the rooted prejudice of race. The possession of common attributes was not suggested by the apostle, who was intent only upon establishing the fact of a common relation. But the necessity of his argument required the identity of race, because the duty he afterwards announced was promulgated to all men, everywhere, and upon precisely identical conditions. The difference between Greek and Barbarian was before determined by God, who, creating this one race to inhabit the earth, the cosmos, had authoritatively assigned to them the limits of their habitation. He had fixed their bounds, and had estab-

lished their divergencies. This second point the debater coupled with the first, and so made his argument complete. The Athenian conceit that gave preëminence to their own race, he meets by this assertion, that God had as a sovereign made them to differ, had determined the location of each family and the times of each generation, and that he was not distant from each one or every one of the children of men. "For," he concludes, "in Him we live and move and have our being." And with this assertion, and in support of it, he quotes, probably from Aratus, "For we are his offspring," thus introducing the final relation, founded upon the universal fatherhood of God.

This idea had long been engrafted upon Greek mythology. Jupiter was worshipped as the father of gods and men; and as this curious system was woven into the literature of the most enlightened people of ancient times, it must either have come to them through traditions having a supernal origin, or have been evolved from the thinking of the wisest. Zeus, with all the absurd fables attached to his history, was always a caricature of the supreme deity, and the fatherhood of the Creator would be readily admitted by one who apprehended the cardinal idea of absolute reigning deity. Besides, the earthly relation subsisting betwixt father and child, was an ever-present type and shadow of the supernal relation, and the philosopher could not evade the necessity of analysing the shadow, or escape the consequent suggestion of the substance.

For example: Nothing in human relations is more nearly absolute than the authority of the father. It is true that it has been hedged about by laws not derived from the Decalogue, yet corresponding with it in essential particulars. And the wise Greek had doubtless discovered the difference between man and other animals in this matter of paternity. The jealous watchfulness of maternal love is manifested universally throughout the great family of mammals; but the manifestation of fatherhood in the sense of authority, defence, or providence, is found no where among creatures except in the race of man. If, therefore, this difference obtains—and it cannot be denied—there must be a reason for it growing out of the relation as subsisting betwixt

intelligent beings ; and fatherhood, involving authority, providence, and defence, is easily predicable of him who created all things and who is supreme Lord of the universe.

The remainder of the apostle's argument is devoted to the duties incumbent upon all men, everywhere, and thus naturally flow from the established relations. Except incidentally, these do not fall within the scope of the present purpose, which has been served by enlarging somewhat upon Professor Christlieb's brief reference to this "first encounter between Christian truth and heathen culture." (P. 3.) The whole of this first lecture, treating of the "existing breach between modern culture and Christianity," is extremely interesting, as well as instructive. He examines first, the "causes of the breach ;" second, the "extent of the breach ;" and third, propounds the question, "Can the breach be filled up ?" It is noticeable that this magnificent discourse upon Mars' Hill is again referred to in his second lecture, upon "reason and revelation," where he formally quotes Paul's announcement of the duty, and the ground of it. "It (the Bible) affirms it to be the duty of all men, even of the heathen, to seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him ; because he is not far from any one of us, and we also are his offspring." (P. 70.) And as confirming much of the foregoing argument touching the instinctive cognition of Deity, the succeeding sentence may be quoted. "The Bible recognises the existence in man of *a spiritual eye*, by means of which he obtains and possesses light in respect to his relation to God." (*Ibid.*) On the next page, he quotes from Aristotle: "Although invisible to every mortal nature, God is yet manifested by his works." And from Cicero: "Thou seest not God, and yet thou knowest him from his works."

With this beginning, Dr. Christlieb proceeds to discuss the modern non-biblical conceptions of God ; the theology of Scripture and of the Church ; the modern negation of miracles ; modern anti-miraculous accounts of the Life of Christ ; modern denials of the Resurrection, and the modern critical theory of primitive Christianity. In almost all of these discussions the author is thoroughly orthodox, though there are some

passages in which the evident fairness of the debater leads him into the use of questionable phrases. The admission that "the Athanasian creed is evidently too stiffly *arithmetical* in some of its definitions and antitheses," is an admission that should not be made, if only because this creed has been the acknowledged faith of the Church for many centuries. And again, the prompt abandonment of the disputed text, 1 John v. 7, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one," (p. 243,) was by no means necessary to his argument. In Vol. XXII., No. 2, of this REVIEW, (April, 1871,) there may be found an able examination of the "Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek," in which this identical passage is elaborately examined. In support of the authenticity of 1 John v. 7, the writer presents two or three weighty suggestions. First, the internal evidence; that is, the necessity for this identical statement to complete the argument of the apostle. Second, the acceptance of the passage by such authorities in the primitive Church as Tertullian and Cyprian, and the direct appeal of the Council of Carthage to this very verse, in their contest with the Arians. Third, the strong probability that Origen, half Sabellian and half Arian, had purposely tampered with the MSS.; and finally, that the real point to decide related to the probability, on one hand, of Arian mutilation of the text, or on the other, of trinitarian interpolation. Which probability is the more urgent?

The doctrine of the text is to be found all over the New Testament, and therefore it is less important to defend it. But the true objection lies against the abandonment of any vantage ground, without a contest. No matter whether the passage is vitally important or not. The principle involved is always important; and it would have been better for Dr. Christlieb to challenge the proof of interpolation, which objectors would have some trouble to find. The "general concession" of which he speaks, is doubtful.

Nevertheless, in all his lecture upon the doctrine itself, he is pronounced enough. Not a taint of Arianism can be found in his work. "The doctrine of the Trinity," he says, "is the con-

summation and the only perfect protection of Theism." (P. 271.) In so far as he relies upon Scripture proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, there are, of course, abundant texts that announce this doctrine in unmistakable language; but in controversies with doubters and deniers, it is needful first to prove the authenticity of the Revelation.

For the sake of the argument, it may be premised that if God gave a revelation at all, it is probable that the Bible would be the sort of revelation from such a God to such creatures as men. The authority of the Creator and Ruler, modified by the love of the Father would naturally induce the tone in which God therein addresses men. It is true that certain accidental obstacles, so to speak, would hinder the manifestation of the fatherly love, but these are unnatural obstacles; and in fact the gospel is designed to remove them, and to restore the normal relation. But, considering man as free from the taint of sin, the tokens of paternal affection might be expected from God. And supposing the beneficent Father foreseeing the fall, and having purposes of redemption in his mind, the fatherhood would induce this revelation of warning, instruction, and invitation.

The probability of a revelation appears from the fact that the intuitive cognition of deity does not imply anything like an adequate knowledge of God. In their natural condition, since the fall, the address of Paul upon Mars' Hill is suited to every man of the race—"Whom ye, as unknown, worship"—for while God is not far from every one of us, he is not comprehensible, or even apprehensible, except by faith. The instinctive apprehension is vague and varying; he is not cognisable by sensuous perception; he cannot be known by the mysterious faculty by which the phenomena of spirit are perceived; he cannot be measured by logical reasoning. And there remains but one other avenue through which truth can reach the soul, to wit, by faith; that is, by the credence given to testimony. Therefore, if man is to know God, whom he "cannot find out by searching," it must needs be by a revelation from the Infinite to the finite.

That man must know God is probable, because the end of creation cannot otherwise be met. A creature constituted as man

is constituted, with mental and moral attributes distinguishing him from all the rest of animate creation, so far as his knowledge extends, cannot glorify a Maker of whom he is ignorant. The Stoics recognised the distinction between vice and virtue, and even had some dim apprehension of possible retributions hereafter. And it is probable that their philosophy would have evolved more distinct postulates upon this point, had they not been perpetually hampered by their prime axiom that deified fate. One cannot withhold the admiration due to the traits exhibited by these ancient thinkers, when their philosophy was tested by the sharpest experiences. Their contempt of all adventitious occurrences; their sublime patience in the midst of sufferings; their unswerving submission to their god, Fate, were all caricatures of Christian virtues. If they had received the knowledge of the true God by revelation, and manifested the same exemplary acquiescence in the divine will as that they yielded to the decrees of fate, they would have shamed many professors of a later generation. But lacking the knowledge of God, all their philosophy was vain, and their lives and teaching neither honored God nor benefited man. It is doubtful whether any other school of unbelievers have done more than these; and in the last analysis, the difference between the Fatalism of the Stoic and the Calvinism of the Christian, is in the object which either invests with infinite power.

That the revelation would come in the manner asserted, is probable. "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." If one will endeavor to conceive of any other method by which God could communicate his will to the world—a world in revolt—he will find insurmountable difficulties in the way. If it be suggested that he might have communed directly with the souls of men, the answer is, that he does. Nothing short of the actual touch of the divine Spirit can vitalise the human soul, dead in trespasses and sins. But God cannot produce a regular and formulated system of truth in this wise; and the inevitable demand of the logical, moral humanity, endowed with the freedom of volition, must be for an accurate system of belief. So the communication of *life* by the direct work of God

upon the soul, only prepares it for the reception of the revealed truth. The men through whose agency God made the revelation, were selected and equipped by God for the special work; and the symmetry of his wonderful working is herein manifested, as each prophet was the type of the one Prophet appointed of God for the special work of instructing a redeemed race. Again, if it be suggested that God might have opened up intercourse betwixt himself and man by the mediation of angels, the answer is, that a mediator must be the peer of man, and the rank of the angelic host is not equal in the scale of creation to that of the race to which they are ministering spirits. When God revealed the one Mediator, it was Jehovah Jesus—the peer of both God and man—so meeting the existing exigencies of the case.

If it be suggested, finally, that God might have instituted and continued an intercourse face to face, so constant that the creature would never be free from the influence of the presence, and so kept from the possibility of disobedience and alienation, the answer is, that God must then have constituted man differently, and in a lower rank, because the royalty of the race is involved in the possibility of the lapse. The highest work of creative power, man, the lord of creation—the doubters being judges—loses his status under the supposition that destroys his will. And after the fall, this intercourse was not possible, because the moral laws that settle all questions of propriety, are the reflexion of the character of God. It would not be possible for God to hold direct intercourse with a revolted race, without annihilating his attributes. And the messengers he selected as the media of his revelation, were men whom he had made the trophies of the grace they themselves proclaimed. And the internal evidence of the things they propound, abundantly establishes the authenticity of the message. It is not credible that the most enlightened members of the human family could have been deceived by so monstrous a fraud as a pretended revelation from God, throughout these long centuries.

Christian teachers are accustomed to refer to the history of Christ as the central topic of revelation. In all parts of the scheme, this exalted personage has special, official agency. Ac-

cordingly, Strauss and Renan, notably among the deniers, devote their chief energies to the task of eliminating from this life all that makes it differ from the ordinary lives of men. Professor Christlieb, in his sixth lecture, examines these two authors, and effectually exposes their errors and ignorance. It may be said this is the most valuable part of his work. The labored unfairness of Strauss, and the shallow flippancy of Renan, are visibly portrayed: the German reducing the Redeemer to a myth, the Frenchman making him the hero of a novel, and both utterly failing to see aught in this wondrous life beyond the figments of superstitious credulity, or the imagination of romance-makers. Commending this instructive lecture to the reader as one that will amply repay the closest study, it may be profitable to consider briefly the efforts of still more modern writers who have produced books upon the same absorbing topic.

The first work to notice, as a type of recent semi-heretical productions, is Dr. Howard Crosby's *Life of Christ*. This author having been a traveller in Oriental lands, was probably induced to write his book by the hope of improving upon the wholly heretical histories of Strauss and Renan. These were avowed deniers, and Crosby brought to his task certainly an avowed belief in revelation. Secondly, his knowledge of the Holy Land, and his acquaintance with the habits of the people, with the scenes made famous by inspired historians, and with the controversies which had rent the Church since the second century, gave him special fitness for the work. But the fatal obstacle to success was his apparent ignorance of theology as a formulated science. Some of his postulates cut across the most exact definitions of orthodox belief, and are as absurd in logic as they are blasphemous in theology. To illustrate: While he recognises the vicariousness of the life and death as one of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, he asserts that "Christ had no conscious divinity until after his resurrection." And there is no event of the Life, as recorded in the four Gospels of which he treats, that he does not explain upon purely human hypotheses. The things he did and endured for the redemption of a lost race, are usually attributed to faith in active exercise,

and to inherent manliness of character. The reader of Dr. Crosby cannot escape the conclusion, if they believe in their author, that the same things could be done and suffered by any pious man who might be commissioned by God for this special work, and who was constant in the performance of such holy duties as prayer, meditation, and study of the ancient Scriptures. Dr. Crosby, of course, does not say this in exact terms, but this is the precise drift of his whole book. Except for the open hostility of Renan and his total omission of evangelical doctrine, he is very little farther from the true conception of the Lord's human history than Dr. Crosby. The heathen philosophers, who chained their deities in the fetters of inexorable fate, were nearer the truth than either.

This will be apparent from a consideration of those passages of Scripture which represent God's acts of grace as constantly conformable to the law of rectitude, which is his essential attribute. It is impossible for God to lie. The salvation of sinners is not possible, nor *thinkable*, any otherwise than by God's method. The substitution of a divine victim in human nature, who dies under the curse entailed upon humanity, is the only thinkable mode of deliverance from the curse. The accurate performance of obligations under a solemn covenant, is the only thinkable method for the production of an imputable righteousness. And the imputation of guilt to the vicar, and of righteousness from the vicar, are the only thinkable conditions prerequisite to a full reconciliation betwixt God and the sinner. In these statements, it is taken for granted that God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his justice, holiness, and truth. And while there may be thinkable deified entities, who are not possessed of these attributes, no thinker can accept the God postulated by Paul on Mars' Hill, without investing him with them. It is also assumed that the *works* of God's free grace, wrought in the heart, and manifested in the life of the transformed sinner, are the natural, *inevitable* fruits of this double imputation.

A very different work is "The Life of Christ," by the Rev. William Hanna, D. D., LL.D., published five or six years ago

in Edinburgh, and republished by the Carters in 1871. There is so much that is instructive and charming in these volumes, that any unfavorable criticism must be offered with regret. But *all* such works are, of necessity, humanitarian. The Life of Christ has been written under inspiration, in fourfold form; and all that God intended the Church to know of that mysterious life, is therein contained. And the attempt to analyse the acts and words of the Lord, for the sake of discovering the *human* motives that impelled him to do or to speak in the manner recorded, is profane, to use the mildest term of objection. Dr. Hanna, in his preface, says: "The human and the divine so meet and mingle in the complex character of our Lord, and in their combination were so singularly illustrated in his words and acts, that if his divinity be denied, his humanity becomes mutilated, stained, and degraded!" How is it possible for the same pen to write the following? In speaking of the Temptation of Christ he says: "We may be sure that by temptations the same in outward form no other human being shall ever be assailed. But setting aside all that was special in them, let us lay our hand on the radical and essential principle of each of these three temptations, that we may see whether each of us is not still personally exposed to it." (Vol. I., p. 201.)

The illustrations he presents will not endure examination. The first temptation he says was "to use a power that he got for other purposes, to minister to his own gratification." The objection to this statement is found in the implication that the man Jesus was invested with divine power, whereas the correct form of expression would reverse the proposition. The mighty God, possessed of unlimited power, took humanity into union with his person. Then he adds: "He is tempted, in fact, to use unlawful means to procure food." This is not true. There is no moral quality under any law known to or obligatory upon humanity, that would be violated by turning stones into bread. The gravamen of the devil's assault was his challenge of the divine power—"If thou be the Son of God." How can such an assault be addressed to the sons of men?

These apocryphal Gospels, being generated in the recognised
VOL. XXVI., NO. 2—18.

Christian Church, are far more hurtful than any assaults from without. There is nothing in the Gospels of Schenkel, Strauss, or Renan, that can do much harm to the believer, because the arguments these employ are marshalled under the banners of doubt, and the citadel of the soul is not taken by surprise. But the more modern "Lives" (one alas! is now being constructed by Henry Ward Beecher!) are apologetic theses constructed in defence of the truth! And readers who are only partially enlightened in the fundamentals of Christian doctrine, do not detect these insidious methods of sapping the foundations. The energy devoted to the task of extracting an example for human imitation from the mysterious history of the Temptation, is ill-directed and profitless and profane.

The concluding passages in Dr. Christlieb's book are models of beauty and orthodoxy. This discussion can have no better ending than the quotation of one of his latest paragraphs, an address to believers:

"Let me beg of you *not to place all doubters indiscriminately in one class. Some of them seek, in order to find. These we must never despair of. God gives success to the upright. Others, however, seek in order to lose, and to cast away one article after another of the old faith; they diligently gather together specious arguments in favor of the unbelief which suits them; they have soon settled the question, mostly without any great inward conflicts, and are then inaccessible to all arguments: so that, as a rule, not human words, but only divine deeds, can set their heart and head right once more. In such cases, the Christian's rule will be to strive less against them with human arguments, than for them before God, with the weapons of his Christian priesthood. As against such opponents, the best argument, and that most likely to make an impression, is the actual proof of a Christian moral life. And while we lament that in our day so many are striking at the foundations of our faith, let us not forget to take to ourselves a share of the blame. The most convincing proof for the great deeds of God, such as the resurrection, does not consist, nor ever has consisted, in words; but it is now, as it was eighteen hundred years ago, the living Church itself, in which the risen Lord is dwelling and working, which counts all things for loss that she 'may know him and the power of his resurrection.'* So long as through our fault this spiritual life is lacking, there will never be any scarcity of doubters and deniers of our faith."

These are sound words; and they suggest the inquiry which

may be addressed to all doubters: How does it happen that all orthodox writers, differing as they may differ upon a hundred minor points, invariably utter the same sound, and speak in perfect unison, when they refer to the person and work of Jesus Christ Jehovah, as the chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely?

ARTICLE VIII.

HISTORY OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti et Œcumenici Concilii Vaticani, Die 8 Decembris, 1869, a SS. D. N. Pio P. IX. inchoati. Friburgi Brisgovix: 1871.

Documenta ad Illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum anni 1870. Gesammelt und herausgegeben von Dr. JOHANN FRIEDRICH. Nördlingen: 1871.

Letters from Rome on the Council. By QUIRINUS. Reprinted from the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. Authorised Translation. London: 1870.

For three hundred years after the Council of Trent had closed its sittings in 1564, no ecclesiastical assembly professing to be in any sense œcumenical, met in Christendom. The experience gathered by successive Popes at Constance, at Basle, and even at Trent, did not favor any repetition of the experiment. These great councils had shewn signs of a desire to assert their independence. The members of them had manifested an amount of insubordination, which made it difficult to persuade them to do the exact thing which the papal court expected them to do. Besides, there was some danger of a council putting itself into antagonism to the governments of Europe, and of thus precipitating a conflict, from which the Church was not likely to escape without damage, and which, for that reason, it would be the part of wisdom to postpone and to avoid. For such reasons, it was

generally believed that the world would never see another General Council.

Under these circumstances, Christendom was taken somewhat by surprise when, on the 26th of June, 1867, Pope Pius IX. announced that it was his design to summon, at an early day, a General Council at Rome, to deliberate on grave and important matters affecting the interests of the Church. Though the bishops, to whom this intimation was made, professed to receive it with pleasure, some of them, we can well believe, were alarmed at the prospect; and all the more so, that there was nothing, at that time, in the condition of the Church to make it necessary to incur the risk of such a dangerous experiment. But Pius knew well what he was about. He had a grand project before his mind, and to him and his advisers it seemed that the times were ripe for its accomplishment.

Pio Nono, though inferior to many of his predecessors in culture, has never had a superior among them in purity of morals, in suavity of manners, in rigid tenacity of purpose, and in the desire to leave behind him a great and historic name. From the first, he cherished the ambition of doing something which should make his pontificate worthy of being remembered in after ages. The fall of the temporal power—an event the consummation of which was then imminent—was likely enough to give him the celebrity that he desired; but a man in his position may well be pardoned for wishing to associate his name with something great, but not so calamitous in its nature. His early association with the Liberal party in Italy, from the ruinous consequences of which French intervention alone had saved him; the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith in 1854; and the celebrated Encyclical of December 8, 1864, with its Syllabus of eighty errors placed by him under ecclesiastical ban, might have been sufficient to signalise the pontificate of a man who had sat in the chair of Peter for a longer period of years than any of the two hundred and fifty-six men who preceded him in office. But even these were not enough. Two ideas, which had weakened the power of many of his predecessors, and which, if let alone, might be productive of evil at a future day, had yet to

be rooted out of the Church. One of these was the notion that a General Council has it in its power to limit the authority, or even reverse the decisions, of a Pope; the other, that bishops have some authority of their own, derived from Christ through the apostleship, and independent of the chair of Peter. It would, he thought, consolidate the papal power and smooth the way of all his successors till the end of time, if these two ideas were formally condemned. It might then be affirmed as a Christian dogma, that church power comes down from Christ through the Pope only, and that no bishop has any right or privileges farther than he is pleased to permit; and also, that while councils may and ought to join the successor of Peter in testifying to the truth, it is he alone who is able to testify as to what is the truth without possibility of error. If a General Council could be induced to affirm these two propositions—*that*, of course, was not understood at Rome to be necessary to the truth of the doctrine contained in them, but it would silence objectors. Never again could any man have the face to appeal from the Pope to a General Council, if a General Council itself had abnegated its rights, and had acknowledged the Pope to be the only source of power in the visible Church. Were it to do so, Gallicanism would receive its deathblow and trouble Christendom no more. Ever after, the personal declaration of the vicar of Christ would end all controversy. In presence of the condemnation of the ONE INFALLIBLE MAN, Rationalism would not venture to speak, Communism would not lift its head, and Protestantism itself would wither and die. Results so beneficial seemed deserving of a vigorous effort in order to attain them, and could not fail to make illustrious the pontificate in which they were secured.

Moreover, Pio had good reason for believing that the means by which he hoped to reach these results were not impracticable, or even difficult. No previous pontiff, as he well knew, was more popular with the clergy. As misfortunes, arising from his relations with the Italian government, and from the loss of most of his territorial dominions, descended upon him in a series of successive strokes, the Catholic bishops made his sufferings their own, and gathered around the throne of their chief with the

greater love and veneration. Besides, the eternal city, under protection of French troops, was still subject to his rule ; but it was uncertain how long, in the casualties of political action, the little strip of territory which he governed might enjoy immunity from invasion. Above all, the Jesuits were in favor of the movement. However ambitious of power that aspiring order might be, it could not object to see the Pope absolute ruler of the Church, so long as it remained, what it has been for some time, absolute ruler of the Pope. Nor was it likely that the Catholic governments of Europe would throw any serious difficulty in the way ; most of them had stood aside, and looked quietly on, to see the vicar of Christ despoiled of most of his possessions, and all of them were shy in cultivating the friendly alliance which had existed between them and Rome in former ages. They could scarcely complain now if the Church took them at their word, and pursued its own way, without asking either their coöperation or advice. Ancient Rome, when the sceptre of dominion over the nations dropped from her hands, seized the sceptre of dominion over human souls, and long held undisputed sway alike over their faith and their life. Now that the vicar of Christ was being despoiled of his territories by sacrilegious force, and that enemies were rejoicing over the approaching overthrow of his temporal jurisdiction, would it not be a grand and masterly stroke to take up a new position, which should enable him to claim the sovereignty, not of one poor little province in central Italy, but of all Christian governments, and, with the concurrence of all Catholic bishops, to have himself acknowledged the one infallible monarch upon earth ?

There is now little doubt that thoughts like these were in the mind of the pontiff when, on the 29th of June, 1868, he issued a bull convoking a General Council to meet at Rome on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception in the following year, the 8th of December, 1869, for the purpose of providing a remedy for the existing evils by which society was afflicted. In this bull, however, he gave no hint of the one grand remedy which there is reason to think had already been resolved upon at the Vatican. That was to appear in due time.

In the interval, nothing was left undone to impress the whole Christian world with the importance of the event which was about to take place. Invitations were addressed to the prelates of the Greek Church, and of the Nestorian and Monophysite Churches of the East not in communion with the Apostolic See, urging them on this occasion to unite with their Latin brethren, and to renew the bonds of ancient brotherhood. The Anglican bishops being judged heretical, were of course ignored; but on the 13th September, 1868, an appeal from Rome was addressed to Protestants and to other non-Catholics, reminding them of the marks of the one true Church, calling their attention to the injuries inflicted on society by their sects and divisions, and urging them to take the opportunity afforded by the Council to be reconciled to the Church from which their ancestors had departed. This was followed up by an apostolic letter, dated 11th of April, 1869, promising full remission of sins to all who, between the 1st of June following and the day fixed for the meeting of the Council, should visit their parish churches on two separate occasions, and there pray devoutly for the conversion of the erring, for the spread of the holy faith, and for the triumph and peace of the Catholic Church. The faithful over Christendom rushed to the altar and took advantage of the very easy terms on which pardon was offered. The Protestants almost everywhere responded to the appeal made to them to reënter the Church, with significant silence. But the Oriental prelates, representing a numerical aggregate of some seventy or eighty millions of professing Christians not in communion with Rome, were more emphatic in their refusal to accept the papal invitation.

The Patriarch of Constantinople receives the spiritual homage of some eighty archbishops and one hundred and seventy bishops. Upon this great ecclesiastic the Pope's legate, having previously given notice of his intention, waited at the time appointed, for the purpose of presenting him with a splendidly bound copy of the Pope's Encyclical. The Patriarch did not take the document into his hand, but by a peculiar movement signified his wish that it should be laid upon the divan. The legate then made a short statement explanatory of the object of the Council. The reply

of the Patriarch in substance was: "It is useless I should go to a council in which a discussion so often fruitlessly undertaken before, can only divide men's minds still further: the Oriental Church will never abandon the doctrine that it has received from the apostles, and which has been handed down by the holy fathers and general councils." At the close of this speech, the successor of Chrysostom and Photius beckoned with his hand, whereupon his secretary took up the Encyclical, which all this time the Patriarch did not deign to read or even to touch, and replaced it in the hands of the legate, remarking to him as he did so, that "the Greek Church would never recognise the Pope's infallibility, nor the domination that he assumed over General Councils, nor the monarchy that he exercised over the Church." The answer of the other great Oriental prelates was to the same effect. In a word, the one hundred and fifty millions of Greek and Protestant Christians refused to participate in any way whatever; so that instead of being Œcumenical, in the true sense of the word, the Council came to be what, from the first, Pius knew well it would be, representative of the Latin Church alone.

Meanwhile preparations were going forward at Rome, with the view that, when the prelates should assemble, they would have little to do except to ratify the proposals submitted to them. The subject of infallibility had not been mooted in the original bull of convocation; and as if to turn the minds of the bishops in another direction, so early as the 6th of June, 1867, a circular was sent them, embodying seventeen questions on points of discipline, and requesting an answer. Six special commissions, consisting mostly of Roman canonists, each presided over by a cardinal, and each with a distinct class of subjects intrusted to it, were appointed to sit and arrange material for the meeting. The Pope himself decreed that the Council should hold its solemn sessions in the basilica of St. Peter's; that all the deliberations should be conducted in Latin, the official language of the Church; and that all the members should sit in the order of their rank. All the officials, the presidents and secretaries, were to be named by the Pope. It was arranged that four "congregations" or commissions—one on doctrine, one on discipline, one on oriental

rites, and one on monastic matters—should be appointed by ballot in the Council ; that they should sit permanently ; and that these congregations—each consisting of twenty-four members, presided over by a cardinal—on the basis of the rough drafts drawn up by the commissions appointed by the Pope, should prepare the decrees. These proposed decrees, having been printed, were to be distributed to the members of Council, and then on an appointed day they were to come up before the “ general congregation ;” that is, before the whole council, in secret session, for consideration and discussion. Members wishing to address the general congregation were to send in their names a day previously, in order that each might have an opportunity to speak in the order of his rank, but before the close of the sittings it was found necessary to modify this arrangement. In case there was no difference of opinion in the general congregation, the vote was to be taken at once ; but in case of a serious difference, the proposed decrees were to be sent back for revision, and brought again before the general congregation at a future meeting. When a public, or, as it was called, a *solemn* session of the Council was held, it was held simply for the public adoption of the decrees already adopted in private session ; no speeches were then allowed ; and no man then had the power of saying more than *Placet*, or *Non-placet*, to the proposal. The public vote having been taken, the Pope, who at the solemn session was to preside in person, would announce the result and decree accordingly. No member was at his own option to submit a proposal even to the general congregation. It had first to be submitted to a congregation of cardinals, and afterwards to the Pope, that they might decide whether the subject was suitable for consideration. It was in the special congregations that the real business of the Council was transacted, as it was in the general congregation that the discussions were to be held ; but in both everything was to be done in secret, and the outside world was to see and know nothing except what transpired at the solemn sessions. Upon trial, however, it was found that seven hundred men could not keep a secret, and each day’s proceedings in the general congregation made their way out of doors, and in substance were reported in

the papers at Rome, Paris, and Berlin. No member of the Council was to depart from the city without permission—an order which, as Pius was still sovereign ruler of Rome, it was easy for him to enforce; and lest his sudden demise should tempt the prelates to do something not set down in the programme, a special bull was issued, enacting, that in case the Pope should die while the Council was in session, it must immediately dissolve. Every precaution was thus taken that the Council should do exactly what the Pope wished, and that, in case of refusing so to do, it should do nothing.

As the time appointed for the meeting drew near, the more intelligent Greek and Protestant Christians regarded the affair with some curiosity, as a modern reproduction of those great ecclesiastical gatherings, which in ancient and mediæval times had exercised a marked influence on the current theology—a link in the chain of great events, whose rapid unrolling is one of the characteristics of our age. But the more intelligent Catholics viewed the matter with more than a historical interest: in them it awoke anxiety and alarm. Though none outside the papal court knew of a certainty why the Council was called, they, by a kind of instinct, subsequently justified by facts, suspected that its object was to coin a new dogma, and add it to the current list of Catholic doctrines. In the more enlightened circles of France and Germany, it was believed that the real design of the meeting of the Council was to affirm the personal infallibility of the Pope, and all who were sufficiently informed to know the consequences involved in such an article of faith, trembled at the prospect which it opened in the distance. In their anxiety to allay this alarm, the German bishops assembled at Fulda three months before the meeting of the Council, and issued a pastoral in which they stated that a General Council can establish no new dogmas, nor indeed any others than those already written on Catholic hearts; that the only dogma it could affirm is one contained already in Holy Scripture or apostolic tradition, and that its purpose was to set the original truth in clearer light. The design of this manifesto was to remove the popular fears in regard to the infallibility; and yet the studied vagueness with which the pre-

lates express themselves, betrayed a feeling on their part—a possibility that the popular fears might, after all, be realised, and seemed to provide for themselves a line of retreat, of which they could take advantage in case of necessity. Well meant as this manifesto was, it was viewed with dissatisfaction at Rome; and when they followed up their action by forwarding to the Court a joint letter in which all except three remonstrated against the definition of the dogma as inopportune, it is said that the Holy Father was astonished at the presumption of these German bishops in no common degree.

The Council, when it assembled, proved to be a General Council of the Roman Catholic Church, in the very narrowest sense. It contained no representative of the hundred and fifty millions of Christians comprised in the Oriental and Protestant Churches; it did not include an envoy from any of the Catholic governments of Europe. Even France, the eldest son of the Church, which so long had lent its soldiers to guard the Pope in his chair, was not permitted to send an ambassador to the meeting. “Were the privilege granted to France,” said Antonelli, “it could not be refused to the other powers.” France, therefore, had to be shut out, lest, if the door was opened, Austria, Bavaria, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, might venture to step in. This one fact shews clearly the altered position of affairs since the Council of Trent met in 1545, and how much the attitude about to be assumed by the Church was at variance with the principles of modern society.

It is also worthy of remark, that the prelates who sat in council did not represent the laity of the Church in proportion to their numbers and importance. Had all entitled to sit in a General Council of the Romish Church been present, it would have consisted of 1,049 members; but age, illness, and other reasons, made this impossible; as it was, there met in Council 51 cardinals, 10 patriarchs, 9 primates, 115 archbishops, 480 bishops, 22 abbots, and 25 generals and vicar-generals of monastic orders—in all 712. Of these 10 belonged to Australia, 7 to Africa, 76 to America, 84 to Asia, and 535 to Europe. Of the 535 European members, Italy alone supplied 276, all the other countries of

Europe united only 259. Twelve millions of German Catholics were represented in the Council by 14 votes; the States of the Church, with a population less than one million, were represented by no fewer than 62. There were 120 archbishops and bishops *in partibus*, that is, titular bishops who had no dioceses; while Paris, with its two millions of Catholics, and Cologne, with a million and a half, were represented each by one archbishop. Notwithstanding these anomalies, perhaps the Church was never so widely represented in any previous Council. Every country in the world where Catholicism has found a home, sent somebody to speak in its name. From Pagan lands there were present missionary bishops, Malay, Chinese, Negro, and Hottentot. From the distant cities of the East, there had come bishops of small communities which professed allegiance to the Roman See. America for the first time appeared by its representatives in one of the great Christian Councils. The leading capitals of Europe were represented each by one of its most dignified ecclesiastics. Under the dome of St. Peter's there assembled the representative pastors of one hundred and eighty millions of human souls. No other man on earth than Pio Nono could have assembled at his call such a grand array out of so many and so distant nations.

December 8, 1869, proved to be a dark and dismal day; but the downpour of rain did not damp the spirit of the prelates, and the Council met amid the ringing of bells and the thunder of cannon, which, from their iron throats, gave the strangers a noisy welcome. The Pope in person took the chair, and after the usual religious formalities, delivered an address, in which he spoke of dangers surrounding the Church, said that he had called them together to aid him by their advice, and closed by imploring on their behalf the guidance and protection of the Holy Spirit, the Queen of Heaven, of the angels and archangels, of Peter and Paul.

The Council had no sooner met than it was discovered that the arrangements made for conducting business were anything but favorable to free and serious deliberation. The basilica of St. Peter's was constructed for grand ceremonials exhibited to the

eye, not for intellectual appeals addressed through the ear to the understanding; voices lost themselves in the vast void which intervened between the floor and the roof; it required an effort to hear anything; and it was not till near the final close of the sittings that the difficulties so long complained of were to some extent diminished by means of a mechanical contrivance which served as a sounding-board. The effect of requiring all the speeches to be in Latin was, that many from want of practice in Latin composition, were precluded from addressing the Council; those who spoke, usually read speeches that were previously prepared; and the few who were able to make themselves heard, were not very well understood, whether from peculiarities of national pronunciation, or from the rapid utterance of a language which they were not accustomed to use as an instrument of thought. Reply and rejoinder, strictly speaking, there was none; for if a man or his published sentiments were directly assailed in the general congregation, he could not respond till his turn came to speak, which might not be for some weeks after, when the whole matter was but dimly remembered; or if he had already spoken, he must allow the attack to pass in silence, inasmuch as it was not permitted to the same man to speak twice in the same debate. Should a speaker occasionally drop a remark displeasing to the curia, that is, to the cardinals and immediate advisers of his Holiness, or object to the concentration of unlimited power in the hands of one man, he was significantly reminded that he had sworn at his consecration not only to maintain but to increase the rights of the popedom. Reporters from the public press were strictly excluded, and although stenographic writers were employed to take down what was said, members were not permitted afterwards to examine even their own speeches, or to correct any inaccuracy which might have crept into the report. Prelates, not serving on any of the special congregations, were not allowed to hold any external meeting for deliberation in common, nor to print anything till it had passed the censorship, nor to originate any action whatever; the only privilege afforded them was the right of speaking in the general congregation, and of saying *Placet* or *Non-placet* in the solemn session. Even

in the general congregation, the right of speech was not beyond interference; an unpalatable address was usually shortened by the vigorous ringing of the bell of the presiding legate, or interrupted by the prelates scraping their feet along the floor. The ballot for the special congregations, which shaped the decrees, and in fact transacted all the real business, was so adroitly managed that no bishop, known to be opposed to infallibility, was by any chance elected to serve upon any of them; and it is not difficult in these circumstances to imagine how suggestions, handed in by the minority to commissions composed exclusively of opponents, would be received. Anything written by the minority, with the view of explaining or defending their opinions, had to be printed at Naples or Florence; but those in favor of the infallibility, were quite free to have printed at Rome anything which they required. It was evident that the Council had assembled, not so much to deliberate and to do what on the whole seemed best for the good of the Church, as to receive the commands of the Holy Father, and to give expression to his mind rather than its own.

Though the great object of the Council was kept a strict secret in official circles, every man came to Rome with the presentiment upon his mind that it was convened to decree the infallibility, and the members were classed with the majority or the minority according as they favored or opposed the dogma. The majority, supposed to number five hundred at least, consisted mostly of Italians, and of titular prelates without sees and without people, the latter of whom were lodged and boarded in Rome at the Pope's expense, and, as a matter of course, were hot for infallibility. The minority, supposed to be unfriendly to the dogma, were mostly Hungarian, German, French, and American prelates—men whose theological culture had been derived from something more liberalising than the study of the canon law. But the influence of the minority was weakened by a division in their own ranks—some of them opposing the dogma on the ground that it was in direct contradiction to historical fact, others on the lower ground that it was inopportune to proclaim it in present circumstances. The manifest policy of the curia was

first to feel its way and test the actual strength of the minority, and then, after this was ascertained, to use every possible means to break the opposition down, so as to produce virtual unanimity at last. In this the court was only too successful.

So soon as the special congregations were appointed, they set to work, and drew up *schemata*, that is, rough drafts of decrees, which it was hoped the general congregation would, with slight change, adopt, and the Council, in solemn session, affirm. These *schemata* were each a little treatise on a particular subject, divided into chapters and sections, as if the design had been that the Council at its close should issue a complete code of theology and discipline. Each *schema* was intended to be a complete official deliverance upon its own subject. Fifty-one of these *schemata*, it was understood, were to be submitted to the Council, namely, three on the subject of faith; twenty-eight on discipline; eighteen on religious orders; and two on oriental church affairs. But the progress of business was so much slower than had been anticipated, that on the 8th of March, three months after the Council met, not one of the *schemata* had been finally adopted; only five of them had been discussed in the general congregation; twelve were then in the hands of members; and thirty-nine had not as yet emerged from the special commission to be distributed among the bishops for consideration. At this rate of progress, years must have elapsed before the Council could get through the work which its conductors had carved out for it. It was not destined to sit so long; and yet it did not separate till it had performed the main duty for which it was convened.

The first SCHEMA laid before the general congregation was that ON FAITH, which came up so early as the 28th of December. Originally it had consisted of eighteen chapters, but when it had passed the ordeal of discussion in the general congregation, it was reduced to very modest dimensions indeed. The first solemn session of the Council was fixed for the 6th of January, in the hope that before that time it would be ready for being publicly affirmed; but the opposition to it was so much greater than had been expected, that when the day arrived there was no de-

cree ready for public ratification, and the fathers, rather than separate without doing anything, repeated publicly the oath which each of them had already taken at the time of his ordination.

The opposition to this *schema* was strong in the general congregation. On the day it was introduced, seven prelates spoke against it, and on the 30th of December five others, all of whom objected to it mainly on the ground that it was unsafe for the Church to pledge itself to any narrow definition. It was sent back for revision. On the 16th of March it was again distributed in an amended form, with the view of considering it in the general congregation on the 18th; but so many sent in their names as wishing to speak on the subject, that the design of holding another solemn session on the 25th of March, for its public ratification, had also to be abandoned.

It was in course of a debate on the amended draft, on the 22d of March, that a memorable scene occurred. A Hungarian prelate, Strossmayer, bishop of Bósnia and Sirmium, spoke that day in his turn. Referring to a passage of the *schema*, where the unbelief and rationalism of the present age are said to have had their origin in the Reformation, and in the rejection by Protestants of the decrees of the Council of Trent, he called attention to the well-known historical fact, that in the centuries before the Reformation religious indifference and heresy were common, and that the unbelief, which attained its climax in the French Revolution, had manifested itself, not in a Protestant, but in a Catholic nation: he reminded them of the distinguished services which Protestants, by their able answers to infidel arguments, had rendered to the cause of Christianity in general, and added that all Christians were under obligation to such writers as Leibnitz and Guizot. Each of these statements was received with murmurs, but the murmurs at last rose to a very torrent of indignation. The president, Cardinal De Angelis, cried out most appropriately, considering that the Palace of Inquisition stood at no great distance from the spot where the Council was assembled, "This is no place for praising Protestants." Amid the uproar, Strossmayer exclaimed, "That alone can be imposed

upon the faithful as a dogma, which has the moral unanimity of the bishops in its favor." The obvious bearing of this general principle upon the doctrine, which, though not yet under discussion, was nevertheless present to every mind, stirred the feelings of the Council. Several prelates sprung to their feet, rushed to the tribune, and in wild excitement shook their fists in the speaker's face, exclaiming, "Shame! shame! down with the heretic!" The tumult was awful. The Bishop of Marseilles had the courage to shout amid the din, "I do not condemn him," but his voice was borne down by the response of the majority, "We all, all of us, condemn him." One bishop did not think it beneath his dignity to call the speaker a "damnable heretic." The president, who kept ringing his bell throughout the commotion, succeeded at last in quelling the noise, and informed Strossmayer that he was out of order; whereupon the speaker descended from the tribune, after having first solemnly protested against the unbecoming treatment that he had received. It was estimated that from two hundred to four hundred bishops took part in this discreditable scene. An American prelate afterwards remarked that he "now knew at least one assembly rougher in its deliberations than the Congress of his own country."

The general debate on the *schema* being concluded, the general congregation proceeded to examine the various chapters in detail. On the 29th of March the first voting took place, when the preamble was adopted in a modified form; and afterwards daily sessions were held on other parts of the draft. On the third chapter no fewer than one hundred and twelve amendments were proposed, but the discussion on these was conducted in a much more quiet way than that of the 22d of March. The result of the protracted debate was, that the *schema* as adopted was reduced from eighteen to four chapters, introduced by a preamble, and having appended to them eighteen canons anathematising all contrary opinions. The third solemn session of the Council was held on the 24th of April, and at this meeting, some five months after the Council opened, the first decrees were passed. Strossmayer and some other bishops stayed away, so that a unanimous vote of the six hundred and sixty-seven members present on that

day was obtained in favor of the "Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith." The form of promulgation ran thus: "Pius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, with the approval of the sacred Council, for perpetual remembrance, declares," and so on. Some took exception to his Holiness assuming to promulgate the decrees in his own name; but it was made a point of honor with the curia that they should be published, not in the name of the Council, but in the name of the Pope, with the Council's approbation. It was so done accordingly; and after the decree was pronounced in due form, the Pope gave to the assembled fathers the benediction of peace.

The Dogmatic Constitution, thus unanimously adopted as the public expression of the mind of the Roman Catholic Church, traces up the errors of Atheism, Pantheism, Materialism, and Rationalism, at present existing in the world, to the fact that so many rejected the divine authority of the Church as expressed in the decrees of the Council of Trent, and claimed the right of private judgment—that is, to Protestantism; for though it is not expressly named, *that* is what is meant in reality. It entirely overlooks that Protestantism, as a religious system, has never sanctioned these errors, that few Protestants, comparatively, have adopted them, and that their ablest antagonists have been always found in the Protestant Churches. The first chapter, treating of the nature of the Divine Being, is unexceptionable; but the second chapter reaffirms the old Romish doctrine that supernatural revelation is contained both in written books and unwritten traditions; that the true sense of Scripture is that which has been held, and is held, by holy Mother Church; and that no one is permitted to interpret Scripture contrary to this sense and to the unanimous consent of the fathers. The third chapter, on Faith, appeals to the Church as herself a witness for her divine mission and an evidence for Christianity, by reason of her "admirable propagation, her eminent holiness, her inexhaustible fecundity, her catholic unity, and her invincible stability;" thus setting forth once more the old and often-refuted sophism, that everything true of the universal body of God's saints in the world, is true of the Romish Church alone. The fourth chapter, on Faith

and Reason, defines "that every assertion contrary to the truth of enlightened faith, is utterly false;" forbids Christians to defend, as legitimate conclusions of science, such opinions as are known to be contrary to the teaching of the faith, especially if they have been reprobated by the Church; and affirms that the meaning of the sacred dogmas, which the Church has once set forth, is to be perpetually retained, and is not to be departed from under the appearance and pretence of more profound intelligence. The canons appended to the Constitution on Faith, pronounce an anathema on all who hold atheistic, materialistic, and pantheistic opinions, or who deny the divine inspiration of the Scriptures and the possibility of miracles, or who assert that the progress of science demands that a sense different from that which the Church has understood shall be given to dogmas taught by the Church; and they end by calling on all to labor in warding off and banishing these errors from Holy Church.

The second SCHEMA presented to the Council was ON DISCIPLINE, dealing more particularly with the duties of bishops. Its general tendency seemed to be to centralize all church power in Rome, by curtailing any independent jurisdiction which still remains to the episcopate, and making it helplessly dependent on the papedom. One of its provisions, for example, forbade a prelate to reside temporarily outside the bounds of his diocese, without having first obtained the papal consent, and required the archbishop to report to Rome any bishop who did not comply with this regulation. Another conferred upon the Pope the right of bestowing, during the temporary vacancy in a see, any benefices in the bishop's gift; the obvious effect of which would have been to draw place-hunters in crowds to Rome, and, of course, to bring large sums into the papal coffers.

The draft containing these and other proposals, gave rise to a brilliant debate in the general congregation, during the course of which the curia was obliged to listen to some plain home-truths, which it was not very fond of hearing. It commenced on the 14th of January, and was continued at intervals for several weeks after. In the discussion, Darboy, archbishop of Paris, who afterwards fell a victim to the tyranny of the Commune,

remarked that, in considering the subject, they must speak of the rights, no less than of the duties, of bishops; and Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague, did not hesitate to say that the college of cardinals needed reform no less than the episcopal order.

The great speech, however, was that of Strossmayer, on the 25th of January. The substance of his address was, that reform should not commence with the bishops; it should begin with the highest, and end only with the lowest members of the hierarchy. The popedom itself should be no longer a purely Italian institution; for Catholics in every country of the world should be eligible to office. The Roman congregations should no longer be composed exclusively of Italians, and should be open to ecclesiastics from all parts of the Church, so that religious questions, in future, may be viewed in a less narrow and jealous spirit. The college of cardinals should contain a representation of all Catholic countries in proportion to their population and importance. General Councils ought to be held more frequently—say once in every ten years, as recommended by the Council of Constance. In this way the nations would have presented to them, at frequently recurring intervals, an example of the forbearance, patience, and charity, with which the Church deals with great questions. Provincial Synods, also, should have a definite and acknowledged influence over the appointment of bishops. He went on to speak of the centralisation of power at Rome, as stifling the very life of the Church, and asserted that true unity is not reached by a flat uniformity, but by every national section of the Church retaining its own peculiar institutions. He called the canon law, as it now exists, a “Babylonish confusion,” made up in the main of unpractical, or corrupt, or spurious canons, and said that the world was looking to the Council for a codification of canon law, drawn up, not by Roman canonists, but by learned and practical men from all parts of the Church, and which should be adapted alike to present times and circumstances. In answer to a previous speaker, who had said that the reformation of the college of cardinals might be safely intrusted to their father the Pope, Strossmayer now said that they had

also a mother, the Church, whose office was to give them wholesome advice and instruction, to which they ought to attend. His speech lasted for an hour and a half; and many who heard it said afterwards that no such eloquence in the Latin tongue had been heard for centuries.

Melchers, archbishop of Cologne, also took part in the discussion. He complained of the concentration of ecclesiastical power at Rome; of the system of dispensations always purchasable there; and of its meddling and troublesome domination. Dupanloup, bishop of Orleans, also spoke of "those courtiers who had never learned to tell the truth to the Pope"—a description which, of course, the curia would understand. But one of the most amusing things was said by a Hungarian bishop, when illustrating the evils arising from the necessity of having to apply to Rome for dispensations. He told of a poor woman who came weeping to her bishop, begging him to save her marriage, and her very existence, by a dispensation. But the bishop could not help her in the way she wished; a dispensation could be granted by the Pope only; and from the Pope there was not the slightest chance of obtaining it; for, said the speaker, significantly, "*Mulier non habet pecunias*"—*a woman has no money*. The court prelates took all this very much amiss, and afterwards said of the poor Hungarian bishop, that "he had made himself very disagreeable with his *mulier non habet pecunias*."

The Council was prorogued before this *schema* on discipline had come forth from the ordeal of discussion and was ripe for passing into a decree. It therefore ranks among the lapsed proposals; though, should the Council ever reassemble, it is possible that it may be revived. Meanwhile the discussion upon it is of interest to us, as affording a glimpse of the internal condition and administration of the Romish Church, and as proving that many of its own ablest and most accomplished prelates are anything but satisfied with the existing state of affairs.

There is reason to believe that the original design of the papal court was, that the Council should vote the dogma of Infallibility by acclamation. But circumstances did not favor this design. It was discovered at an early part of the proceedings, that there

was a small but influential minority opposed to it. From the first, the opposition bishops showed a disposition to speak their minds freely and at length; so that there was every probability that the sittings would be very protracted. In the unsettled state of Europe, who could tell what disarrangement might occur to prevent the grand consummation? Some political storm might rise suddenly to disperse the Council before it had time to do the main work for which it had been called together. Considerations of this kind led to the SCHEMA ON THE CHURCH being brought forward at an earlier period than was originally proposed. It was printed and put into the hands of members about the 21st of January.

In its original form it was a lengthy document of 213 pages, and was drawn up so skilfully that the doctrine of the infallibility, which was not stated but implied throughout, could, by a slight addition, be inserted with ease as the natural conclusion to which the whole led up. Three main ideas ran through it all: *first*, that the Pope has an absolute dominion over the whole Church; *second*, that his temporal power as a sovereign prince is one of the doctrines of Christianity; and *third*, that Church and State are inseparable, but only on this condition, that when the two powers come into collision, the Church is always to prevail. To the draft as originally presented, twenty-one canons were attached. On the 6th March, as the court party then more than before were feeling the necessity of coming to the point without delay, the doctrine of the personal infallibility of the Pope was added by way of supplement and conclusion. Up till the 25th of that month, criticisms might be sent in and suggestions offered; and, even after that date, the congregation having the *schema* in charge made various alterations, the object being to preserve the dogma, and, consistently with that, to secure for its definition as much unanimity as possible.

For months the Infallibility was the grand subject to which were directed the thoughts of the leading ecclesiastics of Europe. In the Council, prelates opposed to it soon became known; and some of them were plied with arguments and temptations almost irresistible to side with the majority; while others of them, not

open to conviction, found to their surprise that no difficulty was thrown in the way of their leaving the city and returning home as soon as they pleased. Out of doors, before and after the Council opened, distinguished theologians, such as Newman, Montalembert, Hyacinthe, Gratry, and Döllinger, expressed their mind freely on the matter; most of them against the definition. When the *schema* was actually tabled in the Council, the Catholic governments of Europe remonstrated against the dogma, more particularly against the application of its principles embodied in the canons attached; but even by them Pius was not to be turned from his purpose; and Cardinal Antonelli assured their representatives, with all due suavity, that his master and himself were concerned only about the theory, and that there was no intention on the Pope's part to put the new principles in force.

The debate commenced in the general congregation on the 13th of May. Though all the chapters of the *schema* were before the house, yet the discussion constantly gravitated toward the infallibility, which every one felt to be its heart and soul. It was ominous of a struggle, that upwards of a hundred members sent in their names, as desirous to speak on the subject. Though these were not all heard, yet the great dignitaries of the Council at one time or other had full opportunity of giving expression to their sentiments; of whom only a few of the more important can be noted here.

Dr. Manning, archbishop of Westminster, asserted that infallibility was already a doctrine of the Church, which could not be denied without proximate heresy; and that the Council was then engaged not (as some alleged) in making a new doctrine, but simply in proclaiming a doctrine already in existence. Many would have been prepared to admit that the Pope, speaking in conjunction with the bishops, is infallible; but the great Anglican convert, more Roman than the Romans themselves, was the first to take high ground, and to say out boldly in the Council, that the Pope is infallible, even independently of the episcopate.

Cardinal Cullen, on the 19th of May, made rather a sharp attack on Hefele, bishop of Rottenburg, author of the celebrated work on the Councils, and the highest living authority in that

department of ecclesiastical knowledge. But the speech did not attempt to refute any of Hefele's positions; it was a mere *argumentum ad hominem*, intended to shew that in speaking of Honorius, the historian had contradicted himself.

Simor, primate of Hungary, and now (1874) a cardinal, rather surprised his friends by opposing the dogma. He was succeeded at the tribune by the archbishop of Tuam, Dr. Machale, a man of celebrity thirty years before, when O'Connell rather profanely designated him the "lion of the tribe of Judah," but who appeared before the Council as a feeble old man. His speech was not very effective, but it served to shew at least that all Ireland was not in favor of the dogma. Archbishop Darboy followed, repeatedly declaring that a decree not accepted by the whole episcopate could have no binding force.

The discussion was continued for many successive days, the ablest speakers on both sides taking part in it, and the monotony of debate being occasionally relieved by a little of the grotesque and absurd. Pie, bishop of Poitiers, maintained that the Pope is infallible, *because* St. Peter was crucified with his head downwards. Original as this argument is, it was eclipsed by that of a Sicilian bishop, who said that when St. Peter was preaching in Sicily, he told the people about his infallibility; that the inhabitants, having some doubt about it, determined to send a deputation to the Virgin Mary to make inquiries, and that her answer was that she was present when her Son conferred this prerogative on Peter. He added, that the Sicilians ever since have been warm infallibilists, for the answer of the Virgin quite removed all their doubts. If this be true, the Sicilians are certainly very advanced theologians.

Valerga, titular bishop of Jerusalem, was less absurd, but not more convincing. He drew a parallel between the Fallibilists and the Monothelites, and maintained, that, as in the person of Christ a divine will coexisted with a human will subject to sin, so in the Pope personal and official infallibility might coexist with moral sinfulness. It is not supposed, however, that many felt there was much weight to be attached to this rather far-fetched analogy.

An American prelate, Dr. Conolly, archbishop of Halifax, spoke strongly on the other side. He maintained that the voice of Christian antiquity, prior to the forged decretals, is unanimously against the notion that the Pope alone, without the bishops, is infallible. He admitted that no Pope could wilfully become heretical, but that did not prove him to be infallible; and, against Manning, he asserted that no man is justified in calling a "proximate heresy" an opinion which the Church has not already condemned; "for," said he, "it is the duty of each individual to follow, not to anticipate, the Church's sentence." He made matters right, however, with the curia, by saying in conclusion, that he would accept the definition if the Council should proclaim it, for he was convinced that God was among them.

Strossmayer made the most remarkable speech of all. He declared that the Papal infallibility was opposed alike to the constitution of the Church, to the rights of the bishops and Councils, and to the immutable rule of faith. In governing the Church, the Pope and the bishops possessed authority and rights in common, as is shewn by the history of the Councils, which in ancient times pronounced on questions of faith and morals. That such Councils met so often, proves that the Pope was not then held to be infallible; for had he been so considered then, there was no necessity to call a Council—the shortest way would have been to inquire at the oracle which never errs. Were the dogma now to be affirmed, the rights of bishops would be gone; all left them would be a shadow—the mere right of giving their assent. For the making of a dogma, something more than a numerical majority is needed—moral unanimity in the Church is essential. Let the personal infallibility of the Pope be affirmed, and then it will be no longer necessary to have what in ancient times was deemed essential to an article of faith—antiquity, universality, and consent. If some were anxious to have the doctrine proclaimed, the greatest enemies of the Church were certainly of the number, and desired nothing better; and the decree, as he anticipated, would work great evil, by preventing some from entering the Church, and by driving out others who had already entered. He concluded by expressing the hope that

the holy father would imitate Christ and St. Peter, by shewing an example of humility, and that he would have the proposal withdrawn.

The speech was moderate in its tone, and the speaker throughout was listened to with great attention. The bishop of Pittsburg was not so fortunate. With the freedom characteristic of his country and of his race, he said that the adherents of the Church in the nation from which he came, knew nothing of the doctrine; and yet they were Catholics in life and practice, not like the Italians, who are Catholics only in name. The bell of the president immediately reminded the honest American that he was touching on rather dangerous ground.

Senestrey, bishop of Ratisbon, assured the Council that all Germany was in favor of infallibility, and that it was simply an invention to say that in that country there were evil-minded persons to call it in question; but he was followed by Dinkel, bishop of Augsburg, who contradicted the statement, and warned the assembly not to be misled by such tricks.

Maret, dean of the Theological Faculty of Paris, and a bishop *in partibus*, was the next speaker. He distinguished between infallibility based on the consent of the bishops, and personal infallibility. He warned the Council of the dilemma that lay before it: either the Council was about to give the Pope an infallibility which he did not possess before, in which case the donor was greater than the receiver, by divine and inalienable right; or else the Pope was about to give himself an infallibility which he did not possess before, in which case he exercised the right of changing the constitution of the Church by his own personal power; and if the latter were allowable, he did not see any necessity for summoning the Council at all. At this point Cardinal Bilio interrupted the speaker by exclaiming, "You are ignorant of the very rudiments of the faith; it does not belong to the Council to judge and to decide, but simply to acknowledge the truth and give its vote, and then to leave the Pope to define what he chooses by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost." Notwithstanding this interruption, Maret was allowed to finish his speech, but at its conclusion it was announced that the debate in

the general congregation upon the collective *schema* was now closed, in consequence of a written request to that effect, signed by one hundred and fifty members, having been received by the presidents.

This was on the 3d of June. The minority made a sort of feeble protest at the unexpected close of the discussion, inasmuch as forty members who wished to speak were thereby deprived of the opportunity; but as nearly eighty speeches had been already delivered for and against the dogma, the prolongation of the debate would have been more likely to waste time than to cast additional light upon the subject. Besides, if anything important yet remained unsaid, it could be produced when the separate chapters of the *schema* came up for discussion *seriatim*. These chapters, after passing through the fire of discussion in the general congregation, were now reduced to four, with a preamble, the doctrine of the infallibility being inserted in the last chapter. But as this great dogma was the natural completion of the whole *schema*, the debate on the three previous chapters constantly reverted to the infallibility, even before the fourth chapter came to be discussed in its order.

About one hundred and twenty prelates sent in their names as desirous to speak on the chapters in detail, of whom about fifty enjoyed that privilege. One of the first to revert to the grand subject was the Dominican monk, Guidi, cardinal archbishop of Bologna. He commenced by saying that the personal infallibility of the Pope was a doctrine unknown to the Church down till the fourteenth century. Scripture and tradition furnish no proof of it. Was there an instance where the Pope, apart from the Church, had ever defined a single dogma? An act might be infallible, but a person never. But every infallible act, he argued, proceeds from the Church herself only: the Pope has to examine whether all the churches agree with the Romish Church on the point in question, and then, having ascertained the fact, is to decree accordingly. He shewed from the works of the Jesuits Bellarmine and Perrone, that in defining doctrines the Popes never act alone, nor have they acted alone even in condemning heresy. As the speaker proceeded, a prelate, unable to restrain

himself when he heard his own opinions called in question, called him a "scoundrel," another called him "a brigand." Guidi conducted himself with great coolness in the face of these salutations, and concluded by proposing that infallibility should be affirmed of the Pope, only when he spoke after making full inquiry into the traditions of the Church on the subject, and after obtaining the consent of the bishops to his decree. It is said that the Pope afterwards sent for the bold Dominican, and rebuked him sharply for his heresy and ingratitude. It did not escape remark throughout the proceedings of the Council, that Pius seemed to regard every man who spoke against his absolute infallibility as a personal opponent of his own.

Dr. Leahy, archbishop of Cashel, in Ireland, spoke on the 13th of June. His argument was, that society now needs a deliverer to protect it from the encroachments of Rationalism, the anti-church policy of civil governments, the poisonous influence of journalism, and the political sects of revolution; that this deliverer, to be of any use, must be omnipotent and infallible, and that the Pope is the very man. The bishop of Badajoz, in Spain, with the capacious faith characteristic of his country, asserted that the Pope is virtually Christ in the Church—the continuation of the incarnation of the Son of God, and that therefore to the holy father belongs the same power, in extent at least, as belonged to Christ when he was visible on earth.

These sentiments were introduced incidentally in speeches made avowedly on those chapters which preceded the fourth of the *schema*, but at last the fourth chapter, containing the great dogma, came forward for special discussion.

The first speaker upon it was Matthieu, cardinal archbishop of Besançon. His address was mainly a panegyric on his own nation, without whose army, at Civita Vecchia, neither Pope nor Council, he alleged, could remain at Rome a single day. This line of remark from him was provoked by Valerga, who in a previous speech had reproached the French for their Gallican errors.

Cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna, then spoke. He shewed that the personal infallibility of the Pope was inconsistent

alike with the facts of history and the traditions of the Church, and that its affirmation at present was likely to damage the Church seriously in future; and he recommended, that, if now proclaimed, every occasion of its exercise should be made conditional on the consent of the episcopate being previously obtained.

On the 20th of June the subject was resumed. The bishop of Teano, in Italy, charged Guidi, although said Guidi was an Italian and a Dominican and a cardinal, with exceeding the French in his desire to canonise Gallicanism, and maintained that it should be left to the Pope to determine in each case how far the Church was to be consulted and the Holy Ghost invoked. Guidi had asserted that the admonition of Christ to Peter to "strengthen his brethren," implied their possession of something which was to be strengthened, and had interpreted it to mean that the Pope was to confirm the doctrine which the bishops already held. To this the bishop of Teano now replied, by saying that Guidi's notion was utterly uncatholic; that the initiation of doctrine must come from above, not from below; that it must originate, not with the bishops, but with the Pope, who has it in his power to avail himself of the help of the Holy Ghost.

On the same day Dr. Machale again spoke against the infallibility with great severity, and Dr. Errington, an English archbishop, who had once acted as coadjutor to Cardinal Wiseman, proposed to express the dogma in an abstract form, but the proposal was not accepted by either side.

Conolly, archbishop of Halifax, then delivered a great and powerful speech. Three times, he said, he had asked for proof from Scripture, from tradition, and from Councils, to shew that the bishops of the Church were excluded from the definition of dogma; but hitherto he had asked in vain. Now again he abjured them, like the blind man on the way to Jericho, to give him sight that he might believe. The credibility of Catholic doctrine, as founded on the general consent of the episcopate, had been used by him and others as an argument to draw into the Church those who stood without; but now a magnet, which had so often proved its attractive power, was to be taken from

them, and they were told to believe, without proof, that it had always been the creed of the Church that the Pope is everything and the bishops nothing. But "we bishops," he continued, "have no right to renounce for ourselves and for our successors the hereditary and original rights of the episcopate, and to give up the promise of Christ, 'I am with you to the end of the world.' But now they want to reduce us to nullities, to tear the noblest jewel from our pontifical breastplate, to deprive us of the highest prerogatives of our office, and to transform the whole Church, and the bishops with it, into a rabble of blind men, among whom is one alone who sees, so that they must shut their eyes and believe what he tells them."

The bold American was followed by a Spanish prelate, the archbishop of Granada. His tone was basely servile to the curia. In the superabundance of his homage he declared that to define infallibility was not enough for him; he wished the Council to decree another Christian dogma—the divine and inviolable nature of the Pope's temporal power.

From the specimens of individual opinion thus presented, the sources of the weakness of the minority are evident. Hampered by the Romish principle of the authority of the Church; none of them could build on the great broad fact, that infallibility is devoid of all basis in the Holy Scriptures. Some of them did maintain that it was in direct opposition to historical fact; others, that it was contrary to the traditions of the Church. Some were in favor of a modified infallibility; others did not object to the doctrine, but pled only for delay. The minority was thus divided in its opposition. But the court party, now aware that the majority was on their side, were united and resolute, and pushed forward the matter to the end; and the Pope, notwithstanding the increasing heat of the summer, and the fever and disease which it usually brings with it to strangers in the city, announced his intention not to prorogue the Council until the *schema* on the Church was disposed of conclusively. As the debate progressed, every means short of force was employed to detach individuals from the minority, and thus to secure, if possible, moral unanimity. But as the summer heat increased, and fever

became more virulent, and intrigues multiplied, a sense of weariness crept over the Council, and all began to feel the necessity of coming very soon to an end.

On the 23d of June, Landriot, archbishop of Rheims, proposed that the whole subject should be remitted to a commission appointed by the Council, with instructions to examine the traditions on the subject, and to report—a proposal which seemed so fair that it was difficult to resist it; yet as *that* had to be done at all hazards, it was displeasing to the curia. But the placid termination of the speech removed all dissatisfaction, for he stated that if it pleased the Pope to affirm the dogma, he submitted already by anticipation.

On the 25th of the same month, Ketteler, bishop of Mayence, alleged that it had not been shewn as yet that any evidence for the personal infallibility of the Pope was contained either in Scripture, or in tradition, or in the consciousness of the Church; all, in fact, that could be said for it was, that it is the opinion of a certain school. He admitted the right of the Pope to condemn doctrines which contradict dogmas already decided by the Church, but could not admit his right to formulate new dogmas, which is an entirely different matter. The deposit of the faith is not intrusted to the Pope alone; in every decree Scripture and tradition are to be taken into account, and the bishops are essential to the Pope as representatives and witnesses of tradition.

The answer to this, given by an Irish ecclesiastic, Dr. Keane, the bishop of Cloyne, was somewhat amusing. He said that the popes were not dependent on the bishops for tradition, because St. Peter brought the whole body of tradition with him to Rome—the Pope had charge of the deposit, and could have recourse to it when necessary. To some in the Council it seemed rather an original idea that St. Peter's portmanteau was stored up somewhere in the Vatican, and that each successive occupant of the chair had only to slip in his hand when there was occasion, and to take out what he wanted.

At the sitting on the 28th of June, Ginoulhiac, bishop of Grenoble, reputed to be, after Maret, the most learned of the French bishops, opposed the dogma, not on the ground that it

was false, but that the proclamation of it would be productive of evil, stirring up hostility to the Church in quarters where it did not now exist, and intensifying it where it existed already.

Martin, bishop of Paderborn, created something like a stir in the Council, by delivering, in an elevated tone, bordering on a scream, a speech, in which he asserted that the personal infallibility is inseparable from the primacy; that the Pope is the supreme legislator, and it is necessary, therefore, that he should be beyond the danger of falling into an error. And so important did he hold this doctrine to be, that he thought priests, and others having care of souls, should be admonished to impress this doctrine often upon the people from the pulpit.

Verot, bishop of Savannah, in the United States, when answering the common statement which seems to pass for an axiom at Rome, namely, that historical facts must yield to the certainty of doctrine, threw his judgment into a very emphatic form—"With me, an ounce of historical fact is worth a thousand pounds of your theories."

Little new light was now coming in from either side. On the 4th of July, all who had not yet spoken waived their right, and by mutual consent this remarkable debate ended; remarkable for the length to which it extended, the importance of the subject discussed, the rank and ability of the speakers, and the results certain to arise from the decision pronounced.

The 13th of July was fixed for taking the vote in the general congregation. On that day there were 91 members of the Council, known to be in Rome at the time, who did not answer to their names. There were, however, 601 members actually present. Of these, 451 voted *Placet*; 62 voted *Placet juxta modum*—that is, they voted for the dogma conditionally; and 88 voted *Non-placet*. The numerical weight of the minority was thus greater than had been anticipated, when the influences at work to diminish their numbers were considered. Among the 88 who had the courage to appear and oppose the Papal Infallibility by their vote, were included Cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna; Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague; Cardinal Matthieu, archbishop of Besançon; Simor, primate of

Hungary; Darboy, archbishop of Paris; Genoulhiac, archbishop of Grenoble; Dupanloup, bishop of Orleans; Maret, bishop of Sura and dean of the Sorbonne; Haynald, archbishop of Kallosa; Ketteler, bishop of Mayence; Hefele, bishop of Rottenburg; Strossmayer, bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium; Conolly, archbishop of Halifax, in Nova Scotia; Kenrick, archbishop of St. Louis; and Machale, archbishop of Tuam—men second to none for learning and position in the Roman Catholic Church. The bulk of the majority consisted of Italians and Spaniards, men whose names, if mentioned, could add nothing to the weight of their votes.

Notwithstanding all that had occurred, some hopeful spirits, it would seem, still thought that a private representation to his Holiness might even yet save the ship of the Church from striking on the rocks. No harm could result from making the experiment. An influential deputation from the minority, consisting, among others, of Darboy, Simor, and Ketteler, waited on the Pope on the evening of the 15th of July. They earnestly entreated that, for the sake of peace, he would withdraw that portion of the 3d chapter, which, at the expense of the bishops, concentrates all ecclesiastical power in himself; and insert a clause in the 4th chapter, limiting his infallibility to such decisions on faith and morals as were arrived at after full inquiry into the traditions of the churches. The deputation were a little taken aback when his Holiness assured them that he had not yet read the *schema*, and did not know what it contained. Had he not positively said so, they could not have believed this possible; but, with admirable presence of mind, the archbishop of Paris said that the legates were certainly much to blame, who up to this time had kept him uninformed as to the terms of a decree which, as was announced, he was, in three days after, to affirm as true before the Church and the world. But their surprise was still greater when he responded by saying that “the *whole* Church had *always* taught the unconditional infallibility of the Pope.” After that astounding statement, further reasoning, of course, was useless. Unwilling to leave without another effort still, Bishop Ketteler fell upon his knees and implored him to

make some concession for the good of the Church; but, while smooth and polished as marble, Pius was as cold and hard, and the distinguished German asked in vain. For a moment, indeed, the deputies thought that they had made an impression, but an hour after the interview, Manning and Senestrey called, and Pius soon relapsed into that "*non possumus*" mood which is associated with his name, and which will probably characterise his pontificate to other generations.

Public opposition and private remonstrance had both failed to avert the danger; and now the solemn session was at hand. To the minority it seemed that to record a public vote against the infallibility could not prevent the definition, while it would exhibit their divisions to the world, and aggravate the evils of the Church. Accordingly, on the 17th, fifty-six prelates sent in a written protest, in which they informed his Holiness that they were still of the same mind, but that, out of respect to himself, they would not vote against a matter in which he took so deep an interest, and that therefore they should return to their homes. The same evening, nearly sixty others left the city. By their absence from the next day's ceremonial, they refused to grace the triumph of their opponents, and avoided the mortification of a public discomfiture. But this was the move which in reality lost the battle. By their voluntary withdrawal from the field, they acknowledged that the victory was with the opposition; they renounced all claims to a drawn battle, and actually produced the moral unanimity, which, they had always said, was essential to a valid decree, and which, if they had remained at their posts, could not have been obtained for the Papal Infallibility.

The 18th of July was the day fixed for the proclamation of the dogma, which, according to the curia, was to consummate the victory of the Church. On that day the fourth and last solemn session of the Council was held. It proved to be a day of darkness and storm, the rain pouring down in torrents, flashes of lightning alternating with peals of thunder, and repeatedly lighting up the dim aisles of St. Peter's with their lurid glare. The Pope was present in full state, together with the prelates and cardinals of the majority, to the number of five hundred and

thirty-three. The religious service being concluded, the secretary read the dogma, and then the names of the members were called over in succession. Amid the darkness and thunder of that dismal day, all present, to the number of five hundred and thirty-one, voted *Placet*; two only voting *Non-placet*—namely, Riccio of Cajazzo, in Sicily, and Fitzgerald of Little Rock, in Arkansas, United States; but their opposition must have been the result of no very deep conviction, for before the session was closed, they also had submitted to the decree. After the voting, the result was made known to the Pope. Pius then stood up with his golden mitre upon his head, but so thick was the darkness, that an attendant had to bring a lighted candle in order to enable him to read the formula. By its assistance, he was enabled to announce to the Church and to the world, that henceforth a man was clothed with the infallibility of God. The decree thus being ratified, the Ultramontane triumph was secure. Higher than the thunder out of doors was the loud and long-continued roar of applause which rose from the assembled prelates; hundreds of white handkerchiefs were waved over their heads, and shouts of “Viva Pio Nono,” “Viva il Papa infallibile,” were again and again repeated. The *Te Deum* and the benediction brought this extraordinary scene to a close.

The *Dogmatic Constitution of the Church of Christ*, as this decree is called, consists of a preamble and four chapters, each of which closes with an anathema on those who deny the doctrine therein affirmed. The preamble asserts that Christ placed Peter over the other apostles, “that by means of a closely united priesthood the whole multitude of the faithful might be preserved in the unity of the faith and communion.” The first chapter affirms that Christ conferred on St. Peter “the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God,” appointing him “the prince of all the apostles, and the visible head of the whole Church militant.” The second chapter affirms that St. Peter has a perpetual line of successors in this primacy over the universal Church, and that whoever succeeds Peter in the Roman see, “by the institution of Christ obtains the primacy of Peter over the whole Church.” The third chapter affirms, that by the

appointment of Christ the Roman Church has supreme jurisdiction over all other churches; that the jurisdiction of the pontiff is immediate; that to it all, both pastors and the faithful, are bound to submit, not only in matters of faith and morals, but in matters of discipline and government; that, in the exercise of his office, he has the right of freely communicating with all pastors of the Church, and with their flocks, irrespective alike of the will or confirmation of the secular power; that he is the supreme judge of the faithful; and that it is unlawful to appeal from his decisions to an œcumenical council. The fourth chapter declares that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the primacy which the Pope enjoys over the whole Church; that he is the father and teacher of all Christians; that the see of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error; and that this gift of truth and never-failing faith was conferred upon Peter and his successors to enable them to perform their high office for the salvation of all. Then follows the decree of Infallibility, in the following words :

“ Therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, with the approbation of the Sacred Council, we teach and define it to be a dogma divinely revealed: that when the Roman pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines that a doctrine regarding faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church, he enjoys, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed in defining a doctrine regarding faith or morals; and therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff are unalterable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church.”

The events which followed the decision were so sudden and stupendous, that they excited the astonishment of Europe. Two days after the proclamation of the dogma, the Emperor Napoleon III., who had for some time felt jealous of the growing influence of North Germany, declared war against Prussia, and entered on that disastrous campaign which in a few weeks resulted in the loss of his crown and in the humiliation of France. On the 2d of September, Napoleon surrendered at Sedan; the fall of the

Imperial Government in France was followed by the proclamation of a republic; the King of Prussia, after his triumph and the capture of Paris, assumed the title Emperor of Germany; and Protestantism, in his person, was elevated to the political and military leadership of Europe. Meanwhile the removal of the French troops, which for years at Civita Vecchia had protected the last remnant of the Pope's civil authority, and their return to their own country, left the way open for the important event which occurred in Italy. So soon as it was known that the tide of war was going against France, King Victor Immanuel, who had long been on the watch for an opportunity to occupy the capital of his own kingdom, stepped in without encountering any resistance, and on the 24th of September, amid the welcome and plaudits of the populace, took possession of Rome. With him the Bible entered, and, at the same time, civil liberty and religious toleration, so that now Christian worship is as free in the city of the Cæsars and of the Pope as in any city of the world. Since that time Victor Immanuel occupies the Quirinal, and Pio Nono the Vatican; the temporal power, which had been wielded by his predecessors for eleven hundred years, having dropped from the hands of the infallible Pope as quietly as a sere leaf from the autumn tree.

The changes which had thus taken place in a few weeks, and the free institutions by which Pius IX. now found himself surrounded, were not favorable to the continuance of the Vatican Council. But the declaration of infallibility, the real work for which it had been convened, was accomplished. Notwithstanding, it existed formally till the 20th of October; then it was adjourned till the 20th of November; and then it was prorogued *sine die*. Should it ever assemble again, it will be under very different conditions from those which surrounded it on the 8th of December, 1869. But why should it meet? An infallible Pope has all within himself; he can never need a council any more.

What has been the action of the minority since the Council was closed? The answer which we have to give to this question, is the most humiliating fact of all. Their conduct has been

apparently that of men who either had no deep convictions of truth, or no strength to make the sacrifices which deep convictions demand. All the opposing bishops have, we believe, submitted to the decree, and have accepted as true what they declared to be opposed to Scripture, to tradition, and to history. Rauscher of Vienna published the decree in August, 1870; Schwarzenberg of Prague hesitated till January 11, 1871; and Hefele waited till the 10th of April, saying, as he yielded, "The peace and unity of the Church is so great a good, that great and heavy sacrifices may be made for it." Maret, the dean of the Sorbonne, has withdrawn from sale his writings against infallibility, adding that he "wholly rejects everything in his work which is opposed to the dogma of the Council." Even the gifted and learned Strossmayer is dumb, and has, we fear, followed the example of his brethren. After fighting in the Council the battle of truth with such ability and persistence, their defection is disappointing, and demonstrates but too forcibly how immeasurably, in faith and courage, these men fall short of the men of the Reformation age. No effort of imagination enables us to think that the same silence and submission found in Rauscher, and Hefele, and Maret, when the interests of truth and conscience were at stake, could by any possibility have been shewn, under similar conditions, by Martin Luther or Philip Melancthon, by John Calvin or John Knox.

The full effects of the Vatican Council it will require centuries to work out. Meanwhile this much is evident, that it has given the last and finishing blow to Gallicanism, for now a General Council has condemned that old theory, has actually signed away its own rights and privileges, and has affirmed that henceforth no appeal lies to any Council whatever after the decision of the Pope has been pronounced. It has destroyed the independence of the Catholic bishops; they can no longer claim to derive their authority directly from Christ and the apostles; they derive it from the Pope, and henceforth they can originate no action and exercise no jurisdiction except by his permission and authority. It has made the Pope the absolute ruler of the Church, no longer bound to consult farther than he chooses the voice of the bishops

or the tradition of the churches. Everywhere over the world it has made such a thing as liberal Catholicism impossible; he who henceforth attempts to reconcile the Romish Church and modern civilisation, by the very act publicly fixes the stigma of heresy on himself. It has created a new Article of Faith, unknown to the Scriptures or the primitive ages, and which no Roman Catholic was bound to believe up till the 18th of July, 1870. He who refuses to believe it now, incurs the sin and penalty of heresy.

From a papal point of view, these results may be counted advantages rather than disasters; but even Roman Catholics can scarcely see the benefit of the new secession from the Church which has taken place on the continent, of the loss to their body of such men as Döllinger, Friedrich, Hyacinthe, and Reinkens, or of the collision with the civil power which the decree has precipitated in Germany and Switzerland. This is the beginning; who can tell the end? Even at present it is easy to see that a new and perennial element of strife has been wantonly cast into the political and ecclesiastical relations of Europe; and it is certain that historians, in coming time, will regard the Vatican Council of 1869 as an era from which Latin Christianity entered on a novel and most interesting part of its career, and commenced to develop tendencies, the results of which will be fresh starting-points in the story of man.

ARTICLE IX.

FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR.

About twenty years ago our attention was directed to an article in the *Westminster Review* on the theology of Germany, wherein it was asserted that the greatest living German theologian was Dr. Baur, of Tübingen. Baur was at that time comparatively unknown in this country; but since then his works are in the hands of biblical students, and his peculiar views are widely diffused. Whatever opinion may be formed of the above estimate of his merits, there are few recent writers in theology who have exercised more influence for good or evil; an influence not so extensive, it may be, but much deeper and more permanent than that either of Strauss or Renan. His learning was both extensive and accurate; his various works in the department of church history show an acquaintance with early Christianity, hardly surpassed by the vast erudition of Gieseler or Neander. His industry was prodigious: he was one of the most extensive of German theological writers. His talents, though not those of a well-balanced mind, were undoubtedly of a high order; he possessed an originality of thought and a wonderful ingenuity, both in forming and defending his theories. His style is somewhat intricate and obscure, as if he felt a difficulty in obtaining proper words to express his ideas; for certainly this obscurity did not arise from any reluctance to enunciate his opinions. There is also an earnestness of purpose in his writings, which favorably distinguishes him from other negative theologians. He is the acknowledged founder of the Tübingen school of theology—a school which, although nearly equally destructive, has for the present superseded the naturalism of Paulus, and the mythical theory of Strauss. Nor has he wanted able expounders and defenders of his system—the most eminent of whom are Schwegler, Köslin, Hilgenfeld, Zeller, and perhaps Hausrath, in Germany; and to these we are inclined to add Dr. Samuel Davidson, in England.

Ferdinand Christian Baur was born on the 21st June, 1792.

When only twenty-five years of age, he was appointed, in 1817, Professor of the Seminary of Blaubeuren; and, in consequence of the abilities and learning which he there displayed, he received, in 1826, the appointment to the chair of Evangelical Theology in the University of Tübingen. The whole of his long life was devoted to theological studies; and the mere enumeration of works published by him would occupy several pages. We can only mention the most important of his writings. His first great work was his *Symbolik und Mythologie*, published in 1825, when still at Blaubeuren—a work of great research and erudition. In 1831 appeared *Die Christuspartei in der Korinthischen Gemeinde; der Gegensatz des Paulinischen und Petrinischen Christenthums; der Apostel Petrus in Rom*—(The Christ-party in the Corinthian Church; the Antagonism of Pauline and Petrine Christianity; the Apostle Peter in Rome)—a work which contains the germs of the system afterwards promulgated by him. In 1833, in reply to Möhler, he wrote *Der Gegensatz des Katholicismus und Protestantismus* (the Contrast of Catholicism and Protestantism,) which at the time was considered a masterpiece of controversial theology, and a complete refutation of Romanism. In 1835 appeared his celebrated treatise on the Gnosis, *Die Christliche Gnosis*, wherein he treated Gnosticism from the first ages of Christianity, through the Middle ages, down to the theosophy of Schelling, Hegel, and Schleiermacher. In the same year, 1835, appeared his work on the Pastoral Epistles, *Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostel Paulus*, wherein he calls in question their genuineness. Then followed two great works on the history of doctrines: the one on the Atonement, *Die Christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung in ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, published in 1838; and the other on the Trinity and the Incarnation, *Die Christliche Lehre von der Dreienigkeit und der Menschwerdung Gottes*, published in 1841–43, both works of great value in an historical point of view. In 1845 appeared perhaps the best known and the most influential of his writings, *Der Apostel Paulus*, wherein the principles of his theological system are fully matured and developed. Toward the later part of his life, he turned his atten-

tion to an examination of the Gospels : in 1847 he published his critical examination of the canonical Gospels—*Kritische Untersuchung der Kanonischen Evangelien* ; and in 1851 his special investigation of the Gospel of Mark—*Das Marcus-evangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Charakter*. In 1859 his great work on church history was commenced, which, since his death, has been continued from his papers, and is now published in five volumes, carrying on the history of the Church from the apostolic times down to the present century—*Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche von der Entstehung des Christenthums bis auf unsere Zeit*, (the History of the Christian Church, from the origin of Christianity to our time). Baur closed his laborious life on the 2d December, 1860, at the age of sixty-eight. If we are to judge of him by his works, he certainly lived the life of many men.

The peculiar views of Baur were gradually developed. His writings may be divided into two distinct classes, marked by a well-defined period of his life—those published before, and those published after the year 1835. During the first period of his literary career, (1824–1835,) he was a disciple of Schleiermacher, and belonged to the so-called conciliatory and positive school of theology, as it then had its organ chiefly in the *Studien und Kritiken*. His defence of Protestantism in his *Katholicismus und Protestantismus* was so ably executed, and so highly appreciated, that he was for a long time regarded as a pillar of the Lutheran Church. But this was also the turning-point of his theological career. A radical change in his views occurred in the year 1835, when Strauss's *Leben Jesu* appeared. Strauss was himself a disciple of Baur; but in this case the scholar influenced the master. Henceforth Baur, partly in consequence of his study of Hegelianism, and partly also from the peculiarity of his mental constitution—a one-sided intellectualism—diverged further and further from a simple and scriptural faith. It is, however, to be observed, that Baur did not, like Strauss, commence his critical researches with the study of the Gospels, but with the writings of St. Paul: and only toward the latter part of his life, did he direct his attention to the life of Jesus.

But although undoubtedly Baur's views were to a certain ex-

tent materially influenced by those of Strauss, yet we must not suppose that the opinions of these two theologians were similar—that they proceeded on the same destructive principles. There is an entire difference in their manner of procedure. Strauss proceeds on the mythical principle: he endeavors to explain the miraculous on the ground that the narrative was composed of legends, gradually formed in the early Christian Church. The historical nucleus of truth in the Gospels is small, and round this nucleus have been aggregated various exaggerations and fables. His system is purely and entirely negative; his criticism is destructive. He assigns no reasons for the composition of the Gospels, but leaves them as effects without causes. Baur, on the other hand, does not teach a mere negative criticism; he endeavors to assign a reason for the composition of those books, which he regards as spurious, in the circumstances of the times. He examines into the literary purpose of the writers, and regards this as the true key for the positive determination of the age of the writings. However much we may differ from him, and however dangerous we may consider his opinions, we cannot refuse to him the praise of ingenuity; and, if we grant his premises, of a high degree of logical acumen.

The great principle on which Baur's positive views are founded, is, that there was in the apostolic age, not only two distinct phases of Christianity, but an antagonism between them; in short, that two opposing kinds of Christianity were then promulgated. There was a Jewish Christianity, which regarded Judaism as to a certain extent binding on the Gentiles; and this was not only the view of the Judaizing teachers—the opponents of Paul—but also of the original apostles; and there was a Gentile Christianity which asserted the universality of the gospel, and the absolute freedom of the Gentiles from the Jewish law—a Christianity whose chief representative was the apostle Paul. Baur designates these two opposite phases as Petrinism and Paulinism: the one being the gospel of the circumcision, and the other the gospel of the uncircumcision. The opposition between Paul and the original apostles was not, indeed, so open as that between Paul and the Judaizing teachers, but still it was no less

real. Baur supposes that at the conference at Jerusalem a compromise was made; each party was allowed to hold its own opinions, without interfering with one another.

“There was,” he observes, “inside of Jewish Christianity, a stricter and a milder party. The stricter party wished to see the principle, common to all Jewish Christians, that no one could be saved without Judaism, extended in all its consequences to the Gentiles. This class of Jewish Christians could not be indifferent to Pauline Christianity; they felt constrained ever to oppose and resist it. . . . The milder party entirely agreed with the stricter party in principle, and yet, after the concession made by the Jewish apostles to Paul, they could not oppose him in the same manner; they dispensed with carrying out their principle, and limited themselves to Judaism in its application. We cannot think otherwise than that the Jewish apostles stood at the head of this party.”

This opinion, that there is an antagonism between Paulinism and Jewish Christianity, appears to have been formerly suggested by Semler; but it was left to Baur to develop the idea and to make it the foundation of a system of theology. Baur endeavors to trace this contrast from the apostolic days down even to the middle of the second century. He supposes that many of the books of the New Testament were written after the death of the apostles, with a design to reconcile Petrinism and Paulinism: the points of contrast between the two systems being designedly broken off, and the points of agreement exaggerated, so that there might be a common ground of reconciliation. Each party yielded something until there ultimately resulted a united Christianity, composed of a mingling of the Petrine and Pauline elements. This conciliation is supposed to be contained and exhibited in the Johannean writings.

This conciliatory design of several of the writings of the New Testament is, according to Baur, especially seen in the Acts of the Apostles. He supposes that this book was written in the middle of the second century, by a disciple of Paul, with a special design to reconcile the liberal opinions of that apostle with the conservative opinions of Peter and the other original apostles. Before Baur, Schneckenburger, in his work, *Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*, (on the design of the Acts of the Apostles,) had asserted that the Acts had an apologetic design, and that it

was a defence of Paul in opposition to the Judaizing Christians. With this object in view, the author of the Acts attempts to establish the perfect similarity between Peter and Paul. The first part of the work is devoted to the actions of Peter. These actions are represented as similar to Paul's. As Peter cured a man lame from his birth at the gate of the temple, so a similar cure was effected by Paul at Lystra; as Peter vanquished Simon Magus in Samaria, so Paul vanquished Elymas the sorcerer in Cyprus; as Peter addressed the Jews on the day of Pentecost, so a similar address was made to the Jews by Paul at Antioch in Pisidia; as a twofold vision brought together Peter and Cornelius, so a twofold vision brought together Paul and Agabus; as Peter was miraculously delivered from prison in Jerusalem, so was Paul at Philippi; as the shadow of Peter cured the sick, so similar miracles were effected by the garments of Paul. But not only were the actions of these two apostles represented as similar, the actions which the one would naturally from his principles perform, are represented as the actions of the other. Peter, when he preached the gospel to the uncircumcised Cornelius, is represented as acting as Paul would have done; and Paul, when he shaved his head at Cenchrea, circumcised Timothy, and took upon himself the vow of the Nazarites, is represented as acting as Peter would have done. So, also, according to Schneckenburger, various actions are purposely omitted in the Acts, because they might militate against the idea of a harmony between these two apostles. Thus, for example, Paul's refusal to circumcise Titus, and the dispute between Peter and Paul at Antioch, are omitted as incidents opposed to the design of the author.

Adopting this view of the nature of the Acts, Baur converts the apologetic into a conciliatory design. He supposes that the author wrote with the design of reconciling Petrinism and Paulinism. The Paul of the Acts, he observes, according to Schneckenburger, is entirely different from the Paul of the Epistles; he is represented as trimming to the Judaizers, instead of boldly and fearlessly asserting the freedom of the Gentiles from Judaism. According to Baur, the Acts was written for a special purpose; as a mere history of events it is

not much to be relied on ; much in it is invented with a view to conciliation ; Peter is there represented as a Pauline Christian, and Paul as a Petrine Christian, in order to show that, in the opinion of the writer of the Acts, there was no essential difference between the two systems of Christianity.

The mere statement of such a view of the Acts of the Apostles, however ingeniously carried out, is sufficient to prove its extravagance and untenableness. It could never have occurred to one in a thousand of the readers of this book that it was written for the express purpose of reconciling two adverse parties in the Christian Church. If such were the design of the author, it was so concealed and hidden, that nearly eighteen centuries elapsed before it was discovered and brought to light. The object of the author must have been entirely frustrated, as, although his work is often mentioned by early Christian writers, there is no trace in their writings of anything approaching to this idea of a conciliatory design. It is always regarded as a real history, and never as a mere historical romance. Indeed, had it not been for the distinguished abilities and ingenuity of the author of this hypothesis, we are persuaded that it would long before this have been forgotten, or mentioned only as an example of the extreme length to which a destructive criticism can go.

The hypothesis of Baur, concerning this primitive antagonism between Petrinism and Paulinism, is built on a very slender foundation. With the exception of a few detached and obscure notices in the Epistles to the Corinthians, it rests entirely on the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians. Here, according to Baur, there is a distinct mention of a difference of opinion between Paul and the other apostles. "There is a gospel of the circumcision and a gospel of the uncircumcision, an apostleship to the circumcision and an apostleship to the Gentiles ; in the one the law of Moses is valid, and in the other it is not ; but both exist together, as yet unreconciled." Paul, in describing the conference at Jerusalem, speaks of the original apostles with a certain degree of irony and disrespect. He mentions them as "seeming to be somewhat," and as "seeming to be pillars of the Church." It is strongly insinuated that it was they who urged

the circumcision of Titus, and only yielded, reluctantly, to the power of circumstances and the force of Paul's character. The agreement which was finally arrived at was, not one of conciliation, but of compromise—that Paul should go to the heathen, and the Jewish apostles to the circumcision. And this difference, which was compromised at Jerusalem, it is asserted, broke forth in the disputes between Peter and Paul at Antioch. Here Peter publicly declined to associate with the converted Gentiles, unless they adopted the Jewish customs; and Paul withstood that apostle to the face, asserting the absolute freedom of the Gentile Christians from Judaism.

Now certainly this passage, when explained by an ingenious mind, may be made to appear to favor the idea of an antagonism, or at least of a difference of opinion, between Paul and the early apostles; but, when closely examined, it will be found that too much has been inferred from it. Of course Baur asserts that in the Acts there is a designed agreement, and therefore we are precluded from supplementing the account in the Epistle with the narrative in the history. But even in the Epistle there is a marked distinction between the Judaizing teachers, who insisted on the circumcision of the Gentiles, and the original apostles. The one are called “false brethren, unawares brought in,” and the other are styled “those which were of reputation,” and “those who seemed to be pillars.” Nor is there necessarily any irony or bitterness in the words of Paul when he speaks of the apostles as they “who seemed to be pillars,” as if he regarded their claims as mere pretensions; but there is in them merely an emphatic assertion of the independence of his gospel, that he was not indebted for it to any human teacher, however highly exalted. It is in no way indicated that it was the original apostles who wished to circumcise Titus; but the most natural and obvious meaning is, that this was the demand of the false brethren. It is true that mention is made of a gospel of the uncircumcision, and a gospel of the circumcision; there is, however, no indication that these were two different gospels, the one asserting and the other denying the necessity of Jewish rites; the one affirming justification by the law, and the other announc-

ing justification by faith ; but it is the same gospel addressed to two different classes of hearers—that Paul should go to the Gentiles, and the other apostles to the circumcision. So, also, in the contest between Peter and Paul at Antioch, it is evident from the words of the Epistle that there was no difference of opinion between these two apostles. Peter is not charged with preaching another gospel, but with acting contrary to his convictions ; not with false doctrine, but with dissimulation. And if in this passage in the Epistle to the Galatians there is no evident antagonism between Paulinism and Petrinism, certainly such an antagonism cannot be proved from the other writings of Paul ; and if so, the whole system of Baur is built on a false foundation.

The criticism which Baur employs in reference to the books of Scripture is entirely of a subjective nature. He forms to himself a notion of what, in his view, a writing should contain, and he applies this as a test of genuineness. Thus, for example, he takes certain epistles of Paul, which he regards as authentic and indisputable ; he then forms from them a certain standard of Pauline doctrine, and applies this standard to the examination of the other epistles, and rejects them as spurious, because they contain sentiments which he judges to be un-Pauline. Thus it happens that his criticism is one-sided and defective, often capricious and forced ; the external evidence in favor of a book from the testimony of the early fathers is entirely disregarded ; and the internal evidence, arising from undesigned coincidences and specialities, is, to a considerable extent, ignored. No allowance is made for the lapse of time, or the change of circumstances. Even Dr. Davidson, otherwise an admirer of the system of Baur, complains of this defect in his method of criticism :

“Too much importance,” he observes, “is attached by Baur to uniformity of ideas and expressions as evidence of Pauline authorship. He takes four epistles, unquestionably authentic, and forming a group by themselves, as the standard of measurement for groups of later and earlier origin. By this means little room is allowed for growth in the apostle’s mind ; nor is there latitude for the influence of that wide variety of circumstances through which he passed, of the persevering opponents he had to encounter, or of the local diversities of peoples.”

Even Baur himself appears to be startled at the length to

which his criticism goes. In objecting to the Epistle to Philemon, he feels constrained to confess that he subjects himself to the reproach of hypercriticism, of an excessive distrust, and of a scepticism attacking everything.

The result of the criticism of Baur is certainly exceedingly destructive. He only admits the genuineness of four Epistles of Paul, namely, Romans, 1st and 2d Corinthians, and Galatians. The other books of the New Testament arose out of that great controversy between Patrinism and Paulinism which disturbed the peace of the early Church, some advocating one or other of these two systems, others mediating between them, and others exhibiting the ultimate reconciliation. It is, however, to be observed, that scarcely any of Baur's followers go the same length as himself. Hilgenfeld, for example, complains that Baur has gone too far, and besides the four above-mentioned Epistles, maintains the genuineness of 1st Thessalonians, Philippians, and Philemon.

A very remarkable fact in the writings of Baur is, that in his statements of doctrine he is often evangelical; so that if one were unacquainted with his views elsewhere expressed, he would think that he was reading the works of an orthodox divine. Thus, for example, in his representation of the doctrine of Paul, in his great work, the *Apostel Paulus*, he maintains the doctrine of justification by faith without works, and the doctrine of imputation, or the vicarious nature of the atonement; and his *Katholicismus und Protestantismus* was regarded as a storehouse of Protestant doctrine. The reason of this phenomenon is, that Baur viewed theology entirely in an historical point of view; in stating the doctrines of Paul, he had nothing to do with their truth or falsehood, but merely with the simple fact that such were the views of the apostle. Of course he himself, not believing in any form of inspiration, held that the truth and correctness of such doctrines were to be judged by our natural reason; it did not lie within the sphere of his theology to attempt any reconciliation between faith and reason. Certainly we have here a strong testimony, from a very impartial witness, that the so-called evangelical doctrines were taught by the apostle Paul;

that, in Paul's view, the death of Christ was that of a substitute for sinners.

It is difficult to state what were Baur's own peculiar religious opinions, but we fear that they must be reduced to a minimum, at least during the later years of his life, for of them only do we now speak. He did not believe in miracles or supernatural interventions, and hence denied the resurrection of Christ. He did not regard the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of the living God, but as a man who was the first to make evident the fatherhood of God and the sonship of man, and the community which there is between the divine and the human spirit. It is indeed extremely doubtful if he believed in a personal God at all. He never declared himself concerning immortality; but there is reason to suppose that he believed in a future state, though he denied the resurrection of the body. It would appear that he gradually became more and more divorced from orthodoxy. The ordinary professors of theology in Tübingen are, by reason of their office, the morning preachers in the principal church of the city, taking that duty upon themselves alternately. In the early part of his career, Baur was a popular preacher, and his sermons were highly appreciated as able elucidations of Scripture. When any special sermon had to be preached, he was applied to. Thus, in 1830, he preached an eloquent sermon at the Jubilee of the Augsburg Confession; and again, at Easter, 1833, he made a great impression by a sermon which he preached on reconciliation through Christ. But after 1835, when his views were permanently changed, he ceased to preach; in all probability he felt that he could not conscientiously fulfil that duty.

The great defect of Baur's character was a one-sided intellectualism. He looked upon religion entirely as a matter of history, and not as a matter of personal experience. As he denied the supernatural in Scripture, he wished to bring everything to the test of reason. He overlooked man's spiritual nature. This peculiar mental state was increased, not merely by his intense devotion to study—associating little with his fellow-men—but also by the fact that he never had a pastoral charge, and thus never had occasion to apply the principles of the gospel in the

ordinary discharge of ministerial duty. In short, he lived in an ideal world of his own, and that world was intellectual, not spiritual; he never experienced the gospel as "a power of God unto salvation." Tholuck somewhere cautions his students against an over application to study, as being an obstacle to the attainment of a religious spirit:

"There is," he observes, "in theology a twofold element, the one human, the other supernatural; by the one it is connected with the department of human knowledge, and hence an accurate acquaintance with human science must have a salutary influence upon the study of theology. On the other hand, there is something supernatural which is to be found in no science, and which no human science can either explain or illustrate. If, therefore, the theologian does not know this by his own living experience; if he be not connected by faith with the invisible world, with him the study of profane literature and its connexion with theology must prove injurious."

An affecting anecdote of Baur's personal life was told us by a distinguished German professor, once his scholar, as perfectly authentic. Baur was much attached to his wife; she was long ill, and he waited upon her with unwearied attention and care. When near her end, she asked him to pray for her. Baur felt he could not; he had lost his faith in the efficacy of prayer; perhaps he did not believe in a Hearer of prayer. Accordingly he sent for a minister who offered up a fervent prayer both for him and his wife. Baur was deeply affected by her death; his hair is said to have turned grey; but whether this had any effect upon his views, whether it produced a salutary change on his religious character, whether it revealed to him the necessity of cultivating his spiritual nature, we cannot tell.

It is very difficult, in the present day, to draw the line of distinction between infidels and Christians. Formerly infidelity was without the Church; the line of demarcation between the ancient Deists and professing Christians was distinct; but now men adopt similar opinions to those of the Deists, and yet profess to belong to the Church of Christ. The danger is much greater in our days than in those of our fathers. Then the citadel of faith was attacked from without; now the enemy is within. Then the attacks were open, now they are insidious. When we

find men, though professing to be Christians, yea ministers and professors of theology, repudiating the supernatural, explaining away the miracles of Scripture, denying the resurrection of Christ, even doubting whether there be a personal God, we feel constrained to regard them as unbelievers; and this we do without imputing to them any wrong motives, and with all possible respect for their learning and abilities. In this class we must rank Baur. His views we regard as essentially anti-Christian. It may be, that many who adopt his principles, do not go so far as himself; it may be, that there is no necessary connexion between his views and a disbelief in a personal God; but still, we do not see how one can adopt them without calling in question the miraculous in the narrative.

The Tübingen school of theology has no permanence; it rests on a mere hypothesis. It is a theological Darwinism; an ingenious theory to account for the development of Christianity from certain germs. Whatever may be the case in our country, in Germany it is fast losing its ground. The German clergy are, as a class, sound in the faith. Tübingen, formerly the stronghold of the views of Baur, is now, comparatively speaking, the school of orthodoxy. Divinity students are deserting the University of Heidelberg, on account of the extreme opinions there inculcated, although that university is adorned by such eminent theological professors as Hausrath and Schenkel. On the other hand, the University of Leipsic, the seat of orthodoxy, where men of such eminence and approved principles as Lechler, Tischendorf, Kahnis, G. Baur, and Delitzsch, occupy the theological chairs, is frequented by hundreds of students. We look forward with hope to the rise of a purer theology in Germany, when its universities will be adorned by men as able and as learned as those belonging to the negative school, by men who, firmly believing in the supernatural, and feeling the truth in their own experience, will account it their duty and privilege to inculcate a positive and living Christianity.

Baur is one of those authors whose works have been selected for translation by the promoters of the Theological Translation Fund, and the first volume of the *Apostel Paulus* is the third volume

of the series which has been issued. An apology has been made for the imperfect manner in which one of the former volumes was translated; but it strikes us that, however necessary such an apology might be, it can hardly satisfy the readers, for they may justly demand why such an imperfect translation was published at all. It is as if an author were to write a worthless book, and then to attempt to disarm criticism by a frank confession of its worthlessness. But whatever were the defects of former translations, and however necessary apologies were, no apology is made for the imperfection of the translation of the *Apostel Paulus*; and, in the opinion of the translator at least, so far from any apology being necessary, its correctness and fidelity will stand the test of criticism. The following is the notice in the preface:

"The translator of the present volume has endeavored to give the meaning of the author clearly and concisely, and has avoided the temptation of making smooth sentences and rounded periods. The translator is perfectly aware that the English is by no means a model of diction or of style, but challenges criticism as to the faithfulness of the translation."

This is rather a bold statement to make in translating a work of such difficulty as the *Apostel Paulus*, where the sentences are often long and involved, the statements frequently limited by restrictive clauses, and every expression carefully weighed. Certainly, as to the first part of the notice, there can be no difference of opinion. All smooth sentences and rounded periods are most carefully avoided—there is no trace whatever of such an impropriety; and instead of the translation being a model of style and diction, it is thoroughly un-English, as if it were the translator's design to make it as unreadable and as harsh as possible. Take for example the following clause in the first page, which, sufficiently clear in the original, is so involved in the translation, that it must be read twice or thrice to discover in it any meaning at all. Baur is speaking of the advancement of criticism in modern times, and asserts that we must examine the history of early Christianity in the light of this advancement:

"This independence of thought," he is made to observe, "attained after such great effort—after the painful toil of many centuries—naturally turns its gaze back into the Past, the spirit reposing in the self-certainty of its consciousness, now first placed on a standpoint from

which it can review the paths along which it has passed, driven by the force of circumstances, and it reviews them in order to illumine the unconscious Past with the consciousness of the inward necessities of the Present."

We leave the reader to make what sense he can of this passage, only observing that it is a specimen of what frequently occurs in the translation.

Giving, then, the translator all credit of "avoiding the temptation of making smooth and rounded periods," and of writing in "English by no means a model of diction and style," and admitting that he has been perfectly successful in his endeavors, what about the challenge made to criticism as to the faithfulness of the translation? Here we are sorry to say that the translator and we must part company; this is a point on which we cannot agree. Not only is the meaning very imperfectly represented; not only is there an obscurity of diction that renders the sense utterly unintelligible; not only is the English language marred by most un-English words and forms of expression; but we have marked several places where a meaning is given precisely the reverse of what Baur intended, as if the translator had resisted the temptation, not only of making smooth and rounded periods, but of giving the true sense of the author.

Baur has been spared the pain of finding himself so grossly misrepresented, and his great work, the *Apostel Paulus*, rendered so unintelligible, as if it were the product of a confused rather than of a master mind. Certainly, if such works are to be translated, we should have a correct version of the original. It may, however, be questioned, what good end is to be served by translating such books as Baur's which can only have the effect of unsettling the minds of untheological readers. Those acquainted with the science of theology are already thoroughly versed in them; they know the arguments on both sides, and can form an impartial judgment. Not that we are at all surprised at the fact of such translations; nor have we any right to complain of them, except as to their defectiveness. Those who adopt views similar to Baur, and who call in question the supernatural, are entitled to promulgate their opinions; and they could not do so more effectually than by translating the works of their ablest

representative. We readily admit that the arguments of such a writer as Baur are not to be met with anything like contempt, or the *odium theologicum*. We are necessitated to give them their full weight; to reëxamine the points in dispute; and to answer the objections brought forward. Nor are we in the least degree afraid of the ultimate result. The theology of Baur, as already observed, is losing its ground in Germany, and though now attempted to be fostered in our country, it must meet with a similar fate. Its ingenuity may captivate for a time; but being destitute of evidence, it must ultimately come to nought.

We have said that we are not surprised at those who entertain similar views to those of Baur desiring to see his works translated. For some reason or other, scepticism is in general proselytising. What does surprise us is that ministers, who profess to believe in the evangelical doctrines, should give countenance to such translations by recommending them, and attaching their names to the prospectus of the Theological Translation Fund Society; and thus should be parties in the dissemination of what they profess to believe is deadly error. In the list of names, most are ministers belonging to the various denominations of England; only there are ministers of the Church of Scotland. We would not judge any harshly. Perhaps they think that it is as well that students of theology should have the opportunity of knowing both sides of the question. Perhaps they think that the inculcation of error may, in some way, contribute to the promotion of truth, by calling forth able defences and expositions of it. Still we are so fastidious in our views as to think that it hardly becomes ministers of evangelical churches, and especially professors of theology, to give their countenance to works which deny the miracles of the New Testament, not excepting the resurrection of Christ, and would destroy all that is supernatural in Christianity. With equal propriety they might attach their names to a prospectus for the republication of the works of the old English deists; or rather, with greater propriety, because with less danger to evangelical truth, as the attacks of the deists were open and avowed, whereas views even more pernicious are made by many of the authors, whose works are selected for publication, under the guise of the Christian faith.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

An Inquiry into the Usage of ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΟΝ, and the Nature of Christic and Patristic Baptism, as Exhibited in the Holy Scriptures and Patristic Writings. By JAMES W. DALE, D. D., Pastor of Wayne Presbyterian Church, Delaware County, Pa. Philadelphia: William Rutter & Co. 1874. Pp. 630.

This volume brings the arduous, elaborate, and successful labors of Dr. Dale to their final result. His researches as to the signification of the word *Baptizo*, as it occurs in Classic, Judaic, Patristic, and New Testament writers, have been absolutely exhaustive, and the primary and secondary senses of the word have been set forth as they never have been before, to illustrate the nature of Jewish, Johannic, Christian, and Patristic baptism. Christic and Patristic baptism are set forth in this volume; the first 469 pages being occupied with the former, and the remaining 161 with the latter of these topics.

The whole four volumes, of probably 1,700 pages, are a miracle almost of persevering and scholarly industry.

In this volume is embraced what he calls *Christic* baptism; that, namely, which Christ *received* personally; that which he personally administered to sinners; the ritual baptism which he authorised to be administered by others; and the everlasting baptism secured by Christ for the redeemed.

Christic baptism, as received by himself from his forerunner, was not "the baptism of John." This was for sinners, demanding "repentance," and "fruits meet for repentance." But the Lord Jesus was not a sinner, could not repent of sin, and could not receive the remission of sin. The reception of "the baptism of John" by Jesus is therefore impossible, untrue, and absurd. John baptized "to prepare a people for the Lord." To address such a baptism to the Lord, (preparing the Lord for himself,) is absurd.

But the Bearer of sin must be baptized with a baptism none other can share, with one that stands solitary and alone. It was a covenant "to fulfil all righteousness," to bear the penalty of a broken law for the redemption of the guilty; a baptism in which the Spirit descended upon him, so that his whole being was under its influence, without the limit of time or degree. It implied that further baptism into penal and atoning death, when the Father held out the cup of penal woe to the lips of his beloved Son, while the Holy Spirit, the Sympathiser and Comforter, was the upholder of the divine-human subject of this unutterable baptism.

But Christic baptism, or the baptism which is established by Christ, the author shows, is, 1, real; 2, ritual. The first is a thorough change in the moral condition of the soul by the Holy Ghost, uniting it to Christ, and through him reëstablishing filial and everlasting relations with the living God—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The second, or ritual baptism, is not another, but the same, declared by word and exhibited (as to its purifying power) by pure water applied to the body, symbolising the cleansing of the soul through the atoning blood of Christ by the Holy Ghost.

These are not two baptisms, the one spiritual and the other physical, but "one baptism;" the former real, the latter a ritual symbol of the real. They are no more two baptisms, diverse in nature, than a rock and the shadow of that rock are two rocks, diverse in nature. P. 164.

The baptism by the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the author regards as an instance of real baptism, which may have been followed by ritual baptism into the visible Church on some other day. It was thus that materials for a church organisation were brought into existence.

The first stated *ritual* baptism under Christianity is, in his view, that of the Samaritans, Acts viii. 12–16, and the point of supremest importance in it is the statement that the baptism was "*into the name of the LORD JESUS.*"

We may doubt, perhaps, whether the Church was not fully constituted at Jerusalem and previous to these baptisms at Sa-

maria. To us it so seems. But the explanation of this phrase expresses emphatically the obligation and meaning of Christian baptism. "When I am told," says the author, "that a living man is baptized *into* WATER, I know that he is put into a condition which, by its terms, has no self-limitation, and which issues, of necessity, in the destruction of life by suffocation. If the baptism is *into* FIRE, I know, by like reasoning, that the issue is the destruction of life by burning. If the baptism is *into* INSENSIBILITY, the issue declared is a condition of complete unconsciousness." But the name of the Lord Jesus is indissolubly and solely connected with the sacrificial atonement for sin, and it is through this that our redemption comes. If there be a real and representative union between ourselves and Christ, our baptism into his name, as an outward rite, is the symbol and expression of this.

But we have not time to dwell on this able and exhaustive discussion. The following expresses briefly the results:

"THE INQUIRY into the meaning of βαπτίζω, as determined by USAGE through a THOUSAND YEARS, and as that meaning bears on Christian baptism, is now completed.

"CLASSIC BAPTISM shows that βαπτίζω demands a THOROUGH CHANGE OF CONDITION for its object: 1. BY INTUSPOSITION (usually within a fluid), by any form of act, without limitation of time; 2. *Without intusposition*, by any controlling, penetrating, pervading, and therefore assimilating influence, however applied, and without limitation of time.

"JUDAIC BAPTISM shows the same primary and secondary meanings in relation to *ships sunk* and *men drunk*; and also the application of the secondary meaning to ceremonially purifying religious rites, whereby is secured a new specifically changed condition and meaning—to *purify ceremonially*.

"JOHANNIC BAPTISM abandons the use of the primary meaning within the sphere of physics, but introduces it in a new and ideal sphere, by representing the soul as passing into a spiritual element—*repentance, remission of sins*—under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and by a rite in which water (occupying the position of symbol agency) symbolises, by its purifying nature, this thoroughly changed spiritual condition. The water in its use has no dependence whatever on βαπτίζω.

"CHRISTIC BAPTISM shows the same rejection of the physical sphere, and presents the Lord Jesus Christ (the slain Lamb of God, whose atoning blood cleanseth from all sin,) as the ideal element, by passing into which the spiritual condition of the soul is thoroughly changed, and also a rite

in which water (still in the position of symbol agency) symbolises, by its purifying nature, this purified spiritual condition. This baptism into the Lord Jesus is preparative for and causative of the further and ultimate real baptism into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

“PATRISTIC BAPTISM shows outside of the religious sphere the same meaning as in Classic and Judaic Baptism, and within the religious sphere the same ideal use as in Johannic and Christic Baptism. It departs from them, however, by merging symbol in the real baptism, and making the water co-active with the Holy Spirit in effecting the real baptism. It also exhibits βαπτίζω (having absorbed the original phrase) with the acquired meaning—to purify spiritually.”

“FINAL RESULTS.

“1. THE BAPTISM OF INSPIRATION is a thoroughly changed spiritual condition of the soul, effected by the power of the Holy Ghost through the cleansing blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, and so making it meet for reconciliation, subjection, and assimilation to the one fully revealed living and true God, FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST.

“2. This ‘ONE BAPTISM’ OF INSPIRATION is, by divine appointment, ritually symbolised as to its soul-purification by pure water, poured or sprinkled or otherwise suitably applied to the person, together with a verbal announcement of the spiritual baptism thus symbolised.

“3. DIPPING THE BODY INTO WATER is not, nor (by reason of a double impossibility found in the meaning of the word and in the divine requirement) can it be CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. That Christian baptism is a water dipping is a novelty unheard of in the history of the Church for fifteen hundred years. This idea is not merely an error as to the mode of using the water, (which would, comparatively, be a trifle,) but it is an error which sweeps away the substance of the baptism without leaving a vestige behind. It is a sheer and absolute abandonment of the baptism of Inspiration, which is a baptism into CHRIST—into the NAME of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and the substitution for it of a dipping into WATER, which has no more place in the Scriptures than the English W has a place in the alphabet of the Greek Testament.

“THIS RESULT (a nullification of the theory which says that ‘dipping into water is Christian baptism’) has not been sought, nor is it announced with any feelings of triumph or gladness of heart as against the friends of this theory; but it is declared as a result demanded by the concurrent and unanimous testimony of Heathen writers, Jewish writers, Inspired writers, and early Christian writers, reaching through a continuous historic period of more than one thousand years.

“CONCLUSION.

“THIS CONCLUDED INQUIRY with its results is now adoringly laid at the feet of Him who is THE TRUTH, for his approval and blessing.

“Whatever of truth there may be in it is his, and as his is made by him the common heritage of all his people. This truth may he establish. And all error may he overturn, whether it be found in or out of this INQUIRY.”

It is to be hoped that the author may be induced to present the results of his elaborate researches in a brief and popular form, suited to the wants of common Christians, showing plainly and pointedly, as he is able to do, by the analogies which linguistic use so abundantly affords, that the word *baptize* expresses not the mode, but, by symbol, purifying, sanctifying, and redeeming power; that symbols and figures are analogous to that which they represent mostly but in some one single point, and that it is of no more consequence as to the significance of the rite, how much water should be used in baptism, than it is how much bread and wine each communicant should eat and drink at the Supper of our Lord. Let all be careful, lest, while they grasp like children at the shadow, they miss wholly the substance.

The Last Journals of David Livingstone in Central Africa, from eighteen hundred and sixty-five to his Death; continued by a Narrative of his Last Moments and Sufferings, obtained from his faithful servants, Chuma and Susi. By HORACE WALLER, F. R. G. S., Rector of Twywell Northampton; with Portrait, Maps, and Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1875. Pp. 541, 8vo.

The elegant volume before us ends with these words: “Thus, in his death, not less than in his life, David Livingstone bore testimony to that good will and kindness which exists in the heart of the African.” There is not the least possible doubt that this testimony is a true and well-deserved one. The African has an affectionate heart and a docile temper. None know this so well as we who have lived our life-time amongst them, and none have so often borne hearty testimony to the simple virtues of this naturally gentle-hearted people as we *quondam* slaveholders. Why should we not? We were brought up together with Africans as children, and with Africans we worked together and dwelt together and suffered together as grown men. It was a kindly relation, the slavery that existed in these States:

and it constantly grew kindlier as time rolled on, and masters and slaves marched together onwards and upwards under the refining and elevating influences of Christian civilisation. Bad masters there were, of course, and bad servants too; and the rod was a needful institution, and not abused by masters generally. Dr. Livingstone often tells of his using it on Africans who required that kind of discipline in their own country—(see pp. 69, 465, 468)—and no one can doubt his humanity and kindness of heart. It suits those who have evil designs to represent us as having been harsh and cruel to our slaves, and as being now the enemies of the freedmen. And many at the North, who are sincere and honest in the interest felt by them for the negro race, are deceived as to Southern feeling on this subject. But we repeat, it was in general a kindly relation that bound masters and slaves together, as witness on the one hand their rapid increase under the mild bondage they endured, and on the other hand their faithfulness to mistress and her children during the whole war, while master was far away in the field. It is not for us to assume to be responsible for masters who feared not God nor regarded man, such tyrannical persons as are found in every community; but we aver, in the face of all assertions to the contrary, that masters, for the most part, and especially Christian masters, all through the South, performed their duty in this relation with as much fidelity as in any other of the relations of life.

Before leaving this topic, let us record to the honor of the African people, how faithfully Livingstone was cared for by his native attendants, as disease gradually undermined his strength. Two of them, in particular, *Susi* and *Chuma*, waited on their dying master (just as amongst us in ten thousand cases,) with all the affectionate tenderness of a mother for her suffering babe. And when Dr. Livingstone breathed his last, these faithful servants and their companions, with consummate adroitness, and at considerable personal risk, and at the cost of much labor and fatigue, managed to convey the remains many hundred miles to the seacoast, without the knowledge of the various tribes through which their journey led them. Hence they were conveyed to his native land and buried with distinguished honors.

Dr. Livingstone was a great man in his devotion to a high purpose tenaciously followed up through years of toil and self-denial and danger. He had a great heart in him, as was seen in his gentleness and tenderness and humility and unselfishness. His pitifulness towards the brute creation of all sorts, and his unspeakable commiseration with suffering humanity, as he so often encountered it in poor and wretched Africa, the records of which appear on almost every page of these journals—these attractive and pleasing manifestations of the man impress the reader very profoundly with a sense of the true nobility of his soul. And Dr. Livingstone's services as an explorer in that unknown land, where he sacrificed his life, are of the greatest value to science in various directions. Yet he must not be looked upon in any strict and proper sense as a Christian missionary. As he passes from village to village, and through tribe after tribe, he is no preacher of Christ. Indeed it is rather remarkable how few are the occasions when he makes any reference to our Saviour, although he does not very infrequently return thanks to *the Deity*, the *Almighty*, or *our Father* on High, for deliverances and mercies experienced. Occasionally we read of his having "divine service" as he commonly laid by on "the Christian Sabbath days," which consisted, it would appear, of reading the Prayer-book, whilst the natives would look on; and sometimes he mentions that he told a chief, or some other person, something about the Bible—but we do not read of his ever preaching, either formally or informally; and he never seems to have made it *his business to instruct* the natives in the truths of the gospel of Christ. He would seem to have been, indeed, not a Christian missionary at all, but rather an apostle of the Humanitarians—a missionary in the service of commerce and science and freedom. As we had occasion to say in our number for January, 1858, when criticising his former work, entitled *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa, etc., etc.*, "Not alone the gospel, not alone Christ and him crucified, but trade and the gospel, Christianity and cotton growing, side by side, together form the aim and object of his earnest desires," so now we feel constrained to observe, that although the cotton

and the manufactures seem not now to have been so much in Dr. Livingstone's thoughts as formerly, yet they were engrossed throughout all these last years almost completely by the slave trade, geology, and geography; the position of lakes; the number and source and course of rivers; and by the minutest details of natural history and of personal adventures with lions, elephants, serpents, crocodiles, etc., etc. We repeat the substance of what we were constrained to say in 1858, viz., that the humane, tender-hearted, and charitable traveller, whom the world delights to honor, was no doubt a good and a pious Christian man, sacrificing his life for the good of Africa, but not her highest good. He was one of that class of good men who deify civilisation, and rely for Africa's redemption on England and America, rather than on Christ and his divine almighty word. And yet, what can science and civilisation and freedom do for Africa, and what did mere trade and commerce with Christian nations, education and liberty being thrown in also as make-weights—what did these ever teach any heathen people but those vices which have but the more rapidly and fatally ruined them, body and soul, forever?

It must not be supposed that this large volume is chiefly filled up with descriptions of the horrors of the slave trade, although that was with our author the most important point of all his researches. On the contrary, all that he furnishes on that subject hardly fills up one dozen of the five hundred and forty pages of his book, as the reader may see for himself, when we come to set before his eyes nearly every word which bears on that dreadful traffic. In great part, the contents of these journals are the most insignificant details, which yet, nevertheless, do give us an idea of what Africa is. Of course we have no reference here to those magnificent geographical and other scientific discoveries recorded here. But we confess that the book is tedious in the extreme. Nor do we perceive how it could well have been otherwise, seeing that it is made up to so large an extent of the briefest entries. It is very monotonous to read over and over and over again, through half a thousand large pages, how Dr. Livingstone reached such a chief's village, whose name and the name of the

village is given ; and then how such a present was given, and such a return made for it ; and then how the traveller pursued his way on the next day, and heard some lion or some elephant in the forest, and saw some curious bird or insect in the woods, with a barbarous African name.

But let us close with the extracts promised :

“ June 19th, '66.—We passed a woman tied by the neck to a tree, and dead. The people of the country explained that she had been unable to keep up with the other slaves in a gang, and her master had determined that she should not become the property of any one else, if she recovered after resting for a time. I may mention here that we saw others tied up in a similar manner, and one lying in the path, shot or stabbed, for she was in a pool of blood. The explanation we got invariably was that the Arab who owned these victims was enraged at losing his money by the slaves becoming unable to march, and vented his spleen by murdering them ; but I have nothing more than common report in support of attributing this enormity to the Arabs.” (Page 59.)

“ We passed a slave woman shot or stabbed through the body, and lying on the path. A group of men stood about a hundred yards off on one side, and another of women on the other side, looking on. They said an Arab, who passed early that morning, had done it in anger at losing the price he had given for her, because she was unable to walk any longer.”

“ June 27th.—To-day we came upon a man dead from starvation, as he was very thin. One of our men wandered and found a number of slaves with slave-sticks on, abandoned by their master from want of food ; they were too weak to be able to speak or say where they had come from ; some were quite young. We crossed the Tulosi, a stream coming from south, about twenty yards wide.

“ At Chenjewala's the people are usually much startled when I explain that the numbers of slaves we see dead on the road, have been killed partly by those who sold them ; for I tell them that if they sell their fellows, they are like the man who holds the victim while the Arab performs the murder.

“ Chenjewala blamed Machemba, a chief above him, on the Rovuma, for encouraging the slave trade. I told him I had travelled so much among them that I knew all the excuses they could make ; each head man blamed some one else.

“ ‘ It would better if you kept your people, and cultivated more largely,’ said I. ‘ Oh, Machemba sends his men and robs our gardens after we have cultivated,’ was the reply. One man said that the Arabs who come and tempt them with fine clothes are the cause of their selling. This was childish ; so I told them they would very soon have none to sell ;

their country was becoming jungle, and all their people who did not die in the road, would be making gardens for Arabs at Kilwa or elsewhere." (Pages 63 and 64.)

"They have all heard of our wish to stop the slave trade, and are rather taken aback when told that by selling they are art and part guilty of the mortality of which we had been unwilling spectators. Some were dumbfounded when shown that in the eye of their Maker they are parties to the destruction of human life which accompanies this traffic both by sea and land. If they did not sell, the Arabs would not come to buy. Chuma and Wakatani render what is said very eloquently in Chiyan, most of the people being of their tribe, with only a sprinkling of slaves." (Page 67.)

"We had now passed through, at the narrowest part, the hundred miles of depopulated country, of which about seventy are on the north-east of the Mataka. The native accounts differ as to the cause. Some say slave wars, and assert that the Makua, from the vicinity of Mozambique, played an important part in them; others say famine; others that the people have moved to and beyond Nyassa." (Page 83.)

"Sept. 16th—At Mukate's.—The Prayer-book does not give ignorant persons any idea of an unseen Being addressed; it looks more like reading or speaking to the book; kneeling and praying with eyes shut is better than our usual way of holding divine service.

"We had a long discussion about the slave-trade. The Arabs have told the chief that our object in capturing slaves is to get them into our own possession, and make them of our own religion. The evils which we have seen—the skulls, the ruined villages, the numbers who perish on the way to the coast and on the sea, the wholesale murders committed by the Waiyan to build up Arab villages elsewhere—these things Mukate often tried to turn off with a laugh; but our remarks are safely lodged in many hearts. Next day, as we went along, our guide spontaneously delivered their substance to the different villages along our route. Before we reached him, a head man, in conveying me a mile or two, whispered to me, 'Speak to Mukate to give his forays up.'

"It is but little we can do: but we lodge a protest in the heart against a vile system, and time may ripen it. Their great argument is, 'What could we do without Arab cloth?' My answer is, 'Do what you did before the Arabs came into the country.' At the present rate of destruction of population, the whole country will soon be a desert." (Pages 94 and 95.)

"The strangest disease I have seen in this country seems really to be broken-heartedness; and it attacks free men who have been captured and made slaves. My attention was drawn to it when the elder brother of Syde bin Habib was killed in Rua by a night attack, from a spear being pitched through his tent into his side. Syde then vowed vengeance for

the blood of his brother, and assaulted all he could find, killing the elders, and making the young men captives. He had secured a very large number, and they endured the chains until they saw the broad river Lualaba roll between them and their free homes; they then lost heart. Twenty-one were unchained, as being now safe; however, all ran away at once; but eight, with many others still in chains, died in three days after crossing. They ascribed their only pain to the heart, and placed the hand correctly on the spot, though many think that the organ stands high up under the breast-bone. Some slavers expressed surprise to me that they should die, seeing they had plenty to eat and no work. One fine boy of about twelve years was carried, and when about to expire was kindly laid down on the side of the path, and a hole dug to deposit the body in. He, too, said he had nothing the matter with him except pain in his heart. As it attacks only the free, (who are captured, and never slaves,) it seems to be really broken hearts of which they die."

"Livingstone's servants give some additional particulars in answer to questions put to them about this dreadful history. The sufferings endured by these unfortunate captives while they were hawked about in different directions, must have been shocking indeed. Many died because it was impossible for them to carry a burden on the head while marching in the heavy yoke, or 'taming-stick,' which weighs from thirty to forty pounds, as a rule; and the Arabs knew that if once the stick were taken off, the captive would escape on the first opportunity. Children for a time would keep up with wonderful endurance; but it happened sometimes that the sound of dancing and the merry tinkle of the small drums would fall on their ears in passing near to a village; then the memory of home and happy days proved too much for them; they cried and sobbed, 'the broken-heart' came on, and they rapidly sank.

"The adults, as a rule, came into the slave-sticks from treachery, and had never been slaves before. Very often the Arabs would promise a present of dried fish to villagers if they would act as guides to some distant point; and as soon as they were far enough away from their friends, they were seized and pinned into the yoke, from which there is no escape. These poor fellows would expire in the way the Doctor mentions, talking to the last of their wives and children, who would never know what had become of them. On one occasion, twenty captives succeeded in escaping as follows: Chained together by the neck, and in the custody of an Arab armed with a gun, they were sent off to collect wood. At a given signal, one of them called the guard to look at something which he pretended he had found. When he stooped down, they threw themselves upon him and overpowered him, and after he was dead, managed to break the chain and make off in all directions."

[*Note by the Editor*, pages 352-4.]

“When endeavoring to give some account of the slave-trade of East Africa, it was necessary to keep far within the truth, in order not to be thought guilty of exaggeration: but, in sober earnestness, the subject does not admit of exaggeration. To overdraw its evils is a simple impossibility. The sights I have seen, though common incidents of the traffic, are so nauseous that I always strive to drive them from memory. In the case of most disagreeable recollections, I can succeed, in time, in consigning them to oblivion; but the slaving scenes come back unbidden, and make me start up at dead of night, horrified by their vividness. To some this may appear weak and unphilosophical, since it is alleged that the whole human race has passed through the process of development. We may compare cannibalism to the stone age, and the times of slavery to the iron and bronze epochs. Slavery is as natural a step in human development as from bronze to iron.” (Page 442.)

The Paraclete: An Essay on the Personality and Ministry of the Holy Ghost, with some Reference to Current Discussions.
By JOSEPH PARKER, D. D. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1875.

The author of this work is not unknown to fame. He made his mark, and no indistinct one, when “*Ecce Deus*” surprised the world into a recognition of Dr. Parker’s peculiar merits as a controversial writer. That notable reply to “*Ecce Homo*” is indeed marred by reason of certain grave doctrinal deficiencies, but it is impossible to withhold the praise that is due to its distinguished literary excellence. Similar rhetorical graces characterise his taking little book entitled “*Ad Clerum*.” Nor is Dr. Parker wanting in those higher qualities which are exhibited in vigor of judgment and freshness of argumentative illustration. What he regards as truth, he utters with a discriminative clearness which evinces great depth of conviction, and with a fervor of earnestness which betokens an eager sense of its importance. His scholarship is, however, not so profound as it is outspread and varied. He has, we believe, never attempted critical exegesis, unless his analysis of the Gospel by Matthew be an instance to the contrary; but this is intended not so much for the student who would search for the meaning of original Scripture, as for the homilist who desires to be prompted in the discovery of practical applications. He possesses that character of mind which rather fits

him for impressive eloquence in the pulpit, than for engaging in the battles of sages. Dr. Parker has, it must be said, one requisite which is always demanded in successful literary enterprise—unbounded confidence in himself. It is hardly possible to conceive of his ever being tormented with the fear that perhaps he is, after all, mistaken in the views he presents, so *ex cathedra* is his manner of addressing himself to his work. It is not exactly conceit, it is not vanity, it is not egotism; it is these mingled and compounded in such proportions as to produce a wonder of self-complacency, which yet sits so easily upon him as to excite no such unpleasant emotion as would be experienced by his readers were he less energetic as an original thinker or less graceful as a practised rhetorician.

The present treatise discusses a subject of the first importance, but which has not, in modern times, been extensively handled either in the pulpit or out of it; which has, indeed, been woefully neglected, greatly, we believe, to the hurt of our current Christianity. Owen's great work on the Holy Spirit has had no fellow; perhaps must always remain unrivalled. But even he by no means exhausted the possibilities of a theme which is as far-reaching as the utmost limits of didactic and practical theology, and which every successive generation of Christian believers ought to study for itself, as guided by the increasing lights of accumulative and sanctified scholarship. We are, therefore, prompt to hail Dr. Parker's new book as a step, an important one, too, in the right direction. If it shall serve no other use, it must largely contribute to transfuse the thoughts of many with a fresh interest in a subject which ought to lay very near the heart of the Church, and now, perhaps, nearer than ever before, because of the general lack of vitality in those ministrations of the gospel which so conspicuously need the accompanying fire of the divine Spirit, and will more and more manifestly need it as "the end" approaches. But this work will be effective, also, in the way of instruction with respect to the attitudes which controversy with the subtler enemies of Christianity is beginning plainly to assume. The author justly remarks in his introduction: "A great battle as between Faith and Unbelief has yet to

come. There have been wars and rumors of wars, but Armageddon itself is now evidently in the near distance. The struggle will probably relate not so much to the mere facts of Christian history as to the reality of Spiritual existence; man's personal spirituality will be denied; thought itself will be still more emphatically pronounced but a form or expression of matter; and, as a logical necessity, so far as these things are supposed to be proved, Christianity will be regarded as the outcome of a tragical mistake, and the entire theological idea be classed with the nightmares of Paganism. This is the manifest course of the controversy which is immediately impending. Christian men are therefore bound to show cause why they insist upon retaining their old theological landmarks, and unless they give some answer to the persistent and boastful Sadduceeism of the times, they may place themselves in a false position, and lose, in respect to young and inexperienced Christians, the reward of being a tongue to the dumb." The inquiry, accordingly, which Dr. Parker would elucidate, is the following: "How far is it possible to divest the Christian doctrine of the Holy Ghost of such mystery as is superstitious rather than religious? Christian theology affirms the existence of a Ghost—a Spiritual Person—who is the highest Teacher of truth and the supreme Minister of comfort. Does that dogma carry with it such a quality of mystery as resents the investigations of reason; or is it possible so to use reason as to see, even with considerable distinctness, that the word *Ghost* is the proper development of the word *Person*, and that without such progress and consummation the word 'Person' would become a limited and self-exhausting term?"

The treatise occupies four hundred duodecimo pages, large print, and is divided into two unequal parts, followed by an epilogue. The larger portion is the first, which is "expository and affirmative," and is subdivided into sixteen chapters. A recital of the headings of these chapters will convey to the reader a pretty fair idea of the general contents of the volume and of the mode of the argument: "Personality and Manifestation." "The Historic Movement towards Spirituality." "Inspiration as a Doctrine." "Inspiration as a Fact." "Inspiration of

Christ's Biography." "The Holy Spirit as the Interpreter of Scripture." "The Ministry of the Comforter." "The Convictive Work of the Holy Ghost." "Regeneration." "Pentecost." "The Witness of the Spirit." "The Human Spirit limited by the Human Body." "The Gift of the Holy Ghost considered as the Culmination of the Gospel." "The Miracles of the Holy Ghost." "Holiness." "Incidental Testimony." Part Second, which is "critical and controversial," is broken into three chapters, whose titles are: "The Collateral Scripture Argument." "Materialism and Spiritualism." "The Spiritual Organ." The Epilogue is principally confined to answering objections.

There are portions, not a few, of this discussion, which are strikingly original and eloquent. We wish for space, that we might quote extended passages, whose perusal would richly repay our readers. Unhesitatingly do we advise ministers and other thoughtful believers to purchase a volume so suggestive and so instructive. Of course we would not be understood as agreeing with the gifted author in all his positions; nor as admiring his dogmatism which too often emerges to view. It is, on the whole, a truly valuable book, and deserving of study.

The Life of Christ. By FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D. D., F. R. S., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Master of Marlborough College; and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. "*Manet Immota Fides.*" New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. Pp. 472, 8vo.

Comparing this recent work with those that have preceded it, such as Hanna's, Crosby's, and others, it is safe to say that Dr. Farrar's is infinitely superior in the display of scholarship, and in beauty of style. Throughout the book he has rendered the dialogues of the Gospels a little more literally than we find them in the English version, but has always preserved the dignity of the speakers, and especially the dignity of the Lord himself. Dr. Crosby is notably unfortunate in some of his paraphrases, making the solemn words of the Lord appear flippant,

for the sake of adopting a dialect a little more modern than that in common use at the date of the translation.

The study of the Saviour's human history has, in most cases, been undertaken for the sake of deriving such lessons from the history as would avail to teach by example. This is the plain object of Dr. Hanna's work; and so long as the great body of believers holds to the theory that the Lord's conduct is imitable by humanity, this sort of teaching may be expected. But Dr. Farrar has exactly stated a difficulty in the way of this theory; even while he, in common with all other evangelical writers upon this topic, repeatedly refers to the acts of Jesus, as exemplary in their character. In speaking of the thirty years preceding the public ministry of the Lord, he says: "They were the years of a sinless childhood, a sinless boyhood, a sinless youth, a sinless manhood, spent in that humility, toil, obscurity, submission, contentment, prayer, to make them an example to all our race. We cannot imitate him in the occupations of his ministry, nor can we even remotely reproduce in our own experience the external circumstances of his life during these three crowning years. But the vast majority of us are placed, by God's own appointment, amid those quiet duties of a commonplace and uneventful routine which are most closely analagous to the thirty years of his retirement. It was during those years that his life is for us the main example of how we ought to live." (Page 43.)

The plain inference from this clear statement is, that this unrecorded life of thirty years cannot form a ground upon which an example can be builded. We cannot imitate imaginary deeds. We have no account, excepting the brief reference in Luke ii. 42-52, of the events of these years; and while it is true beyond controversy that every thought, word, and action of the Lord, was entirely sinless and pure, no man can *know* what these thoughts, words, and acts really were, or anything touching the surroundings that induced them. So, if the quotation we have given is to be taken literally, excluding all the recorded doings of the "three crowning years" as inimitable, in the nature of the case, the example theory falls to the ground.

There is, perhaps, too much emphasis given to traditions, and

even to the apocryphal Gospels, in Dr. Farrar's book. He always cautiously discriminates between these uninspired and non-authentic histories and the Revelation of God; but once and again refers to them as illustrating some point in the Saviour's life or teaching. But he visited Palestine, and sojourned amid those sacred scenes, purposely, while preparing this work; and in those old localities, where changes occur so slowly, there is no doubt that much light may be gained by the observant traveller, to illuminate the sacred narrative. In all this portion of the book the author is simply charming; and indeed he is so uniformly orthodox in his teachings, so pronounced in his recognition of the Lord's essential divinity, that one can readily tolerate the occasional presentation of the example theory, even where the record does not justify it.

It seems never to have occurred to sceptical philosophers that the production of these numerous Lives of Jesus, not only by godly men like Drs. Hanna and Farrar, but also by Strauss, Renan, and other unbelievers, affords a proof of the divine origin of Christianity. On one side, the doubters carefully select the Bible incidents, and carefully exclude all that are inexplicable upon the hypothesis that this historic character was merely human. On the other, the Christian essays to explore the hidden history of the Lord's life, in order to show that he was not merely divine, and to search for some indication that he was governed by the ordinary principles that control humanity. But the whole value of investigation is summed up in the concluding words of Dr. Farrar: "But for ever, even until all the Æons have been closed, and the earth itself, with the heavens that now are, have passed away, shall every one of his true and faithful children find peace and hope and forgiveness in his name, and that name shall be called Emmanuel, which is, being interpreted, 'GOD WITH US.'"

How is it explicable that this central Figure, in the vast volume of human annals, should attain this preëminence, except upon the hypothesis that he is very God, very man?

History of the South Carolina College, from its Incorporation, December 19, 1801, to December 19, 1865, including Sketches of its Presidents and Professors. With an Appendix. Prefaced by a Life of the Author, by J. L. REYNOLDS, D. D. By M. LABORDE, M. D., Professor of Metaphysics, Logic, and Rhetoric, South Carolina College. Charleston, S. C.: Walker, Evans & Cogswell, Printers, Nos. 3 Broad and 109 East Bay Streets. 1874. Pp. 596, 8vo.

This new edition of Dr. LaBorde's admirable History is very elegantly got up, and does credit to the Charleston publishers. Having already, in former years, fully expressed our judgment, as critics, of the work itself, we shall now only refer to Dr. Reynolds's sketch of the author's life. It is the tribute of a life-long friendship to a lofty character. Dr. LaBorde was connected with the College from 1837 as a Trustee, and from 1842 as a Professor. No more popular instructor, unless, perhaps, Dr. Thornwell be the exception, ever taught within the walls of that noble institution. His resignation took place in October, 1873, so that his term of service was the long one of thirty-one years. It was not uninterrupted service, however; for in 1862 the College was left without students, their patriotic ardor having impelled them to enter the Confederate army. Relieved of College duty, his generous nature sought employment in which he could serve the State in her hour of need. He helped to form, and became chairman of, the "Association for the Relief of South Carolina Soldiers." Possessed then of ample means, he devoted himself to its operations with characteristic energy. The entire summer of 1861 he had spent in Virginia, establishing "Wayside Hospitals" at Richmond, Charlottesville, Culpepper, Manassas, etc., etc. Now, by his associates and agents, he follows the soldier of his State, to give him the refreshing draught as he lay weltering in his blood; to take charge of him on his way in the ambulance to the hospital; soothing him with the tenderness of a parent's love, and pointing him to heaven as he was passing out of this life. His memory, accordingly, is dear to our people; and in many a humble dwelling, where the fame of letters would excite no emotion, tears of gratitude evince the tenderness of the affection in which he is held. When the struggle for Southern inde-

pendence came to its disastrous termination, the College being reopened in October, 1865, he returned to his peaceful vocation. When Sherman suffered his soldiers to consume the city, Dr. LaBorde's energy, with that of Dr. Reynolds and Prof. Rivers, had saved the College buildings from their petrolcum torches. The Hon. R. W. Barnwell and a corps of other colleagues now enter with him on the work of rebuilding the institution, transformed by the Legislature into a University. But their prosperity was not for long. The State passes into the control of strangers from the North, of the worst character. The old trustees, having the confidence of the white people of the State, are rudely thrust aside to make way for adventurers unknown or known unfavorably. "In the mere wantonness of power," as Dr. Reynolds says, "or for the satisfaction which a rude nature takes in the humiliation of his superiors, negroes are placed upon the Board of Trustees. This act, although less cruel than that which needlessly outraged the sentiments of our people by thrusting negroes among the Regents of the Lunatic Asylum, was more pernicious in its results. It excited suspicion of what ultimately followed—the attempt to mix the races in public education—and kept students away." The Professors stood at their posts, hoping to avert the ruin of the institution, and save it for the white sons of the State. "A mixed school was impracticable. The colored people neither needed nor desired it. Claflin University, at Orangeburg, established expressly for the education of their children, offered them the facilities—the means of varied culture—obtainable as the University of the State. But the Trustees were bent upon a mixed school; and there were needy adventurers at hand to aid them in their attempt. Supposing, correctly, that the old Professors would not lend themselves to the perpetration of such an act of wanton injustice, they removed them, and conferred their places upon strangers who, even if unknown, or known only to be despised as incompetent or immoral, were yet more subservient to their views. The University thus became, both in its officers and in its matriculates, a mixed school; and a policy which a Republican Congress has

since refused to adopt, and thus virtually repudiated, was allowed to effect the ruin of that seat of learning."

The South Carolina College had always been the pride of the State. It had nurtured many hundreds of her sons in sound learning. She had always liberally supported it, the annual appropriation for its wants being between twenty and thirty thousand dollars. The white race in this State established the institution for their children. But the black race being now in power, have, under the leading of aliens who are the enemies of our people, spoiled us of this cherished school, and appropriated it to themselves. Out of the revenues of the State, almost entirely collected from the white people, large appropriations are made to support Professors from the North as teachers of colored youth, while at the same time, as quoted above from Dr. Reynolds, there is another University at Orangeburg, expressly for the blacks. The white youth of South Carolina must now remain without the benefits of liberal education, or they must go to other States to obtain it, or they must consent to the association of negroes in their daily pursuits. It is a hard case that our youth should be forced to choose one of these three alternatives, while their fathers are made to pay thousands of dollars annually for the education of another race in a school designed for their own children. But this injustice cannot always last. This rude tyranny must come to an end. The black race will not be able always to keep the white man down in South Carolina. We bear the negroes none but the kindest feelings. They were faithful servants—let them have and let them enjoy the rights and the blessings God's wise and good providence has conferred on them. We would not curtail the least one of them all. But the white race in South Carolina, too, has some rights; and though deprived of them now, we confidently look for the day to come which shall restore them.

The Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland: With a View of the Primary Causes and Movements of the Thirty Years War. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, D. C. L., LL.D., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, etc.; Author of "The Rise of the Dutch Republic," and "The History of the United Netherlands." In two Volumes, with Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1874. Pp. 389 and 475, 8vo.

The former works of Mr. Motley constitute a noble monument to his abilities and his learning. The field which he undertook to cultivate is vast and fertile, but he brought to the task powers commensurate with its value and importance. The present work grows out of the two which preceded it, though not necessarily dependent upon them. But this is now put forth as the introduction to what the author has long contemplated and been preparing—a History of the Thirty Years War. We shall wait impatiently for its appearance.

Upon the first announcement of the publication of this History of John Oldenbarneveld, the great Arminian statesman of Holland, it must have occurred to any reflecting reader that Mr. Motley had entered upon a more difficult task than was involved in either of his two previous performances. It is hard enough for one educated a Protestant, to be just and fair in writing of events which bear directly and cogently upon the controversy with Roman Catholics. But the life and the death of Oldenbarneveld stand related most intimately to the controversy betwixt two forms of Protestant doctrine. Mr. Motley would fain represent these issues as dead ones. He could not make a greater mistake. They are as much alive as they ever were. They have ever been living and potent since Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, though at some times more, and at other times less conspicuously active as the factors of controversy. These issues cannot die for the human race so long as the two kingdoms of Christ and the wicked one contend for the supremacy over it, so long as the old and the new man wage warfare together; and it is simply impossible for our author to be absolutely impartial in describing the contests of Calvinists and Arminians, unless he

can claim to be utterly indifferent to the most important truths of the Christian system. It was for this reason very natural to be apprehensive that his success might not prove so distinguished in this as in his first two works. And we cannot deny that this apprehension appears to us to have been but too well realised.

A deliberate judgment on this point we may not pronounce without a more full and complete examination of these volumes than has yet been allowed us. The statement above made is that of our *first impressions*. It is hardly possible, however, that we can be mistaken in observing that there is a degree of flippancy constantly appearing in Mr. Motley's references to the great questions which divided James Arminius and John Calvin. There is nothing little or trifling surely in the doctrines of the Divine Sovereignty, of Original Sin, of Predestination, or of any of the Five Points. If Mr. Motley can allow himself to sneer at these, as a mere *slag and cinders of an extinct volcano, making the past black and barren*, he must expect that the readers of his books will inquire whether, after all, his is the right sort of mind to do justice either to the subjects of such a controversy or the actors in it.

Waiving for the present any further observations on this point, we must refer, before we close, to the characteristic representation which our author, himself a New Englander, makes of "the Pilgrim Fathers," as "the founders" of this "mightiest republic of modern history." Without stopping to ask on what grounds the founding of this republic is to be ascribed to New England, to the exclusion of Cavaliers and Presbyterians and Huguenots, it is pertinent to observe that there is yet lacking more than one year of the single century of this republic's life, and lo! men of all schools of politics are gazing fearfully into the future, to see if *the Empire* is not at hand; and the coolest and calmest and fairest minds are forced to acknowledge that already, in less than one century, the republican government our fathers set up has been fearfully if not fatally revolutionised.

The Communistic Societies of the United States ; from Personal Visit and Observation : Including Detailed Accounts of the Economists, Zoarites, Shakers, the Amana, Oneida, Bethel, Aurora, Icarian, and Other Existing Societies, Their Religious Creeds, Social Practices, Numbers, Industries, and Present Condition. BY CHARLES NORDHOFF, Author of "Northern California, Oregon, and the Sandwich Islands," "California for Health, Pleasure, and Residence," etc. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1875. Pp. 439, 8vo.

The author of this book is a Prussian by birth, but was brought to the United States at four years of age, and early in life became attached to some of the New York city journals, and thence passed into authorship of books. In the work before us we seem to have a truthful, candid, and honest account of all the Communal families in this country, for the preparation of which the author qualified himself by actual visitation and inspection. He appears to be a thoughtful observer and an earnest and fair inquirer. He sets himself strongly, in his introduction, against Trades Unions and International Clubs, as possessed of a mischievous and hateful spirit, and as corrupting our politics, lowering the standard of intelligence and independence amongst laborers, and producing amongst them an unreasoning and unreasonable discontent. They have in a few cases temporarily increased wages and diminished the hours of labor in certain branches of industry ; but on the other hand, they have debased the character and lowered the moral tone of their membership, by the narrow and cold-blooded selfishness of their doctrines. But, according to our author, the greatest harm done by Trades Unions is in their seeking to eliminate from the thoughts of their adherents the hope or expectation of independence. They teach them to accept, as inevitable for themselves and the masses, the condition of hirelings ; whereas the laborer ought always to have set before him the expectation of his becoming himself a capitalist.

This is the aspect in which the author looks with most interest upon Communism—as a plan for enabling the hired workman to become an independent employer of his own labor. He has devoted himself to the examination of the Communistic Societies

to see if their experience would offer any hints towards the solution of the labor question. These societies, originally farmers or mechanics of very limited means and education, have grown rich, and have developed amongst their members remarkable business ability, and also leaders of sufficient wisdom and skill to rule and direct them. Some of them have existed fifty, some even eighty years. Some are celibate, others inculcate or at least permit marriage. Some gather their members into a common or "unitary" dwelling; others, with no less success, maintain the family relation and the separate household. Mr. Nordhoff was curious to ascertain if their success depended on conditions *not generally attainable*, as extraordinary ability in a leader; or *undesirable*, as religious fanaticism, or some unnatural relation of the sexes; or whether success were not in the reach of any ordinary company of carefully selected and reasonably determined men and women. He desired also to find out what means Communism had to overcome the difficulties of idleness, selfishness, and unthrift in individuals. Still further, he wished to discover what is the effect of Communal living on the character of the individual, whether to broaden or to narrow it, and whether to make the laborer aspire to anything higher than a mere bread and butter existence.

These Societies are as follows: *The Inspirationists*, of Amana, Iowa; *The Harmonists*, of Economy, Pennsylvania; *The Separatists*, of Zoar, Ohio; *The Shakers*, two Societies in Maine, two in New Hampshire, one in Connecticut, four in Massachusetts, three in New York, four in Ohio, and two in Kentucky—in all, eighteen; *The Perfectionists*, of Oneida, New York, and Wallingford, Connecticut; *The Communes*, of Bethel, Missouri, and Aurora, Oregon; *The Icarians*, of Corning, Iowa; *The Cedar Vale Community*, of Kansas; and *The Social Freedom Community*, of Chesterfield County, Virginia, which has for its members only two women, one man, and three boys, with four women and five men as probationers. All these are first described separately, and then a concluding chapter presents a comparative view of their customs and practices. There is also an account of three coöperative colonies, which are sometimes, but erroneously.

said to be Communistic, viz., those of Vineland, in New Jersey; Anaheim, in California; and the Prairie Home colony, in Kansas.

First, then, as to *Religion*: The Icarians reject Christianity; the Bethel and Aurora Communes make little of outward religious observances, and hold that the essence of all religion is unselfishness; the Shakers, Harmonists, Zoarites, and Amana Communists, and the Perfectionists, have each a positive religious faith, such as it is.

Secondly, as to the *Family*: At Icaria, Amana, Aurora, Bethel, and Zoar, the family is held in honor, and each family lives apart. The Icarians even forbid celibacy. The Shakers and the Harmonists are celibates. The Perfectionists extend their Communistic ideas to persons as well as property, and practise what they call "complex marriage," meaning thereby both polygamy and polyandry.

Thirdly, as to the *general influences* of Communism. 1. There is no refinement or high cultivation in men or women—no art, no ornament, no beauty or grace. 2. There is no severe toil. 3. There is great attention to cleanliness. 4. The Communists are honest. 5. They are humane and charitable. 6. They devote much thought to personal ease and comfort. 7. Food is plenty and well cooked. 8. They are healthful and long-lived. 9. They are temperate in the use of wine and spirits. 10. They keep out of debt. 11. Their life does not appear to be considered dull or dreary—a Commune is a village, and occupations are various. 12. They keep up harmony and good order amongst their members, and also get rid of such as they do not want, by *disciplinary* means. Among the Perfectionists, they use what they call *Criticism*, where the subject of it sits and hears all the brethren and sisters freely tell him just what they think of him.

Mr. Nordhoff says of the *quality* of Communal life, that it should not be once compared with that of men and women in pleasant circumstances. But compared with the life of hard labor, he thinks, it gives more scope for enjoyment, more restraint against debasing pleasures, greater variety of employment for each individual, more independence, less severe toil, and less cark-

ing care. It inculcates prudence and frugality, demands self-sacrifice, and restrains selfishness and greed, and so increases happiness. Yet he admits that the success of a Communistic society must depend greatly on a feeling in its members of the *unbearableness of the circumstances which they have to leave*, in order to be Communists. "The general feeling of society is blindly right at bottom: Communism is a mutiny against society. Only, whether the Communist shall rebel with a bludgeon and a petroleum torch, or with a plow and a church, depends upon whether he has not or has faith in God—whether he is a religious being or not. If priestcraft and tyranny have sapped his faith and debauched his moral sense, then he will attack society as the French Commune recently attacked Paris—animated by a furious envy of his more fortunate fellow-creatures, and an indiscriminating hatred toward everything which reminds him of his oppressors, or of the social system from which he has or imagines he has suffered wrong. If, on the contrary, he believes in God, he finds hope and comfort in the social theory which Jesus propounded, and he will seek another way out, as did the Rappists, [Harmonists,] Eben-Ezers, [Inspirationists,] the Jansenists, the Zoarites, and not less the Shakers and the Perfectionists; each giving his own interpretation to that brief narrative of Luke, in which he describes the primitive Christian Church: 'And all that believed were together, and had all things in common; and sold their possessions and goods; and parted them to all men as every man had need.' These words have had a singular power over men in all ages since they were written. They form the charter of every Communistic Society of which I have spoken—for even the Icarians recall them." (Pp. 408, 409.)

His concluding observations are these: "That Communistic societies will rapidly increase in this or any other country, I do not believe. [He had said (page 389) that "the Eben-Ezers and the Perfectionists are the only Communes which are at this time increasing in numbers."] The chances are always great against the success of any newly formed society of this kind. But that men and women can, if they *will*, live pleasantly and prosperously in a Communal society is, I think, proved beyond

a doubt; and thus we have a right to count this another way by which the dissatisfied laborer may, if he chooses, better his condition. This seems to me a matter of some importance, and justifies, to myself at least, the trouble I have taken in this investigation." (P. 418.)

Now it cannot be supposed for a moment that the *common use* of goods in apostolic days, signified any *common property* in those goods. Peter expressly acknowledges the right of Ananias to keep his land, or to sell and keep the whole or any portion of it, at his own good pleasure. Nothing is said in the account of the distribution to the "widows," (Acts vi.,) which signifies a common stock for the support of the whole body. And Paul, in his directions about liberal giving, plainly recognises the freedom of the party contributing to judge for himself how much to give. The tendency of Communism is, therefore, in this direction, plainly *Anti-Christian*. The Scriptures make much of the Family. Communism would fain shew itself wiser and better than the Scriptures; and this is enough to condemn it with all Christian people.

There lies before us, however, a deliverance by the Synod of Central New York last fall, describing the Oneida Perfectionists as anti-Christian in respect also to marriage. They talk of "complex marriage," but their polygamous polyandria is just a system of systematised concubinage, and has no claim whatever to the holy name of *marriage*. But the Synod tells us that by their thrift and prosperity, land in the neighborhood of the Perfectionists has risen in value, and that the Community does good work, and is honest and industrious, which constitutes a mantle broad enough in all that region to cover a multitude of sins. So that there has risen up around Oneida, Madison County, New York, "a large and influential circle of friends, a constituency they might almost be called, who are prepared to do battle for it when assailed on the ground of immorality." "Respectable people (they tell us,) allow themselves to speak sympathisingly." "Nay more, the frequent visits of large companies, and even the assembling of excursionists in crowds, not unfrequently of the young and of Sunday-schools, upon the grounds of the company, which

are shrewdly permitted by the Communists, would go to prove that the existence of the Community is regarded as an accepted fact from which we may derive our share of innocent entertainment or business profit, and deny all responsibility for the rest."

We have no room for further comment, except that the barbarous and benighted South has no Communistic societies, except two settlements of Shakers in a portion of Kentucky lying near to the region of Northern light, and a feeble beginning at Chesterfield County, Virginia. The waves and billows of a great revolution have gone over us, however, and the wickedness of slaveholding having come to an end, there is a better chance for free thinking and free loving to take root on this free soil. What would not the abolitionists have given in the fierceness of their crusade against us, could they only have pointed to such a *fungus* as Communism growing upon our social system! We shall not imitate Northern unfairness by affirming that this is any thing else than a *fungus* on theirs. But let them observe how easy it would be to demonstrate in their fashion, that this is a legitimate outgrowth of their system.

The Poems of Henry Timrod. Edited, with a Sketch of the Poet's Life, by PAUL H. HAYNE. New Revised Edition. New York: E. J. Hale & Son. 1873. Pp. 232, 16mo.

The common experience of book-makers declares that uniform uphill work lies before the poet. In America, there are only two or three names among verse-makers that have attained any great notoriety. And even among the poets of other lands and older times, there are but few that reach the masses of readers. The world is inclined to be prosaic. In the face of this fact, as well as the other fact that Mr. Timrod was a Southern poet, this volume has reached a third edition, winning its way to popularity by the beauty and sweetness of the songs it contains. The history of the author is well known to many of our readers. He was born in Charleston and died in Columbia, and the odors of the magnolia and the pine are found in all his stanzas.

The peculiarity of this collection, consisting mainly of sonnets and short ballads, is the absolute purity of thought and utterance

pervading the book. It is a rare quality in popular poetry, either ancient or modern; and we take special pleasure in commending this little book for this distinguishing excellence. In addition to this, however, the poetry is of a very high class, and is entirely free from the morbid sentimentalism that might have been excusable in the author's circumstances. The march of Sherman, with ruin in its track, trampled his prosperity in the dust, and his later years were spent in dire distress; yet no murmur against the decrees of Providence can be found to mar the sweetness of his songs. We append three stanzas from his ode, sung on the occasion of decorating the graves of the Confederate dead at Magnolia Cemetery, Charleston:

“ Sleep sweetly in your humble graves,
 Sleep, martyrs of a fallen cause;
 Though yet no marble column craves
 The pilgrim here to pause.

“ In seeds of laurel in the earth,
 The blossom of your fame is blown;
 And somewhere, waiting for its birth,
 The shaft is in the stone!

“ Meanwhile, behold the tardy years
 Which keep in trust your storied tombs;
 Behold! your sisters bring their tears,
 And these memorial blooms.”

The work is issued in very attractive style, by Messrs. Hale & Son, who are about to publish a companion volume of poetry by the Editor of *Timrod*, Mr. Paul H. Hayne.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVI.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXXV.

ARTICLE I.

THE DEACON'S OFFICE IN THE CHURCH OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

“BY INTRUSTING ALL PECUNIARY MATTERS INTO THE HANDS OF MEN ORDAINED UNDER SOLEMN SANCTIONS FOR THE PURPOSE, OUR SPIRITUAL COURTS WOULD SOON CEASE TO BE WHAT THEY ARE TO AN ALARMING EXTENT AT PRESENT, MERE CORPORATIONS FOR SECULAR” [FINANCIAL?] “BUSINESS. . . BOARDS COMBINE WHAT GOD HAS SEPARATED, THE PURSE AND THE KEYS.”—*Thornwell's Works*, Vol. IV., page 155.

It richly deserves to be reckoned among the blessings which a merciful providence designs bringing out of the tribulations of the past fifteen years, that the thoughts of our Church have been more and more turned to what has been happily styled “The Financial System of Jesus Christ.” Our difficulties have scarcely been less than those of the Free Church party at the memorable crisis of the disruption in 1843. Like our Scottish brethren, we were cut off as in a moment from the benefits of monetary endowments and organised schemes of Church work. And it remains to this hour a grievance suffered at the hands of our former associates, that they have held fast to every dollar of the common property which, for reasons of convenience, had been chiefly invested in the large commercial centres at the North. We retained, for the most part, our Church edifices, and the few manses attached to them. But as the South became occupied by Federal garrisons, the strong arm of the military was invoked to

place representatives of the Northern Church in many of our pulpits. And as the struggle went forward, not a few of our Church buildings shared the fate of the towns, homesteads, and barns that were being daily consumed by the invader's torch, or else, after being used as barracks, hospitals, and stables, were left to us in such a condition as to be unfit for religious worship, without costly repairs. Perhaps, on the whole, our advantages over our brethren of the Free Church, in the shape of organised congregations, were fairly counterbalanced by our being compelled to devise ways and means for general purposes, amid the terrific throes of civil war, every available dollar and every able bodied man being imperatively demanded for the public necessities. Elders, deacons, and people, had gone in large numbers to the Confederate camps, and our pastors had, in many instances, followed their flocks with the counsels and consolations of the gospel to the scene of danger and suffering.

Such were some of our embarrassments during the long years of the war; nor have they been much lessened since. For it is a melancholy fact, that, after the immense destruction of our resources by the war and its immediate consequences, the process of depletion has been going on more silently, but not less surely, during the nine or ten years of nominal peace. It is confidently believed by the most competent observers, that not less than *fifty per centum* of the capital, in various shapes, left at the cessation of hostilities in the hands of Southern farmers and planters, has been sunk in agricultural operations since! It is not relevant to our present purpose to inquire at length into the fatal causes of this frightful waste, though they may not be hard to find—want of energy, thrift, and economy at home; a persistent clinging to old habits of living; “keeping up appearances” when the wealth which warrants them is gone. But, dominating over these private follies, every impartial eye must see the costly experiments of State Governments forced upon us by the reconstruction measures of Congress—greedy strangers placed in power by the suffrages of ignorant and venal negroes; legislatures, largely composed of the non-taxpaying element, squandering millions upon senseless pretexts or private schemes of plunder. Besides

this, our whole system of labor was instantly crushed by the rude hand of fanaticism ; and it becomes only too painfully apparent that for the tax-burdened South, it will be a difficult lesson to learn how to prosper by the labor of the freedmen. However, let the causes be what they may, whether the fault or the misfortune of our bewildered people, the stubborn *fact* remains, that a large class of them are hourly sinking into what seems to be a bottomless quagmire of bankruptcy. And the question ever returns, like the ghost of murdered Banquo, *How, in the face of all this public fraud and private loss, shall we provide for carrying on our work as a Church ?*

The question has sent pious and able thinkers among us, to inquire at the oracles of God. And as the result, in part, of such anxious questionings, we have the excellent treatises of Dr. Arnold W. Miller and Rev. A. L. Hogshead. Concerning Dr. Miller's monograph, "The Law of the Tithe and the Free-will Offering," we can devise nothing more suitable than to repeat the substance of a remark made to us by Dr. B. M. Palmer, to the effect that he considered it the most learned and thorough discussion of the subject which has yet appeared. This, we feel sure, is the opinion of every competent reader ; though, like the speaker just quoted, he may not be able to accept the Doctor's suggestion as to the enforcement of tithes by the Church. Dr. Dabney has expressed, in his own forcible way, through the columns of the *Central Presbyterian*, his approval of Mr. Hogshead's tractate, "The Gospel Self-supporting." These excellent treatises, differing on some points, are thoroughly agreed in setting forth the main features of the biblical doctrine of worshipping God by frequent thank-offerings of our substance. They exhibit the fallacy (savoring in some cases of little less than insult to God our Almighty Creator, Preserver, and Redeemer,) of the prevalent habit of terming our gifts to religious purposes a *charity*, and succeed in putting the thank-offering on the same footing as our praises and our prayers, among the holy duties of the sanctuary. And more than this, unless we are in error, Christian readers of Dr. Miller and Mr. Hogshead will be apt to rise from the perusal of their discussions convinced that Scrip-

ture furnishes ample evidence that it is a service, both reasonable in itself and well pleasing to God, that we dedicate to him in this way not less than the tenth part of our incomes. Let these scriptural principles once get full possession of the mind and heart of our people, or even a respectable minority of them, and we shall see a perpetual end to some of the evils which now humiliate us. The Church's treasury will no longer be empty. We shall not need the importunate pleadings of committees, reiterated again and again by Assemblies, Synods, and Presbyteries. Brethren of whom the Holy Ghost has said, through the solemn decisions of the Presbyteries, as he did of Barnabas and Saul, "Separate me these for the work whereunto I have called them," will not then be detained for months or years in their purpose to go far hence unto the Gentiles, by the failure of the churches to furnish the necessary means. We shall have no cause to blush at the meagre alms doled out to aged and infirm ministers, and to the widows and orphans of such as have spent their lives in the service of the Church. Nor shall we be mortified by the generation of "Church-beggars" who tease and vex worldly men by their constant applications until they make religion itself hateful. And we shall be forever quit of fairs, "hot suppers," tableaux, charades, "hops," raffles, *et id omne genus*, human devices all of them, though not necessarily all equally wicked, to accomplish what the Lord Jesus has already provided for, if only he be heard in his own house.

It is with some hope of helping forward the same good cause that we venture to present these reflections relative to the Deacon's office in the New Testament Church, and a plea for its more complete restoration among us. For it may be that all efforts to bring up the modern Church to the apostolic standard, have hitherto fallen far short of our aim, in part, from a failure to employ in its full extent that very office to which Christ, through his inspired apostles, has intrusted the revenues of his kingdom. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

The deacon's functions have been, with great propriety, termed by Prof. Wilson "a part of the order of the Church of God

which has, in modern times, been remarkably overlooked."* And this learned writer suggests one of the possible occasions for this neglect, in the prominence naturally given in the discussion of our system to the office of the presbyter. But he judiciously adds: "The office of the deacon is not, it is true, so important as either that of the pastor or of the ruling elder; yet it is not without its importance as a distinct part of the building of God. The care of the Church's poor, and the wise and faithful administration of the contributions of the saints for the promotion of Christ's cause, are matters that cannot, without injury to the Church, be forgotten or neglected; and it is worth our serious inquiry, whether the manifest deficiency in the first of these, and the almost insuperable difficulties that often beset the Church in regard to the second, may not be in part owing to the want of the diaconship as an actively executed function in the churches. For two other reasons, however, this subject should engage the most careful and solemn attention of the members of the Christian Church. 1st. If the deacon's office be, as it is generally admitted to be, a divinely instituted office, can the churches be guiltless in the neglect of it? And 2dly. Most of the churches explicitly recognise this office in their standards as of divine right; but how few have such an officer as the deacon! . . . That we may know Christ's will as King in Zion, and pay our own vows, we ought to examine this subject honestly and prayerfully; and not only examine, but act, by restoring this office to its original and proper position in the Christian Church."

It is matter for astonishment to note the contrast between the ample discussions by the great masters of the eldership, and their meagre notices of the diaconate. Calvin's hands were too much preoccupied with the outlines and leading principles of Presbyterian Church Government to allow of his stopping to elaborate the minuter questions of internal polity. And besides, the diaconate could not become a matter of such vital consequence before the interest of the Church in missionary schemes had

* Essay on the Deacon, by James M. Wilson, D. D., late Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. Philadelphia: William S. Young, No. 14 South Seventh St. Pp. 58.

been revived after long ages of neglect, and while she was continuing to receive aid from the State. Calvin's doctrine, however, while expressed very briefly, will be seen to be in accord with the best results of later thought. It occasions us some surprise to find absolute silence in the able discussions of Principal Cunningham. Prof. Addison Alexander's *Essays on Primitive Church Offices* have nothing to say of the Deacon. And even Dr. Bannerman's elaborate volumes on the Church of Christ, contain no more than a hasty announcement of the well known fact, that the four leading types of Church polity—Papal, Anglican, Presbyterian, and Congregational—agree in recognising the divine appointment of an office bearing the name, and of its consequent perpetuity in the Church, (Vol. II., p. 260.) Pre-occupation and want of the necessary books have prevented our intended examination of the earlier Scottish writers. Their conclusions, however, are embodied in the First and Second Books of Discipline. And citations from such authors as Rutherford and Guthrie, show how much more important the deacon was in their eyes, than in the opinion of their successors in Scotland, Ireland and America. Prof. Wilson (*Essay on the Deacon*, pp. 10 and 25,) asserts that the placing of ecclesiastical funds in the hands of deacons, was one chief ground of objection to the First Book. The Court party wished the funds to be handled by a civil functionary, it would seem. The Kirk refused, and so the First Book of Discipline never was adopted by the Government, though it is claimed as a standard by the Church of Scotland. Dr. John Lorimer, of the Established Church, in his little work on the Deacon, calls attention to the use made of this office in the financial system of the Free Church, and expresses the confident opinion that much of their wonderful success as a Church enterprise is due to the wisdom of those financial measures, suggested in the main by Dr. Chalmers. Indications seem to point toward a revival of the scriptural office, and these are linked to the need of free-will offerings to carry on such enterprises as Foreign Missions. And when Church and State are once separated in Scotland, as has been done in Ireland, the diaconate will assume its proper place as an arm of the Church.

The venerable Owen, alone of all the great masters, seems to have considered the functions of the deacon in all its bearings. And this he has done with that patient examination and thorough analysis of Scripture which entitle the greatest of the Puritans to the surname of "The Judicious," bestowed with infinitely less merit upon the great Anglican, Hooker. Dr. Owen's opinions coincide with the citations affixed to this article.*

The doctrine of our Church, as to the deacon, is briefly expressed in chapter VI. of the Form of Government, and embraces the following points: I. The diaconship is a permanent office by divine appointment in the Church of Christ. II. It pertains exclusively to matters of finance. III. Deacons have entire control over the alms of the saints, intended for the use of the poor. IV. To them also may be properly committed the temporal affairs of the Church.

I. As to the first element in the doctrine of the deacon, the permanence of the office as of divine appointment in the Church, there is no difference of opinion, according to Dr. Bannerman, among Papal, Anglican, Presbyterian, or Congregational Churches. The denial of this position, therefore, may be set down as individual opinion, though it be acquiesced in by some of the smaller bodies calling themselves Christian. The permanence of the diaconate has been called in question (1) on the allegation that the necessity recorded in Acts vi., as the occasion of appointing men to this business, was transient in its nature; and (2) that the term used to designate the supposed office, is applied to so many persons, and in such a variety of relations, that nothing definite can be inferred from it. To these objections it is only necessary to answer, (1) that the necessity for such an office has not passed away; the poor are always with us, accord-

* Some discussion of the deacon's office may be found in such treatises as those of King, McKerrow, and Dr. Samuel Miller on the Ruling Elder. Prof. Wilson's Essay, already cited, seems to be the most thorough. But Dr. A. W. Miller, of Charlotte, N. C., has ably criticised defects in the Scottish Theory adopted by Prof. W., in two valuable contributions made by him to the *North Carolina Presbyterian*, in 1869. These papers ought to be more generally known to the Church.

ing to the Master's word; and if inspired apostles needed such help, how much more those who come after them! (2) Paul's salutation to the "deacons," as a separate class of office-bearers in the church at Philippi, (Phil. i. 1,) and yet more clearly his directions to Timothy, (1 Tim. iii. 8-13,) as to the qualifications necessary to fit persons for holding the office, place it beyond all question that a separate and permanent office is intended. (3) The same objection of various significations in the name of this officer can be, on the same grounds, made against others also, both ordinary and extraordinary. *Pastor* signifies one who takes care of sheep as well as those church officers who supervise the flock of Christ. *Apostolos* (ἀπόστολος) signifies a messenger sent upon any errand, as well as those inspired men, twelve in number at first, to whom Paul was afterwards added, sent forth by the Lord Jesus to found churches and write Scripture. *Presbyteros* (πρεσβύτερος) is used in the common meaning of an old man as well as the ecclesiastical sense of a ruler in the Church. The only question is, Have we sufficient evidence of this special or ecclesiastical application? And in reply, we allege the instances cited above.*

II. The second point in the doctrine of our Church is, that the deacon's office pertains exclusively to the finances, and not to government, preaching, or administration of Sacraments. Here we part company with Papists, Anglicans, and with most of the Congregational bodies also. In the Congregational churches, deacons exercise functions nearly akin to those of the Presbyterian elder, the chief point of difference being that discipline is commonly administered immediately by the church-members, and not by their official representatives. The finances being for the

* According to Hutson's Critical Greek Concordance, *diakonos* (διάκονος) occurs thirty times in the New Testament, in twenty of which cases our version renders it *minister*; in seven, *servant*; and in three only, *deacon*. The verb *diakoneo*, (διακονέω) and its derivative, *diakonia*, (διακονία) are found thirty-seven and thirty-four times respectively, and with about the same renderings in the English version. It is a curious circumstance, that the old Anglo-Saxon seems not to have been able to furnish a suitable term for *doulos* (δούλος) or *diakonos*, (διάκονος) and hence borrowed *minister*, *servant*, *deacon*, or the correlative words *serf* and *slave*.

most part in the hands of committees, the Congregational deacon is the spiritual adviser of the pastor and of the people. In virtue of his office, he conducts religious exercises, and feels authorised to preach when occasion offers in frontier and destitute neighborhoods. Dr. King justly observes that the usages of our Congregational brethren bear a silent testimony to the wisdom of our Presbyterian system, by showing the need of just such an office-bearer as the ruling elder, intermediate, as it were, between the people and the preacher.

The Anglican and Methodist Episcopal doctrine is for substance the same as that of Rome, certain excesses being omitted. They hold the deacon to be the third order of the clergy, bishops being the first, and priests being the second. To the deacon pertain the preaching of the Word and the administration of baptism. He is also to assist the officiating minister in distributing the bread and wine at the Lord's Supper.

So far as any direct authority from Scripture for these clerical functions of the deacon is concerned, it is easy to find large concessions in our favor made by the chief Anglican writers. The learned antiquarian, Bingham, scarcely pauses in his eager investigation into post-apostolic customs, to glance by the way at the New Testament. (See *Antiquities*, Book II., chap. 20.) His antiquarian researches terminate too soon. Hooker is forced to concede our point so far as direct authority from God's word is required: "Deacons were stewards of the Church, unto whom *at the first* was committed the distribution of church goods, the care of providing therewith for the poor, and the charge that all things of expense might be religiously and faithfully dealt in." (*Eccles. Pol.*, Book V., chap. lxxvii., 5.) This clearly concedes all that we claim; only Hooker is too "judicious" to replace the somewhat indefinite phrase, "at the first," by the more outspoken equivalent, *by the apostles*. The Anglican doctrine of a third order in the clergy, he must, therefore, establish upon the ground of an alleged right inherent in the Church to modify at will the apostolic constitution. He proceeds to specify next the duty of attendance upon their presbyters at the time of divine worship, and then adds:

“ These only being the uses for which deacons were first made, if the Church hath sithence [since then] extended their ministry farther than the circuit of their labor at the first was drawn, we are not herein to think the ordinance of the Scripture violated, except there appear some prohibition which hath abridged the Church of that liberty. Which I note chiefly in regard of them to whom it seemeth a thing so monstrous that deacons should sometime be licensed to preach, whose institution was at the first to another end.* To charge them for this, as men not contented with their own vocations, and as breakers into that which appertaineth unto others, is very hard. For when they are once thereunto admitted, it is a part of their own vocation, it appertaineth now unto them as well as others; neither is it intrusion for them to do it, being in such sort called, but rather in us it were temerity to blame them for doing it. Suppose we the office of teaching to be so repugnant unto the office of deaconship, that they cannot concur in the same person? What was there done in the Church by deacons which the apostles did not first discharge, being teachers? Yea; but the apostles found the burden of teaching so heavy that they judge it meet to cut off that other charge, and to have deacons which might undertake it. Be it so. The multitude of Christians increasing in Jerusalem, and waxing great, it was too much for the apostles to teach and to minister unto tables also. The former was not to be slacked that the latter might be followed. Whereupon we may rightly ground this axiom, that when the subject wherein one man's labors of sundry kinds are employed, doth wax so great that the same men are no longer able to manage it sufficiently as before, the most natural way to help this is by dividing their charge into slips, and ordaining of under officers, as our Saviour, under twelve apostles seventy presbyters, and the apostles, by his example, seven deacons to be under both. Neither ought it to seem less reasonable, that when the same men are sufficient, both to continue in that which they do, and also to undertake somewhat more, a combination be admitted in this case, as well as division in the former. We may not, therefore, disallow it in the Church of Geneva, that Calvin and Beza were made both pastors and readers of divinity, being men so able to discharge both. To say they did not content themselves with their

* T. C., that is, Thomas Cartwright, was pressing him with this very objection: “ If the apostles, which had such excellent and passing gifts, did find themselves (preaching of the Word and attending to prayer,) not able to provide for the poor, but thought it necessary to discharge themselves of that office, to the end they might do the other effectually and fruitfully, he that shall do both now must either do none well and profitably, or else he must have greater gifts than the apostles.”—[Footnote to the text of Hooker.

pastoral vocations, but brake into that which belonged to others; to allege against them, 'He that exhorteth in exhortation,' as against us. 'He that distributeth in simplicity,' is alleged in great dislike of granting license for deacons to preach, were very hard."

"The ancient custom of the Church was to yield the poor much relief, especially widows. But as poor people are always querulous, and apt to think themselves less respected than they should be, we see that when the apostles did what they could without hindrance to their weightier business, yet there were that grudged that others had too much and they too little, the Greeian widows shorter commons than the Hebrews. By means whereof, the apostles saw it meet to ordain deacons. Now tract of time having clean worn out those first occasions for which the deaconship was then most necessary,* it might the better be afterwards extended to other services, and so remain as at this present day, a degree in the clergy of God, which the apostles of Christ did institute."

So reasons the great champion of Anglicanism in support of their doctrine, as to the right of deacons to exercise the teaching function in the Church. His argument is not free from the vice of an "ambiguous middle," as the conclusion shows, the playing between an order of office-bearers, ordained by the apostles to do a certain work, and an order in the Church of England, bearing the same name, but discharging functions entirely different from those of their ancient namesakes. If the *kind of work* to be done, be not the essence of an office, (*ob-facio*,) in the Church or out of it, there is no meaning in the term. Identity of name is not identity of office, but identity of *work* to be done is. And as to the alleged analogy of the case of Calvin and Beza, it is only necessary to remark that the teaching office in the Church is exercised solely in expounding God's word to his people. Whether this be done in the audience-room of a church-building to an ordinary congregation, or else in the class-room to a congregation of students preparing to be preachers, this is merely a question of manner in teaching. The work done as pastor or as reader of divinity is the same thing.

These blemishes being duly noted, it is evident that the stress

* A foot-note to the text shows the sense, either of the author or else of his editor, to be that the Poor Laws of England anticipate the need of the original function of deacons—that is, that a civil functionary supersedes Christ's appointment.

of Hooker's defence rests upon the Anglican principle, (see Article XX.,) that the Church is warranted to decree, abolish, and amend rites and ceremonies as she judges expedient; provided only nothing be enacted by the Church which is expressly forbidden in Scripture, and that such enactments of hers be not declared to be "of faith, necessary to salvation." By these two limitations, the founders of the Anglican Church considered that they had sufficiently guarded themselves against the evils of the Roman theory of church power—with what success, let the developments of Ritualism say. It is precisely at this point, the discretionary rights of the Church, that, as all know, there lies the "*cardo præcipuus*" of the differences between Anglicanism and ourselves. They hold the right of the Church to decree at discretion all things not forbidden; we hold the right of the Church to do only the things commanded. Her discretion consists in choosing *among things commanded*, what seems, in view of the circumstances, to be most suited to glorify God and edify the saints. To attempt the discussion of this long-standing controversy, would carry us far aside from our course; and besides, it would be doing poorly what has already been often done with masterly ability. In dismissing the topic, we venture the remark, that we have little hope of any proposed schemes of "reform," within the Protestant Episcopal Church or elsewhere, which fail to extirpate this root of all evil—the right of the Church to change the apostolic constitution. Branches may be lopped off as they become offensive; but like the hydra's heads, they will multiply with baffling facility. Our brethren must learn the full meaning of the battle-cry of their own Chillingworth, "The Bible! The Bible is the religion of Protestants!" The only safe "reform" is that elaborated with præminent ability by the great Reformer of Geneva. The experiment has been fairly tried, and results sustain our opinion. And if the Methodist Episcopal Church has hitherto escaped the seductions of Ritualism and Sacramentalism, while retaining this doctrine of church power in her symbols, we believe it due, under God, to two causes—complete separation from the historical associations and the traditions of the mother Church, and to the purifying influence of that

amazing activity which has made them the "Cavalry of Christianity."

Hooker very properly does not lay any stress upon certain additional arguments which have been advanced by Anglican apologists to sustain that theory of the deacon's office. Such, for example, are the alleged preaching of two, at least, of the seven original deacons, and the "good degree" promised as the reward of the faithful deacon in 1 Tim. iii. 13. So far as the asserted preaching of Stephen is concerned, *the record* only shows that he made a masterly defence of himself and of Christianity before the Sanhedrin, in which he seems to have been miraculously inspired, and that he was very successful in his public arguments with the Rabbins. More than this the facts of the inspired history do not authorise, and in it all we see nothing which unordained men are incapable of doing with equal right. If more be insisted upon, the reply is, that he was evidently not appointed to preach by the election spoken of in Acts vi., and nothing is said of "aptness to teach," in the detailed statement of the qualifications for the deaconship given by Paul in 1 Tim. iii. 8-15. As to the case of Philip—who administers baptism to the Ethiopian eunuch, (Acts viii.,) and afterwards appears as "Philip the Evangelist," (Acts xxi.,) as an English bishop (Dr. Croft) well puts the case, it is altogether unreasonable to suppose that Philip, the preacher, was, during the time of his incessant travels, holding the appointment of deacon in Jerusalem, the duties of which, though represented as very pressing, he would be manifestly unable to discharge. The "*good degree*" which the faithful deacon is to receive, according to 1 Tim. iii. 13, carries with it no necessary reference to his being advanced to the presbyterate. (See Bishop Ellicott's Critical Com. in loco.) And even if it be assumed that *καλὸν βαθμὸν* implies ultimate advancement to the higher office, (though deacons not being required to possess certain qualifications for the eldership, might be unfit for it in some cases,) still this does not affect our position. Let all such as have the needful gifts be regularly called by the election of the people and ordained thereto by the presbyters. It is all proper enough, and in no wise inconsistent

with the scriptural teaching, that deacons, as such, are appointed to the care of matters financial only.

III. We now reach the third element of the Presbyterian doctrine of the deacon, viz., that to the deacons especially belongs the care of the poor and the distribution of the alms of the saints for their benefit. The language of the Form of Government is unmistakable. The deacons have the final disposal of funds collected for the poor, to the end specified. Their decisions are not liable to be reversed by the session, unless they are convicted of misappropriating funds, after due process of trial. A difference of judgment as between the deacons and session cannot be entertained by the court; as, for example, the question, Does this or that person deserve the aid of the poor fund; and if so, how much should be given? Of all such questions the deacons are to judge. It is not competent to the session to interfere until accusation is brought of maladministration or of gross negligence of duty, which cannot be explained upon the supposition of honest difference of opinion. Only then can session take up the case, except by way of fraternal suggestion, which the deacons are at liberty to follow or not.

This point has been settled by the General Assembly of 1857, in response to the following overture:

"1. Has a church session any original or direct control over the management and distribution of the fund collected and in the hands of the deacons for the benefit of the poor of the Church?

"2. Or does the management of this fund belong exclusively to the deacons?

"3. If the session has any control over this fund, what is the nature of that control?

"The committee recommended that the first inquiry be answered in the negative; the second in the affirmative; and that the third be answered as follows: They may advise respecting the use of funds. [Adopted.]" See Baird's Digest, (Revised Ed.) p. 65.

So much for the control by deacons over funds for the poor. The decision is, that their *lawful* disposal thereof may not be interfered with. The case is analogous to the right of jurisdiction inherent in the session, of admitting persons to the privilege of communion at the Lord's table. The Scripture lays down

certain qualifications which are to be possessed by persons claiming this privilege; and by the Constitution of the Church, (based, as we hold, upon the word of God,) the session is appointed to decide when the profession by this or that man of such qualifications is *credible*. The higher courts may not touch that decision, unless proof be adduced that the session violated the law by requiring qualifications not laid down in Scripture, or else by failing to require a credible profession of such as are therein revealed. The higher court may, upon due consideration of all the facts, differ in opinion from the session; it may make suggestions which session may or may not adopt. But the original jurisdiction to judge under the law of the qualification of communicants is by the Constitution vested in the session. And difference of opinion does not warrant interference, except by way of advice, which leaves the lower court free. The analogy holds good as to the inherent rights of presbyteries to judge of the qualifications of candidates for the gospel ministry. This has been recently tested by an appeal to one of our Synods, wherein Synod rendered decision, asserting the original jurisdiction of Presbytery in the premises.

As to the control of the alms for the poor, then, it is apparent that our Form of Government, chap. VI., departs from the older doctrine of the First and the Second Books of Discipline. "The First Book of Discipline teaches," says Dr. Arnold Miller, "that 'The office of the deacones is to gadder and distribute the almes of the puire according the directione of the sessione.' And the Second Book, that 'thair office and power is to receave and to distribute the haill ecclesiastical gudes unto them to whom they ar appoyntit. This they aucht to do according to the judgment and appoyntment of the presbyteries or elderships, (of the quhilk the deacons ar not,) that the patrimonie of the kirk and puire be not convertit unto privat men's usis, nor wrangfullie distributit.'" (See papers above referred to.) Our Book gives deacons more, therefore, than the symbols of the ancient Church of Scotland allowed, by placing the poor fund in their hands for distribution to lawful purposes, even though they may differ with the session in matters of opinion. And in contrast

with the Scottish theory, it may be well to ponder the words of Owen: "This office of deacons is an office of service, which gives no power in the rule of the Church. But being an office, it gives authority with respect unto the special work of it, under a general notion of authority; that is, a right to attend unto it in a peculiar manner, and to perform the things that belong thereunto." (See Works, Orme's Edition, Vol. XX., p. 524.) Divested of its quaint scholastic and Puritan phraseology, Owen's meaning is, that while in the Scriptures we find no carefully drawn definition of the precise limits of the deacon's authority, yet the fact of an office being instituted by Christ, carries with it a grant of power from him to transact the duties pertaining to it, in such way as their own judgment shall decide. Otherwise, is the diaconate an office at all, in the same sense as the presbyterate is? Is it not made the mere creature or tool of the session? Owen argues that office implies a certain original endowment of discretionary power; and if he is correct, does not the earlier Scottish theory vacate the office of deacon? The office of preacher involves a certain discretionary power; *e. g.*, the selection upon his own judgment of topics from the word of God for presentation to the people. And the office of ruling elder implies, *ex necessitate rei*, the right to judge of applicants for the privilege of communion at the Lord's Table. Has the deacon no discretion as to matters financial? And, in so far as the Scottish theory proposes to secure *unity* and *honesty* in the administration of the congregation, does our Book not secure the same necessary end? For the parochial presbytery, having "the care of the *persons* of the Church," as Dr. Girardeau expresses it, certainly has the charge over the morals of the deacons, and may discipline them, when necessary, for neglect of duty, or for misuse of funds.

There can, we think, be no question as to the increasing importance of the deacon's work among the destitute families of our population, and especially in the large cities. The great problem of pauperism, which has long baffled the skill of European statesmen, has become a practical question in our own country. Particularly is the change perceptible in the South, where, before

the war, we rarely ever saw a case of honest want. Dr. Lorimer's little volume on the Deacon's Office addresses itself especially to this very question, What shall be done for the poorer classes? And he proposes the Church of Christ as the reconciler of the alienation between the rich and the poor, which is showing itself in the International and the Commune. The diaconate he considers to be the helping hand of the Church; and he contends that no organisation likely to be devised, can take the place of God's ordinance. The Doctor's suggestion strikes us with great force. There is a mighty work to be done for the glory of God and the good of man, among the poor of our cities. And it must be confessed that our modern Christianity, with all the manifest advances in certain directions, is far short of the apostolic exemplar in caring for the poor. When we look upon the congregations of prosperous, well-dressed citizens, who press through the carpeted aisles and rest in the softly cushioned pews of our churches, we can hardly realise that our Master announced to the despondent Baptist, as the crowning demonstration of his Messiahship—as the climax in the splendid array of miracles which attested his mission—that “*to the poor the gospel is preached.*” This breach between the churches and the poor must be healed by all means, if Christianity is to attest her divine origin. It will not do to say, self-complacently, that the poorer classes can go to church if they please. We must obey the Master's injunction to go out into the lanes and by-ways, that we may compel them to come in, that his house may be filled. The very sight of this apostolic Christianity shall do more to silence the cavils of materialistic infidelity, than all the tomes of learned controversy which the teeming presses of Christendom can put forth. The world is and has ever been intensely practical. It sets far greater store by deeds than by words. The primitive Church comprehended this feature of human nature, and met the scoffs of infidel philosophy by simply pointing to the deeds of love which Christ had, by his Spirit, evoked from his disciples. The masses have neither the time nor the capacity for abstruse argument; and if they are declaring themselves in favor of Infidelity, when it claims to ally itself with physical science,

we believe it is more because they see the practical power of science to meet the wants of men, than from any appreciation of the asserted demonstrations of Positivism and Materialism. Of course money alone will not "answer all things" in this cause. It will require wisdom and prudence to check any disposition to follow Christ for the loaves and fishes. But the homely logic of the apostle's question is instinctively appreciated by the suffering people: "Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" The Church will ever find her richest harvest of souls among the sons and daughters of poverty and sorrow. For it is written, not as a passing feature of early Christianity, but as an everlasting fact, "Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world and things which are despised hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence." The *reason* for this procedure would seem to be of a permanent character. The modern millionaire, clothed in dainty apparel and faring sumptuously every day, is not a more hopeful subject for missionary effort than his prototype in the parable. It is time that the Church should appreciate this fact, and our Presbyterian body more than some others. For our zealous brethren, the warm-hearted Methodists, and the Baptists, too, can better than we afford to inscribe over the doors of their sanctuaries, "The rich and the poor meet together; the Lord is the Maker of them all." Providence is preparing a great work for those who will use the office of a deacon well.

IV. So much for the duties of the deacon towards the poor, and his control of the poor fund. Do the Scriptures restrict his responsibilities and his authority at this point? Does the Constitution of our Church so restrict him?

It might almost be inferred from the custom of the churches, that our organic law, sustaining itself by an appeal to the Scrip-

tures, either expressly limits the deacon's handling of church finances to the poor fund, or else that it somehow discourages the thought of his being further employed. But when we turn to the Form of Government, chapter VI., we find the law, after first establishing the deacon's control over all the gifts of God's people for the use of their needy brethren, going on to say: "To them also may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church." The Constitution, then, is very far from restricting the deacon's responsibility to the poor fund. Its language cannot be construed to imply less than an explicit approval of placing deacons in charge of all the finances of the congregation, wherever and whenever the way is clear. For not only is a bare permission granted—"may be committed," would have expressed such permission—but more than this, the word "properly" seems to add a sanction of such proceeding. A legal gentleman tells us that in the ruling of civil courts, "may" in a statute is always equivalent to *shall*, and that deacons could claim, upon such a showing, the management of all funds. But the Assembly has not so construed the language of Chap. VI. of the Form of Government. For when the question came before that Court in 1833, from the Synod of West Tennessee, as to the interpretation of the law, the Assembly replied: "The answer we conceive to be explicitly given in our Form of Government, Chap. VI. Their duties are there plainly made to consist in distributing the charities of the church to which they belong to the poor of that church. Over charities collected for any other purposes than those specified, their office gives them no control. In addition to this, the temporalities of the church generally may be committed to their care." (Baird's Digest, p. 64.) This decision, though bearing on its face evidence of that haste which so often characterises the ruling of our Courts, even upon points of constitutional law, seems to present two points: 1. That the law, as now received, does not, of itself, put deacons in control of all the congregational funds, but requires the further action of some one of our courts to do this. 2. That some court other than the Assembly, is competent to carry this legal permission into effect. The wording of the Assembly's

answer suggests the church session as competent to do this, by limiting the deacon's functions to a particular congregation. And the Book itself, by placing this definition of the deacon's duties along with matters congregational, plainly suggests the same course. We have heard objection made to the sessions of churches taking order to place all finances under management of the deacons, on the ground of departure from general custom. The reply might be made, that such variety is within the terms of the law and has the sanction of the highest court. And besides, the Assembly's sanction in favor of carrying into effect the provision of Chap. VI., may be fairly claimed on the ground of its adoption of the "New Book," which places all funds under the control of the deacons.

As to the ground of the discrimination made between the deacon's power over the poor fund and that over other finances, we have heard the suggestion made, that at the time of the last revision, suitable material could not always be had for elders and for deacons also, and so the framers of the law hesitated to place such grave responsibilities in untried hands. The difficulty still exists in many of our congregations. But even if the discrimination had been removed by the adoption of the Book of Church Order by the Presbyteries, there need not have arisen any serious complications thereby, inasmuch as the Assembly of 1840 decided that when necessary the same persons might hold both offices. "*Resolved*, That while it is important and desirable that the several offices in the Christian Church should be kept distinct, and be sustained by different individuals, whenever a sufficient number of competent men can be found, yet, in the opinion of this Assembly, it is not inconsistent with the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, nor with the precedent furnished in filling the office of deacon at its first institution, that where a necessity exists, the same individual should sustain both offices." The language being somewhat ambiguous, it is not perfectly clear in what manner the Assembly expected one man to receive both offices—whether by his being regularly called to the second office, or upon the theory of the greater office including the lower, which has been formally sanctioned by the

Free Church of Scotland, and made the basis of her "Deacons' Courts."

But it must be confessed that the discrimination made in the Form of Government, between the deacon's positive control over the poor fund and those for other purposes, may have arisen from a doubt on the part of the framers of the law as to the teaching of Scripture. They may have felt that while the poor fund is clearly placed, according to Acts vi., in the hands of deacons, the word of God does not decide so plainly who shall handle any other funds. And if this conjecture be correct—as there is much in the circumstances of the times and in the history of the Church to make it probable—our law departs from the older Scottish symbols in two directions, (1) by limiting the control of the session over the poor fund, and (2) by leaving it an open question, to be determined by each church for itself, whether the remaining funds shall be handled by the deacons, or by the elders, or by some other parties. And as a matter of fact, each of the three courses has been adopted. In the Established Church of Scotland, the elders gradually superseded the deacons altogether; so that the deacons being found to be a useless piece of machinery, they were no longer elected. In the Irish Presbyterian Church, "committee-men," representing both the ecclesiastical and the civil authority, have largely taken the place of deacons. In the American churches, both methods are in vogue: Baird's Digest showing that the highest court has openly approved of "temporal committees," and also of trustees to hold and manage fiscal affairs; the members of which bodies need not be ordained men, or even communicants. Such has been the practical working of the discrimination made between the management of the poor fund and of other moneys, whatever may have been the unexpressed opinion of those who drafted the law in its present shape. And it is a hopeful sign of a return to better views, to find strong voices on both sides of the Atlantic, pleading for the divine right of deacons. Dr. Lorimer, in his treatise, points to the evils which have, in his opinion, grown out of the neglect of Christ's office, reminding his brethren that the two Books of Discipline have not been set aside by the Westminster Confes-

sion, and are therefore parts of the organic law of the Church of Scotland. Prof. Wilson turns the main force of his able discussion against the experienced evils of trustees and committees. Chapter III. of his Essay treats "of the substitutes for the deacon," and this he manages under the following heads: "I. *Boards of trustees are an innovation.** There were no such officers in apostolic times. There were no officers sustaining such a relation to the Church in the congregations of Geneva, France, Holland, and Scotland, at the time of the Reformation. Their introduction has been gradual; but no doubt keeping pace with the downward progress in doctrine and godliness that has been manifest among most of the descendants of the Reformers. . . . II. *Boards of trustees are unscriptural.* The authority, or even the permission, of Scripture is not often pleaded in behalf of trustees. The argument in their defence seems generally to take for granted that upon this system alone can all the rights of the people be secured. . . . The scriptural order does by no means deprive the members of the church of an interest in the management of the ecclesiastical goods; for deacons are chosen by the people, and are the representatives of the church; not, indeed, the agents of the people. . . . Trustees having no scriptural warrant, can stand upon no principle that does not impugn the wisdom or the goodness of the Church's Head. If it is necessary for human wisdom to devise a system of pecuniary management for the Church, then it follows that on this point her arrangements have been left incomplete by her blessed Head, etc. . . . III. *Boards of trustees are anti-scriptural.*" Under this head Prof. W. argues that the objectionable system embodies the serious error that church property belongs exclusively to the people, instead of being a trust managed for Christ, to whom it

* Prof. W. expressly exempts from these strictures such boards of trustees as may act under church courts in the management of the funds of theological seminaries, etc. He does not say Foreign and Domestic missions may be so managed also. But even in these cases, would not the analogy of Scripture suggest what Dr. Thornwell advocated, a bench of deacons, co-ordinated with the Assembly, to transact its financial business?

has been solemnly consecrated, and by officers of his appointment. "IV. *Boards of trustees are of dangerous tendency.*" His argument is, that bodies composed wholly or in part of worldly men, will assuredly develop a disposition to accommodate themselves to outside sentiments, which may embarrass the minister and hinder the spirituality of the church. "V. *Boards of trustees are not, as depositaries of church property, so safe as deacons.* And that because they are, comparatively, irresponsible. Trustees are not, indeed, without responsibility to the laws of the land; and provided they are church-members, they are individually accountable to the courts of the church for immoral or scandalous conduct. But they have no such responsibility, as trustees, to any ecclesiastical tribunal, as deacons have." Every competent witness of the working of the trustee or committee system, must have seen the reality of the evils thus pointed at. Dr. Miller gives an incident which places in an almost ludicrous light the incongruity of putting worldly men to control important interests in the Church: "A minister, at one time pastor of a church in Philadelphia, informed the writer that, during his ministry in that church, the president of the board of trustees was a rich Jew, who often complained of the trouble he had in keeping the session of the church in order!" Dr. Miller also signalises the objectionableness of throwing the deacon's work into the hands of the elders; but we shall have occasion to direct attention to this in connexion with other matters. Meantime, it is well for us to bear in mind that, whatever may have been the unexpressed reasons which led the Westminster divines to make this discrimination between the funds for the poor and those for other purposes, yet no obstacle is interposed by the law to placing all temporal concerns in the hands of the deacons. It does not require a revision of our present Constitution to render such a step legitimate; for the law already provides for it, and in fact *advises* it, as a measure of expediency, if not of absolute right.

We are prepared, therefore, to examine such considerations as may be adduced to move our church sessions or other courts to

put this clause of the Constitution into operation, without waiting for the adoption of the New Book, or other needed reforms.

I. And the first reason—the controlling consideration, in fact, with us all, as holding to Presbyterian Church Government, established “*jure divino*”—is that such management of church funds is fairly implied in the transaction recorded in Acts vi. 1–6: “And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables. Therefore, brethren, look ye out from among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude, and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch; whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.” We shall quote Prof. Wilson’s exposition of this leading proof-text:

“This passage contains the history of the appointment of the first deacons of the New Testament Church. That we may have a complete view of this transaction, we must go back a little, and ascertain what was the ‘daily ministration’ of verse i., the ‘serving of tables,’ of verse ii., and the ‘business’ of verse iii. This we learn from chap. ii. 44, 45: ‘And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need.’ And chapter iv. 32–37: ‘And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common. And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all. Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles’ feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need,’ etc. From these passages it appears that the ‘daily ministration’ was the management, for public purposes, of a common fund, created by the contributions

of the disciples ; that from this stock all the ecclesiastical expenses were defrayed, and, likewise, the poor, if there were any, supported. The apostles and other ministers were supported from this fund, and the other charges (and there must have been some,) attendant upon the dispensation of the Lord's Supper, and other ordinances, were, unquestionably, defrayed out of it, for there was no other source whence they could be drawn. It is plainly impossible that there could have been any fund at that time distinct from this common stock, or another fund under the control of distinct officers, such as the trustees or committees of modern times. Such officers could not have existed. The funds required for the promotion of the good of the whole body, and to meet all demands upon the Church, were 'thrown together at the apostles' feet.'*

“ Indeed, the very circumstance that is sometimes relied upon as favoring the view, that the 'widows' were chiefly concerned in this ministration, namely, that when they 'were neglected,' the deacons were appointed, is, of itself, enough to show that 'this business' was not merely attending to the poor. For then it would follow that the apostles had altogether neglected to attend to the very object for which the contributions were thrown at their feet! This is impossible. It, therefore, appears plain, that there were other objects contemplated in the formation of this fund, attention to which interfered in some degree with due attention to the 'Grecian widows.'

“ The 'business' over which the deacons were appointed was the whole of this daily ministration—the whole service of the tables. The apostles themselves say, referring to the whole of that charge, which they had at first undertaken, and for a time managed, that the deacons were appointed 'over this business.' It is plain, therefore, that the entire fund formed by contributions for ecclesiastical purposes, was at first managed by the apostles, and by them transferred to the deacons. There could at the time have been no other officer, such as a trustee or a committee-man, appointed to any part of this charge. The whole was first placed in the apostles' hands, the whole was placed in the hands of the deacons when

* It is not properly within the scope of this paper to warn the reader against the error of mistaking the purport of this record as to a community of goods. There is not a word here or elsewhere in the New Testament enjoining such a course. Every where we find the apostles alluding to money matters under the notion of *private property*, and discussing the duties entailed upon its possessors. And even in the carrying out of this spontaneous resolve of the zealous brethren, the apostles record the acknowledgment of the rights of private property, as when Peter, in Acts v. 4: "Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" The Communism of the Roman Catholic orders and of the Quakers find no precedent here.

they were ordained. These are the views which have been entertained of this passage by the purest churches, and by the greater part of the most judicious commentators.

“As the passage has a very important bearing upon our investigations respecting the deacons duties, a few quotations, and but a few, for our space is limited, are given from standard commentators, with the hope that the reader will carefully examine the passage, in the light thus reflected upon it. These quotations are not classified; our limits do not admit of this. They are given, however, nearly in the order of time beginning with Origen, one of the early fathers. He lived in the commencement of the third century, a little more than one hundred years after the death of the Apostle John. He says: ‘The deacons preside over the money-tables of the church,’ and adds, ‘as we read in the Acts of the Apostles.’

“Passing over many centuries, our next quotation is from Beza, the distinguished colleague of John Calvin, in the Theological School of Geneva. He explains the passage, ‘To serve tables’—‘to attend to that which was then observed, the common table, and the other necessities of the church.’

“The Scottish Reformers, in the Second Book of Discipline, chapter IX., are very explicit. ‘In the apostolic kirk, the deacons were appointed to collect what sum soever was collected of the faithful, to distribute to the necessity of the saints; so that none lacked among the faithful. These collections were not only of that which was collected in manner of alms, as some suppose, but of other goods moveable and immoveable, of lands and possessions, the price whereof was brought to the feet of the apostles.’*

“Henry, on Acts vi. 1-6: ‘And these (the deacons,) must take care of the church's stock; must review, and pay, and keep accounts; must buy those things which they had need of against the feast, (John xii. 29,) and attend to all those things which are necessary, *in ordine ad spiritualia*, in order unto spiritual exercises, that every thing might be done decently and in order, and no person or thing be neglected.’

“Scott, (Comm. on Acts vi. 1-6): ‘To lay out their contributions in the most satisfactory manner, both among the poor and in other necessary expenses.’

“Guyse, (*ibid*): ‘As all the necessary expenses for carrying on the

* This opinion, says Prof. W., was maturely formed after years of close examination, the Reformers contending for putting all temporalities into the deacons' hands, while the sovereigns, Mary and James VI., bitterly opposed it. The Court party contended that these contributions were for the poor alone; the Reformers that they were intended for all church uses.

worship of God, and as the apostles themselves, as well as the poor, were doubtless to be supported out of the common stock, I have given such a paraphrase as may take in the Lord's table, and the tables of the apostles.'

"Dick, (Lect. C.): 'It is true, indeed, as the design of the institution was not to divert the attention of the apostles from the ministry of the word, the care of the temporal matters in which the church is concerned, may be considered as belonging to deacons.'

"Dr. Miller, of Princeton: 'It has been supposed by many that the phrase, 'serving tables,' in the history of the institution of the deacon's office, had a reference either to the Lord's table, or to the overseeing and supplying the tables of the poor, or perhaps both. But I am inclined to believe that this is an entire mistake. The word *trapeza* signifies, indeed, a table; but in this connexion it seems obviously to mean a *money-table*, or a counter on which money is laid. Hence *trapezites*, a money changer, or money merchant. The plain meaning of Acts vi. seems to be this: It is not suitable that we should leave the word of God, and devote ourselves to pecuniary affairs.' The passage from Origen, quoted above, is conclusive evidence of the soundness of this criticism." (Essay on the Deacon, pp. 19-22.)

To the same effect our author cites Calvin's Comm. on 1 Tim. iii. 8-13, and Inst., Bk. V. 13. Hooker's words already cited, point to the same exposition, as also Owen's views, and Dr. Thornwell's.

It is obvious that this exposition of the record which exhibits the origin of the office, so far as we have authentic information, militates against placing over church funds any person other than a deacon. Elders are not the proper persons to take upon them this charge, though their doing so may be less obnoxious than the employment of committees. And even if the argument in favor of one consolidated fund in the church at Jerusalem, used for all congregational necessities, could be set aside, still the claim of the deacons to control all ecclesiastical funds and properties might be fairly established upon a principle which is extensively used in elaborating the details of our Presbyterian Church Government. If it be insisted, (contrary to the implication of the words, as we think,) that the "business" to which the deacons were appointed was only the care of the poor and widows, yet that particular fund might justly be regarded as a specimen of the class financial, which, being confided to

the deacon, serves to direct us in the committing of other like matters to his charge, unless we are otherwise instructed elsewhere. The principle is commonly recognised by the best Presbyterian authorities, that a system of church government is given in the New Testament, in general principles, certain examples under them being given also to illustrate their application. It is only by keeping this maxim in view that we can construct our system of courts, and adjust their several relations to each other. And it seems to us that this is eminently a fair use of the principle. We have in the New Testament a class of office-bearers, concerning whom we are expressly told that they were appointed to take charge of financial matters. They have no other duty. Concerning no other office have we any intimation of appointment for such a work. We read, it is true, in Acts xi., of collections made at Antioch for the suffering brethren at Jerusalem, being sent up to the elders there. But, without stopping to question how far the action of these uninspired Christians at Antioch furnishes a precedent, it is evident that such a fund must have been placed in the hands of the deacons who had been appointed about ten years before in this church for this very "business." The elders may have been a presbytery, presiding over many congregations in Jerusalem. For these ten years had witnessed the conversion of many thousands to Christ, and it is impossible to suppose that they attempted worshipping together. No hall could have contained them—no voice could have reached them in the narrow streets. The funds were probably sent to the body of elders who had the oversight of the several congregations in the city, in order that they might be distributed equitably among the various congregations.

It has been supposed, in opposition to the views of the eminent scholars cited by Prof. Wilson, that, at the time of the appointment of deacons, there were elders in charge of such funds as were not expressly given to the newly ordained officers. And from this it is inferred that the church session ought now to control all funds except those intended for the poor. But to this it is sufficient to reply, that proof is wanting for the presence of any such ordinary officers at the time of the appointment of deacons.

It was only a few months after Pentecost, and it would seem likely that the apostles and the seventy evangelists sufficed for the spiritual control of the body of disciples. So far as we can see, the deacon was needed before the ordinary presbyter, and so was first appointed. The brief sketch of apostolic history gives no notice of the first appointment of elders; but they seem to have made their appearance at some time between the establishment of the diaconate and the year of Paul's carrying up alms to the needy saints at Jerusalem, which was about ten years after.

The conclusiveness of this argument is not materially affected if, with Dr. Arnold W. Miller and many others, we understand that Acts vi. 1-6, gives us a hasty notice of the appointment of the first Grecian deacons, while implying that Hebrew deacons had, from the beginning, charge of this business.

"Many persons," says the Doctor in his papers on the Deacon, "without sufficient examination, entertain the opinion that this office was for the first time introduced into the Church of God on the occasion recorded in the sixth chapter of Acts. This is to overlook the fact which has been abundantly proved by learned Jewish and Christian writers, Maimonides, Vitranga, Lightfoot, Hammond, Adam Clarke, Neander, Mosheim, Burnet, Olshäusen, and others, that the office of deacon existed in the Church long before the days of Christ and his apostles.

"In the Jewish Church, the Synagogue, there were not only elders, but deacons. 'The office of the deacon,' says the learned Lightfoot, 'was translated from the Jewish to the Christian Church. There were in every synagogue at least three deacons, to whom the care of the poor was intrusted.' 'The synagogue deacon,' says another learned scholar, 'collected money for the maintenance of the poor and for the general support of the synagogue, including the stipends of the office-bearers. Many learned Jewish theologians affirmed that the office belonged to the synagogue. This testimony is decisive of the point that the Presbyterian Church of the New Testament is identical with the Presbyterian Church of the Old Testament, equally with respect to the deaconship as to the eldership; and that, in the language of Archbishop Whately, 'Wherever a Jewish synagogue existed, that was brought to embrace the gospel, the apostles did not so much form a Christian Church or congregation, as make an existing congregation Christian, by introducing the Christian sacraments and worship, but leaving the machinery of government unchanged, the officers being already provided in the existing institutions.'

'A synagogue became a Christian church as soon as its members acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah.'

"Thus the Old Testament Church naturally glided into the New. The deacons of the converted synagogue became the deacons of the Christian church. This is the reason why no record exists of the original institution of this office by the apostles. For the narrative in Acts vi. implies that the seven chosen and ordained on that occasion were added to the number already existing. The office is not mentioned in that narrative; only the duties of the office are incidentally alluded to, which would imply that the office was already in existence. There were Hebrew deacons before this; deacons in every converted synagogue. Besides this, the New Testament Church must have had some dispensers of its bounty before this; and therefore either the apostles officiated as deacons in the distribution of the money which was laid at their feet, derived from the sale of lands and houses, or else these officers already existed and discharged this duty. If the former, then, as the matter was in the *apostles'* hands, it would seem that the 'murmuring' of the Grecians should properly have been against them, and not against the Hebrews. Complaint of neglect should have been to the apostles, *against themselves*. But that the apostles did not officiate as deacons, is evident from their own words: 'It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables'—showing that they had not left the word of God and served tables. For the apostles to have 'served tables,' would have involved their abandoning the preaching of the word of God. The one is evidently spoken of as not only distinct from, but incompatible with, the other. How absurd, then, to make the deacon a minister of the gospel! 'Serving tables,' then, had already been done by the proper officers, the deacons. The seven who were afterwards elected were all Grecians, as their names show, because the Grecians (or foreign Jews) had murmured against the Hebrews, (or native Jews,) on account of their widows being neglected in the daily ministrations. 'Now this surely would have produced, in turn, a murmuring of the Hebrews against the Grecians, unless they had some already in office, looking after their rights.' (En-*eye. Metropolitana.*)**

We need not undertake to sit as umpire between these rival interpretations. Some minds will probably prefer one, some the other. But in either case the record sustains our point, that deacons are the revenue officers of Christ's kingdom, who should collect and disburse its funds, and hold its property.

* Dr. Miller has pointed out the prevalent inaccuracy of making the *chazzan* of the synagogue the equivalent of deacon. The *shadrash*, he says, is the deacon, while *chazzan* is nearly the same as our sexton.

2. We urge that steps be taken by the Church to put this clause of her Constitution into operation, because it will tend to promoting greater efficiency in the entire system of our church work. Let one class of office-bearers understand that their duty consists in caring for "the *persons* of the church," and the other class that they are responsible for "the *things* of the Church." This will secure in the Church that very *division of labor* which has so greatly aided in advancing the sciences and the mechanic arts. As matters now are—the clause recommending that deacons be placed in charge of all finances being overlooked, as if by common consent—the need of such division of labor is obvious. For, not only are church courts clogged with pecuniary business for which many of their members have no aptitude, but in every congregation confusion and negligence are seen to result. Deacons are overshadowed, and, in many instances, set aside, by unscriptural substitutes in the shape of committees or trustees; who, like the Canaanites left in the land, only too frequently become thorns in the sides of pastors and sessions. In most of our village and rural congregations, there being scarcely an indigent member to be found, the deacons have nothing to do, unless it be to pass the collection-plate at the bidding of the session. And so the office helps to manufacture a class of inactive men, who are but little more than "cumberers of the ground." Nor is the injury less real, as we honestly believe, to the preacher and ruling elders. The elders are in part withdrawn from their appropriate vocation, which is to "*shepherdise* the Church of God," (*ποιμαίνω*;) by the care of perplexing finances, which in the end come to be regarded as the more important part of their duty. And thus the undivided responsibility of visiting, counselling, and comforting the people, is devolved upon the preacher, who is in turn withdrawn from his peculiar sphere of labor, to the great detriment of his public ministrations for the whole congregation. In fact the care of the poor also passes into his hands, the diaconate, like an unused limb, becoming enfeebled and inert. Any lawful expedient for restoring the eldership to its scriptural duties, and developing in the deacons an increased sense of responsibility, should be hailed as an omen of good. Lorimer, in his Essay

on the Office of Deacon, states that Dr. Chalmers, in his "Christian and Economic Polity of a Nation," devotes a chapter to a discussion of the reasons which render it inexpedient that the same officers who look to the spiritual interests of the poor, should also distribute alms among them. And Lorimer himself occupies a chapter in pleading for the general advantages to the pastors and eldership, and to the cause at large, of reviving the deacon's office. He argues that, by relieving the elders of a burden for which many of them are confessedly unsuited, they will be enabled to devote their undivided time to the work of guiding, instructing, and correcting the flock. He mentions that in some places in Scotland, the undivided burden had proven too heavy, and many excellent men had declined the eldership altogether, or until relief could be had. The minister, he contends, would be greatly strengthened by surrounding him with a large body of intelligent men, who would relieve him of oppressive cares of a pecuniary nature, which, despite the help derived from the elders, often rest as a burden upon him. It would bring, he says, a larger body of chosen men into active service, and by making them a blessing to others, secure a blessing for their own souls. And, as regards the poor themselves, it would call attention to other matters besides physical suffering, and by promoting kindly intercourse between rich and poor, greatly tend towards softening down the asperities of social distinctions. And the result of it all must be greatly to strengthen the hold of Christianity upon the masses of the community.

Scottish writers of the Established Church do not hesitate to ascribe much of the efficiency of the Free Church to its use of the diaconate. It may not be amiss, therefore, to give, in the briefest form, some account of the peculiar arrangement made at the Disruption, under the guidance of such leaders as the sagacious Chalmers, for the management of matters financial. In Forbes's "Procedure in the Inferior Courts of the Free Church of Scotland," p. 7, we find the following statement of the Free Church's doctrine :

"The peculiar duties of deacons are thus stated, (Assemb., 1846, VII.):
(1) To give special regard to the whole secular affairs of the congrega-

tion; (2) To attend to the gathering of the people's contributions for the sustentation of the ministry, and to receive donations made for other ecclesiastical purposes; (3) To attend to the congregational poor; and (4) To watch over the education of the children of the poor. Along with the elders they may receive the Sabbath collections of the people, according to such arrangements as may be made by the deacons' court. It is their duty to visit periodically the districts assigned to them, and to cultivate an acquaintance with the members and adherents of the church resident therein. When a sufficient number of deacons cannot be had, the elders may be employed as deacons; while, on the other hand, the deacons may assist the elders with their advice, whether in session or otherwise, when required so to do. According to Pardovan, (Bk. I., Title 8, § 3,) the deacons may be employed to provide the elements, to carry them, and serve the communicants at the Lord's table. While the deacons' court now provides the elements, the latter duties are now universally discharged by the elders; but in case of a deficiency in point of numbers, it is competent for the deacons still to be employed for these purposes."

Forbes next proceeds to give the constitution and procedure of the deacon's court, which is one of the most striking peculiarities of the Free Church's polity. Viewed apart from the theory of the inclusion of the lesser office by the higher, which is not essential to such an arrangement, there is nothing unconstitutional in the deacons' court. For if elders may, *ex officio*, take charge of church funds, and if they may coöperate with committees and with trustees, made up of unordained men, there can be no valid objection to their coöperating in the management of finances with the deacons. Tested by its fruits, the Free Church system of the deacons' court would seem to have proved itself superior to all the various plans adopted by churches in Scotland, Ireland, or America; while at the same time it does not precisely meet the whole doctrine of the New Testament, we think, which fairly implies a separation of the management of finances and the spiritual oversight of persons.

1. The members of the deacons' court, according to Forbes, are the pastor, (or pastors, if there be more than one,) the session, and the deacons. All sit as deacons, and have the same rights.

2. *Officials.* These consist of a chairman or moderator, a clerk, and two treasurers. In the absence of the minister, any mem-

ber, whether elder or deacon, may be elected chairman for the occasion. In all cases the presiding officer has only the casting vote in case of a tie. The clerk keeps the roll and accurate minutes of all proceedings. He may receive a salary, if agreed upon. The treasurers are elected by the court: one to be the general or congregational treasurer, who is to receive and disburse, under instructions, all moneys save those raised for the sustentation, education, and missionary funds; the other, or associational treasurer, to receive and transmit to the Assembly's treasurer such moneys as may be intended for the purposes above specified, at the bidding of the court.

3. *Meetings.* The deacons' court may assemble upon citation from the pulpit, or upon regular notice to each member. But it is advised that they have a regular time, *e. g.*, once a month. Three members constitute a quorum. Minutes state that each meeting is opened and closed with prayer.

4. *Jurisdiction.* This court has the charge and management of the whole property belonging to the congregation, including church, session-house, manse, school-buildings, etc., and of all its financial affairs, including, of course, the appropriation of seats, with the determination of all questions relating thereto; and it is the duty of said court to transmit to the general treasurer of the Assembly the sums contributed to the Sustentation Fund, and to distribute the remaining funds to the supplementing of the minister's salary, to subordinate officers, and the defraying of all necessary charges connected with the property; to take up special collections for the poor, and to receive the deacons' reports touching them, and to instruct the deacons concerning the disposal thereof. The business, therefore, consists of the administration of the funds and property and financial affairs of the congregation. (Assemb. of Free Church, 1847, XIV.) The members of this court are to be incorporated as trustees for holding the property before the civil authorities, for the congregation as connected with the Free Church. Provision is made for the disposal of the property in case of a disruption. To the deacons' court belongs the right of giving or withholding the use of the church or other buildings for meetings not of a strictly religious

nature. In all other cases, and especially when divine service is to be performed, the church is solely at the disposal of the minister. [We should probably say the session.] It assigns to each deacon a certain district, requiring him to keep an accurate list of all adherents therein, and to see that the collectors punctually gather in all the church funds.

The accounts are to be audited annually, and, being attested by the moderator, are, along with the minutes of the court, sent up to the Presbytery to be reviewed and attested. And soon thereafter the deacons' court is required to lay before the congregation an abstract of the work accomplished by them, for their information.

"The deacons' court and session are to be regarded as co-ordinate courts, having separate and independent jurisdictions. There is, therefore, no appeal from one to the other, nor can the proceedings of the one be reviewed, altered, or reversed by the other, while each remains in its own province. By carefully attending to the jurisdiction of each, all collision will be avoided."

"An appeal from a decision of the deacons' court is not usually sustained; for it has been declared by the Assembly inexpedient to sustain complaints or appeals against its ordinary administration in secular or financial affairs. (Assemb., 1847, XIV.) A member, however, may dissent from any finding of the court, and place his reasons in the record (if given at the time,) for so doing; but he cannot usually complain to a higher court. It is to be observed, that all the proceedings of this court are subject to the review of the Presbytery, and are regularly brought under its notice by the annual examination of its record and accounts: so that by this means any step taken or resolution adopted of a censurable nature, or in violation of the laws of the Church, can be checked, and means taken for having it altered or reversed."

Such is a brief, but, we think, accurate outline of the main features of the Free Church's plan. As we said before, the questionable theory of the necessary inclusion by the higher office (the eldership,) of the lower, (the deaconship,) is not essential to the scheme. The session of any church can agree to deal with finances by such an arrangement as the deacons' court of the Free Church; and we see no reason to debar a presbytery from commending it to the churches within its bounds, and supervising the records of such courts when regularly submitted to it

for review and amendment. Intelligent Christians the world over are aware of the wonderful success which has crowned this effort—the nearest approach, so far as we know, to the plan taught in the New Testament, and approved, though not enforced, by the Westminster Confession.

Two questions remain, to which we shall give very brief replies. The first is, Should the deacons distribute the bread and wine at the Lord's table? We shall present our reply to this query in the words of Dr. Arnold W. Miller :

“The principal business of deacons is to *serve tables*. The old distinction, current for ages past, refers the term ‘*tables*’ to three departments: the table of the Lord, the table of the pastor, and the table of the poor. All cognate duties, all duties of the same class, are embraced in the comprehensive definition of *table-service*—‘the table of the Lord’ including not only the furnishing and distribution of the elements of the communion table, but also the care of the sanctuary vessels, and entire furniture of the Lord's house, and the providing every thing necessary to the proper celebration of divine worship, and of all the services for the social and public duties of religion. As the office of deacon had for so long a time, through the culpable negligence of the Church, fallen into disuse, its duties had to be discharged by the elder, who, in turn, neglected, to a great extent, his own appropriate work, and came to be known chiefly to the Church as the officer who served in the distribution of the sacramental elements on communion occasions. And to this service some of this class cling; for, were it taken away, their occupation would be gone. But this is not their business. Visiting the flock, oversight, and government, are assigned to them. Table-service is no part of government, but belongs to those appointed by Christ to ‘serve tables,’ (literally, to *deaconise tables*,) viz., deacons. Some have objected that this is ‘too sacred’ a service to be discharged by the deacons. But if the communicants may distribute the elements, when received from the minister, *among themselves*, as the Scotch Directory for Worship prescribes, then the deacons may perform the same office for them without encroaching upon ‘too sacred’ a service. Besides, the scriptural qualifications of deacon are *spiritual*, as well as those of the ruling elder: they must be ‘full of the Holy Ghost, and of wisdom,’ ‘holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.’ This objection comes with a better grace from a Papist or a Ritualist than from a Presbyterian.

“Others have objected, that the office of deacon is contingent, dependent upon circumstances, if not unnecessary; and as the inferior office is comprehended in the superior, may be dispensed with, his duties being discharged by the ruling elder. This contradicts our Book, which

teaches that 'the offices of ruling elder and deacon are perpetual, and cannot be laid aside at pleasure.' If the greater part includes the less, if the inferior be comprehended in the superior, then may not only the duties of deacons be assumed by ruling elders, and the office of the former expire, but also the duties of the ruling elders may be assumed by ministers, and the office of the former expire! And this some have even dared to teach! Then all power may be absorbed by the ministry; the monarchical principle against which Presbyterianism has ever deemed it to be its vocation and its glory to protest and to resist, be fully enthroned in the Church; and abominable Prelacy or Popery install the man of sin over the house of God!

"If 'the greater office includes the less,' then the greater officer must possess, not only *all* the qualifications, but *all* the opportunities, too, of *all* the lesser—otherwise the Head of the Church has made very imperfect provision for his Church.

"Others, again, have objected, that custom now sanctions the discharge of this service by the elder. But was it the custom of the primitive Church? The custom of allowing the deaconship to fall into disuse, in many churches, and of transferring its duties to the elder, is an old custom. And so, the custom of elders distributing the elements at the Lord's table, and neglecting their own work, may be as old, and as unwarrantable, too. Abundant testimonies prove that the distribution of the elements at the Lord's table pertained to the deacons in the primitive Church. The first witness we adduce is *Justin Martyr*, who wrote his two Apologies for the Christians within fifty years of the Apostle John. His writings form an impregnable bulwark of Presbyterianism, and furnish a complete refutation of Prelacy, as they show us but two officers in the Christian Church of his day—presbyters and deacons. Describing the administration of the Lord's Supper, he says: 'There is then brought to that one of the brethren who presides, bread and a cup of wine mixed with water, and he taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at a considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands. And when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying, Amen. And when he who presides has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons, give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine; and to those who are absent, they carry away a portion.'

"This one testimony is sufficient to settle the question, and has been deemed decisive by a multitude of learned writers, in various ages of the Church.

"Bingham, in his '*Antiquities*,' says: 'It belonged to the deacons to take care of the holy table, and all the ornaments and utensils pertain-

ing thereto, *and to distribute the elements to the people.*' Poole says: 'To the deacons was committed the serving of tables, *the Lord's table*, and the poor's,' etc. Annot. on Phil. i. John Brown of Haddington, whom Dr. Samuel Miller (of Princeton,) terms 'one of the most decisive, consistent, and devoted Presbyterians that ever lived,' thus speaks: 'The business of the deacons is to serve in *distributing the elements at the Lord's table*, and to provide and duly distribute provision to ministers and to the poor. Their work is to manage the temporal affairs of the congregation relative to the table of the poor, the table of ministers, and the table of the Lord.' Rutherford says: 'I yield that the deacon is to serve at the communion table, and provide the elements, and to carry the cup at the table.' Pardovan's Collections (concerning the worship, discipline, and government of the Church of Scotland,) teach that 'deacons may be employed to provide the elements, to carry them, and to serve the communicants at the Lord's table.' Dr. Owen, who strenuously maintained the distinction between the elder and the deacon, says: 'It belongs to deacons not only to take care of the poor, but to manage all other affairs of the church of the same kind, such as providing for the place of church assemblies; of the elements for the sacraments; of collecting, keeping, and dispensing of stocks of the church for maintenance of its officers, and for incidences.' 'The work of the deacon lies in the providing and disposal of earthly things, in serving of the tables of the church, and those private of the poor.' So likewise Dr. Ridgeley, who recognises the distinction between the elder and the deacon.: "The deacon's work is described as 'serving tables,' that is, the Lord's table, by providing what is necessary for the Lord's Supper, and assisting in the distribution of the elements,' etc. Dr. Guyse, in his learned exposition of the New Testament, includes in table service, 'the Lord's table, the tables of the apostles, and of the poor members of the church.' Dr. Dwight, who also distinguishes between the ruling elder and the deacon, observes, 'It is the proper business of the deacon to distribute the sacramental elements to the communicants. This they have done in all ages of the Church.' Dr. James P. Wilson, a learned Presbyterian divine, in his work on Church Government, says: 'The presiding presbyter (in the primitive Church,) administered the eucharist, and the deacons carried it to the people.'

"Dr. Miller, (of Princeton,) quoting the testimony of Justin Martyr, relative to the distribution of the sacramental elements by the deacons, remarks: 'This is still one of the functions of the deacons in the Presbyterian Church.' Other testimonies could be adduced, but these are sufficient to show that we are the advocates of *no new doctrine*. The cry of 'Novelty,' 'Innovation,' has often been raised against what was subsequently proved to be a time-honored truth, or a time-honored usage in the house of God; and time-honored, because God-honored."

Such is Dr. Miller's reply to the question, Whether deacons should distribute the elements from the hands of the preacher at the Lord's table? The reply is conclusive so far as ancient custom is concerned; and the propriety of the custom cannot be successfully called into question. The chief value to be attached to it is, as he intimates, that, by removing all side issues, it may help to bring out more clearly the real work of the eldership—the oversight of the flock of God. And, for that reason, we would gladly return to the old paths. Take out of the way the "table service" in all its cognate departments, and let our elders see more clearly that to them is committed by the Lord Jesus the weighty charge of caring for the *persons* of his Church. Let this Senate of associate pastors give themselves to visiting, counselling, and admonishing the people from house to house, while the preacher is allowed to devote himself "to the ministry of the word and to prayer." In this way shall the full strength of our apostolic Presbyterianism be developed, and our Church become a joy and a praise in all the land.

The other question is, May the service of deacons be extended beyond the bounds of the particular congregation? And to this we reply in the words of Dr. Thornwell, already cited in part, at the head of this article:

"Our Book does not confine deacons to particular congregations. There should be a competent number of them in each particular church; but we insist upon it, that Presbyteries, Synods, and the General Assembly, should also have their deacons to attend to their pecuniary matters. Those ordained at Jerusalem were not confined to a specific congregation, but acted for the whole College of Apostles. By intrusting all pecuniary matters into the hands of men ordained under solemn sanctions for the purpose, our spiritual courts would soon cease to be what they are to an alarming extent at present—mere corporations for secular business. . . . Boards combine what God has separated, the *purse* and the *keys*."

So speaks "a master in Israel," second to none in his intuitive comprehension of our divinely ordained system of church polity. The evil of which he complains is painfully apparent to every one who attends our higher church courts, and witnesses the tiresome discussions upon pecuniary questions, resulting, for the

most part, in measures devoid of fruit. Many excellent ministers and ruling elders seem not to possess any special gift for the management of such matters. It behooves us to ponder well a suggestion from such a source. The experiment might be made with ease and safety. Let the Assembly elect a bench of deacons to do the work now in the hands of its trustees, and let these deacons of the General Assembly be incorporated as trustees to represent it in the civil courts. And then let it constitute these deacons into a general committee of finance, to devise ways and means for conducting all schemes of church work. The advantage is obvious of such a body in dealing with complicated monetary questions, wherein it is so important to have *time* to consider well what is to be done, over an Assembly made up of new men every year. The conclusions reached by such a body of men, "full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom," bound by solemn vows to do this part of the work faithfully, would have all the weight which our necessities would require. They would be the Church's hand carrying into effect what she has in her highest council devised. The Church seems to have rejected the idea of ecclesiastical taxation, the apportionment of Presbyterial, Synodical, and Assembly expenses among the churches hitherto, according to their roll of communicants, being considered as a convenient way of meeting a trivial expense, but not a recognition of a right in courts to compel payment of assessments, it is difficult to see wherein the calls of the Assembly, or its committees, for contributions, could possess any greater authority than those of its deacons. And of course the Assembly's approval of the schemes would give all the force of its sanction to such lawful measures as its deacons would devise for giving them effect. The same separation of the purse and the keys, which Dr. Thornwell finds made in the word of God, could very easily be made in the workings of Synods and Presbyteries also.

But whatever may be done by the higher courts, to give effect to some such plan as Dr. Thornwell's, for getting rid of the troublesome questions of finance, we long to see this divine system carried into effect in our congregations at least. There is no constitutional barrier in the way of immediate action. The

law expressly allows and sanctions it. The General Assembly, by adopting the Book of Church Order, has thrown all the weight of its authority in that direction. We are sure that such a step is sanctioned by God's word, and that infinitely outweighs all else. We devoutly wish to see all the friction which human use of it produces in our divinely contrived machinery, eliminated, and church work simplified by a wise division of labor—"the things" to the deacons, "the persons" to the elders, the "ministry of the word" to the preachers. We shall then expect to see some such results as followed the first introduction of the diaconate by the apostles. Dr. Addison Alexander, in his Commentary on Acts, thus speaks of it:

"To prepare the way for the extension of the Church, a difference is permitted to arise within it (1), in consequence of which the twelve assemble the disciples (2), and propose a cure for the existing evil (3, 4), which is accordingly applied by the appointment of seven men to dispense the charities of the church (5, 6). A great addition, from the most important class of Jews, ensues upon this measure (7)". (See summary of contents for Chap. VI.)

ARTICLE II.

ITALY AND ITS RELIGIONS.

Taylor's Manual of History ; Coleman's Ancient Christianity ; Lecky's History of European Morals ; Evangelical Alliance Proceedings ; Ranke's History of the Popes, etc.

It has been said of Bunyan's immortal allegory, that it is equally interesting, and for different reasons, to the child, the poet, the Christian, and the theologian. With similar appropriateness it may be affirmed of the history of Italy, that it is equally interesting, and for different reasons, to the tourist, the artist, the poet, the scholar, the historian, the statesman, and the believer. It is proposed, by the aid of the authorities above named, partly to unravel one of the threads (in too many places crimson-hued,) of this marvellous and variegated tapestry.

The religious history of this interesting country may be divided into three grand epochs, not abruptly separated, but shading into each other, and of unequal duration: Italy Pagan, Italy Christian, and Italy Papal. Italy first appears in history as the home of a number of rude, independent, warlike, and hostile tribes, occupying but a small part of the territory now included within its bounds. Their origin and religion are unknown. Coalescing with the colonists of Thracian Asiatics, whom Æneas led into Italy after the fall of Troy, their faith seems to have been early merged into that of the new comers, with which Homer has made the world familiar. Thirty confederate cities, we are told, offered sacrifices to the gods of Olympus, on Mount Alba, before Rome was built. Shortly after this last event, Romulus instituted games in honor of Neptune, the Homeric god of the sea.

To Numa, who professed to have received revelations from the goddess or nymph Egeria, in a cave, the Romans were indebted for the main features of their religious system as it existed down to Virgil's day. Rome was by him placed under the custody of Jupiter Capitolinus, temples were reared, priests appointed, sacrifices ordained, vestals consecrated, augurs created, and the rules concerning omens settled.

One very remarkable feature was added to the national worship in the time of the empire. Divine honors were paid to some of the Cæsars living, and to others dead. Ranke remarks, "This worship was the only one common to the empire." As new nations were conquered, their gods were transported to a single building in Rome, until the Pantheon had well nigh justified its name, for thirty thousand divinities filled the capacious chambers of this grand religious museum. It does not appear that they brought any accession to the gods worshipped; for no Roman could pay any honors to a foreign divinity, but by special permit of the Senate—a law which seems to have been relaxed in the times of Horace and Juvenal.

The public worship of the "immortal gods" was observed with great pomp and solemnity, and Roman households had each their Penates, under whose guardianship they were placed, and to whom they poured out libations at their feasts. Every import-

ant transaction of life, public and private, was consecrated by appropriate religious ceremonies.

The Romans of the Republic and the Empire were a religious people. Their uniform good fortune they ascribed to this, and believed that their victories were quite as much due to the superiority of their gods as to the superiority of their arms. Religion was inseparable from the State. To be religious was to be patriotic; to be patriotic was to be religious.

How far it was due to their religious system, it were hard to determine; but certainly the history of Italy Pagan presents many splendid specimens of civic and domestic virtue. The Roman of the earlier days of the Republic was a man faithful to his trusts, patriotic and brave; but it must be confessed that his patriotism was accompanied with a singular indifference to the rights of other nations, and his bravery too often stained by unnecessary cruelty. Chastity in the married woman was prized. Does the lavish praise bestowed upon a few, for its possession and preservation, indicate its uncommonness? In the other sex it was neither esteemed nor professed. Indeed, the moral character of their gods was none of the best.—Many of them were in the popular theology charged with crimes for which an honest jury would send their human imitators to the penitentiary or the gallows. Yet even such a religion was better than none. Said Robespierre, “If God did not exist, it would be necessary to invent his being. The idea of a Supreme Being, who watches over oppressed innocence, and punishes triumphant crime, is and ever will be popular.”—*Alison*.

An interesting observation of Lecky in his *History of European Morals* may serve to introduce the next epoch. Alluding to the profound unconsciousness of the importance and destinies of Christianity manifested by contemporaneous Pagan writers, and remarking upon the meagreness of the few allusions they make to its presence and progress, the brief but famous letter of the younger Pliny being the fullest of them, he concludes: “And the long series of Pagans who wrote the lives of the Emperors in the most critical period, from the accession of Hadrian almost to the eve of the triumph of the Church, among a crowd of details

concerning the dresses, games, vices, and follies of the court, supply us with six or seven short notices of the religion that was transforming the world."

The first Cæsar who wore the imperial purple was seated in his palace by the Tiber, undisputed master of the world, when, in an obscure village of a distant province of his dominions, there was born the heir apparent of an empire destined to be wider and more enduring than that of Augustus. His immediate successor held the reins of power when the risen Christ bade a few Jewish fishermen offer his gospel to every creature. Nero, the fifth of the series, was on the throne, when Paul, the "prisoner of Jesus Christ," "preached the gospel at Rome also."

But other Christian volunteers had preceded him, and welcomed him as a brother beloved to the seven-hilled city. The spark had already fallen in its very centre, which was destined to consume the vast fabric of Paganism; the leaven had already been hidden, which was ere long to leaven the entire mass with a purer faith and a more vital civilisation.

The story of the introduction, conflicts, and final triumph of Christianity in Italy, forms one of the most thrilling chapters in history; and however a Gibbon or a Lecky may seek, by different modes of assault, to discredit it, furnishes no mean argument of its divinity. Islamism triumphed by the sword; Christianity by the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. It used no force, effected no compromise, employed no stratagem, in the seemingly unequal contest with Paganism, entrenched behind Imperialism; yet the dove of the Jordan vanquished the eagle of the Tiber. It was not, however, a bloodless victory, which the new faith won over the old. The bold front it from the first presented to idolatry, its unconcealed claim to spiritual supremacy, and the rapid increase of its adherents, could not fail, in time, to arouse the fears of the populace, whose superstitions were invaded; the alarm of the priesthood, whose craft was in danger; and the concern of the Emperor, who, by right of his high office, was charged with the preservation of the ancestral faith; and the history shows that rulers and people endeavored to check the inroads of the dreaded superstition by violence.

The persecutions thus instigated were now local and now general, as they originated in a fanatical outburst in a single province, or were inspired by the alarm or the zeal of an Emperor, spurred on by the priesthood of the capital. Nero heads the list of imperial persecutors; yet some of the best Emperors were the most cruel enemies of the Christians. Under Decian, the tenth wave rolled over the infant Church. Diocletian's name marks the last deliberate effort of dying Paganism to crush by force its formidable rival.

During this period, every calamity, local or national, was construed as a token of the anger of the gods, incensed by the toleration of Christianity, and was the signal for a fresh outburst of fury against its unfortunate professors. Says Tertullian: "If the Tiber arise against the walls of the city, or the Nile does not overflow its banks; if drought or rain occur; earthquake, or famine, or pestilence, the cry is at once, 'Away with the Christians to the lions!'"

But these frantic efforts to stamp out the fire only scattered the sparks and widened the conflagration; or, as one of the sufferers beautifully expressed it, "Persecution was the pruning-knife, which only trimmed the branches to make the vine more fruitful." The constancy of the martyr sometimes won the executioner to the faith. "Torment us," says one of the early apologists, "rack, condemn, crush us—the most exquisite cruelty which you devise avails you nothing, but rather induces the more to become Christians. As often as we are cut down by persecution, we spring up the more abundantly. The blood of Christians is the seed of the Church."

A wonderful story is told of a légion, six hundred and sixty strong, who, commanded by the Emperor to sacrifice to the gods and turn their arms against the Christians, quietly withdrew and remonstrated. Decimated as an example, they still declined, affirming their willingness to obey the Emperor, but their inability to disobey Christ. The order was given for a second decimation, when the survivors, declaring themselves his soldiers, but Christ's servants, continued: "We have arms, but offer no resistance, choosing rather to die innocent, than to live rebel-

lions and revengeful. Christians ourselves, we cannot persecute them that are also Christians. The bravery of our legion you must acknowledge. We lay down our arms and bend our necks to the sword of the executioner. He will find our right hands disarmed, but our breasts armed with the true Christian faith." The account closes: "They were immediately devoted to death, and died with their arms at their feet."—*Coleman.*

As no Church, by its location, was more exposed to the fury of these repeated tempests than that of Italy, so none furnished examples of greater constancy, or of more illustrious martyrdom. The populace had hardly dispersed from the amphitheatre, wet with the blood of a Roman bishop, before another had accepted the same perilous dignity. If these primitive Christians were distinguished for these heroic qualities, no less were they marked by the lowlier traits. Their charity was such as to attract universal notice. When the heathen fled from their plague-stricken relatives, it was the Christians who cared for them living, or buried them when they died. Were Roman citizens ransomed from captivity, it was the money of the Christians which purchased their liberty. The single church at Rome, A. D. 250, supported fifteen hundred widows, besides other poor.

In the time of the Decian persecution, a Roman officer was led by this liberality to suppose the Christians must have great treasures, and demanded them of Laurentius, one of the deacons. He asked for three days' time; and having assembled in the courts and porches of one of the churches, the aged, infirm, and destitute persons receiving constant aid, he sent for the prefect and said: "Come, see the treasures of our God." The prefect followed, and was shown the assembled poor.

To this and other Christian virtues to which the early apologists confidently appeal, and such Pagan writers as Pliny admit, was superadded a flaming missionary zeal, exhibited by all ranks alike, and which nothing could dampen or repress. Hence, as early as A. D. 180, Tertullian could say: "We are but of yesterday, and have already filled all your empire, your towns, islands, forts, boroughs, councils, your very camp, every tribe and quarter of the city, the palace, the senate, the forum. We

leave you nothing but your temples. Calculate the number of your armies, and the Christians of a single province would exceed it." Possibly there may be exaggeration in this utterance; yet the fact is historical, that in three centuries the Christian religion had become, not merely a *religio licita*, but the state religion of the Empire! In the beautiful language of Ranke, "The rulers of the world, themselves considered as deities, gave place to the Son of God, arrayed in the nature of man. The local deities passed away, and were seen no more. In every highway, on the summits of the steep hills, in the deep ravines and remote valleys, on the roofs of houses and in the mosaic of the floors, was seen the Cross; the victory was complete and decisive. As on the coins of Constantine, the labarum, with the monogram of Christ, is seen to rise above the conquered dragon, so did the worship and name of Jesus exalt itself above the gods of heathenism."

The triumph of pure Christianity in Italy was comparatively short; and we now turn to the contemplation of a picture not so pleasing—Italy Papal.

It is difficult to fix the exact date of the origin of the Papacy, for the reason that it grew up gradually from an almost imperceptible beginning. The process by which the simple pastor of a church developed into a universal primate, is not obscure. The philosophy of it is easy, and has been expounded by more than one able writer. Fortunately the theory is, in its main features, susceptible of amplest verification from history.

The gospel, as we see in the Acts, was first planted in cities, then, more even than now, the great centres of intelligence, and to them was committed the work of evangelising the circumjacent territory. As a natural consequence, the illiterate country churches and rustic pastors looked up to and depended upon the mother churches and more learned city pastors. As the spirit of piety declined, and the Church began to feel the paralysing effect of its union with the State, the pastors of the more important cities would begin to demand, as an official prerogative, what was at first conceded as a voluntary tribute to superior personal worth and attainments. The presiding minister of a city which chanced to be a provincial capital, would arrogate preëminency to himself

on this account, and the bishop of a city which happened to have been the residence of an apostle, would conceive a peculiar dignity and authority attached to his office by that circumstance.

Now, what more natural than that the bishop of that city, which was certainly the scene of Paul's labors, and some insist of Peter's, and therefore an apostolical see, and withal was under Pagan as well as Christian rule the mistress of the world, should imagine himself the universal pastor of the Church Catholic?

That the lofty yet natural pretensions of the Romish see were generally conceded, and that exclusively by the Western Church, only after centuries of strife, is matter of record, and is told with masterly clearness, eloquence, and brevity in the pages of Ranke's *History of the Popes*, a work worthy of all the praise bestowed upon it by Macaulay. As early as the eighth century, he informs us, Gregory II. writes with great satisfaction: "All the lands of the West have their eyes directed toward our humility; by them are we considered a god upon the earth." By the French Synod of Rheims, in the eleventh century, Leo X. was acknowledged "Primate of the Universal Church." Pepin having wrested a fair province from the Lombards, who had seized it from the Emperor, laid the keys of the conquered towns upon the altar of St. Peter. This donation marks the beginning of the States of the Church, and of that temporal dominion which succeeding Popes found the ready means, not always the most Christian, of enlarging, until it embraced a large part of the fairest and most fertile portion of Italy.

The system reached its highest development in the time of Gregory VII., otherwise known as Hildebrand. Then the Pope claimed political independence and spiritual supremacy over all Christendom; his voice was only less than omnipotent; high and mighty emperors, on occasions of state, held the reins of his palfrey, or did obeisance at his feet; he confirmed kings on their thrones, or released subjects from their oaths of allegiance; his interdict laid upon an empire, smote every interest as with the withering breath of a sirocco; and at his bidding and with his benison, all Europe poured out its choicest blood and richest treasure, to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from Paynim profanation.

The flood reached its height and then steadily declined to the era of the Reformation, when there set in a powerful reaction, which enabled the Papacy to recover much of its lost territory; and had nearly restored its ancient supremacy.

It is a remarkable and interesting fact, that the principles of the Reformation had gained a very strong foothold in Papal Italy about the time they prevailed throughout middle and northern Europe. Views of truths not dissimilar from Luther's, it is said, were held by the "Oratory of Divine Love," an association in Rome, and composed of high ecclesiastics, several of whom afterwards became cardinals. A book on "The Benefits of Christ," advocating the same views of justification with the German Reformer, was published in Naples, and very generally circulated throughout the Italian peninsula, and made many converts. The works of Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, and Bucer, (says McCrie,) translated into Italian, and under assumed names, found their way even to Rome, and were read and approved by bishops and cardinals, before their authorship was discovered. The German students who resorted to the Italian universities, and the Protestant soldiers of the army of Charles V., who about this time invaded Italy, sacked Rome, and imprisoned Pope Clement, contributed still further to the propagation of the Reformed doctrine.

Clement himself complains of the spread of the pestiferous heresy of Luther among ecclesiastics no less than the laity. In Ferrara, Milan, Naples, Geneva, Verona, Florence, and even Rome itself, Protestant views found adherents. "O Florence," exclaims a friar, "what is the meaning of Florence? The flower of Italy; and so thou wast, until these ultramontanes persuaded thee that man is justified by faith and not by works."

At Imola, in the Papal territories, a monk told his hearers that it behooved them to purchase heaven by good works. "That's blasphemy," exclaimed a boy present, "for the Bible tells us that Christ purchased heaven by his sufferings and death, and bestowed it freely on us by his mercy." A dispute between the two ensued, when, provoked by the pertinency of the youth's replies, and evident sympathy of the audience, the incensed monk

cried out, "Get you gone, you young rascal; you are but just come from the cradle, and do you take upon yourself to judge sacred things, which the most learned cannot explain?" "Did you never read these words," replied the undaunted boy, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings God perfects praise?" The young disputant, for his cleverness and orthodoxy, received a lodging in prison. In fine, advocates of the great doctrines of grace, as expounded by the Reformers, were found even in the Council of Trent, albeit all connexion with them was sedulously disavowed.

The Papacy at last roused itself to action, and in an incredibly short space of time, every vestige of the Reformed principles in Italy had been effectually stamped out. The means by which this was effected, were: the definition of doctrine by the Council of Trent, condemning the tenets of the Reformed as damnable heresies; the revival of the Inquisition, which spared neither sex, age, rank, nor condition, visiting with condign punishment the tainted cardinal, no less than the heretical mendicant friar; imprisoning upon suspicion; extorting confession by torture, and practising a kind of justice, reminding one of the saying, "hanging a man first, and convicting him afterwards;" the authorisation of the order of the Jesuits, who, through the pulpit, the confessional, and the professorial chair, labored with amazing assiduity for the restoration of the waning power of the Papacy; and the establishment of the Index Expurgatorius, which burned the books, as the congregation of the Holy Office did the bodies, of the heretics. It seemed, no doubt, to its zealous adherents, as if henceforth the reign of the Papacy would be undisturbed. Whether, if indulged, this was a well-founded expectation, remains to be seen.

A glance is all that can be given to the moral history of rulers and people under the Papacy. Certainly it has had ample time to work out to the last results, all its purifying and beneficent influences, if it ever possessed them. The judgment of impartial history is not a favorable one.

Cardinal Baronius, a high authority in the Romish communion, writing of the Popes about A. D. 897, says that for a hundred

and fifty years they were apostate rather than apostolical; that they were thrust into the Papal chair by Tuscan princes and by the influence of courtesans; that they were monsters, men of the most shameful lives and most dissolute manners, and in every respect detestable. John XII. was a thief and a robber; Boniface VII. a miscreant and a murderer; and that at one period there were several Popes claiming the chair, and cursing and denouncing each other as anti-Christian. Readers of history are familiar with the crimes which have made the names of the Borgias, father and son, notorious. Ranke says, that at one period it was the fashion among high ecclesiastics at Rome, who laid claim to liberal culture, to profess infidel sentiments. The morals of the Papal court were too often infamous.

Up to the era of the Reformation, which, strange to say, produced a reaction favorable to virtue within the bosom of the Papacy itself, and the effects of which still survive, the religious and moral condition of the people was deplorable. Seeing in their chief pastor all the features of a secular ambition, not to speak of worse vices, ecclesiastical positions sold to the highest bidder, or conferred upon unworthy and illegitimate sons or nephews of the Pope, cardinals and priests leading openly immoral lives; burdened by constantly multiplying imposts upon the necessaries of life, to support a vast hierarchical system, Christian scarcely more than in name, and conferring little if any spiritual benefit—it were a wonder if any true piety survived among the people. If they remained attached to the Romish see, it was only because their ignorance and superstition were too profound to permit their openly breaking with those who, they had been taught to believe, however dissolute, carried in their hands the keys of heaven.

There is evidence enough that the masses were degraded, ignorant, and superstitious to the last degree. Brigandage prospered, and at times became so rampant as to march through the country with flying banners, seizing treasures and burning villages in open day. In a late carnival pageant in New Orleans, the Pope rode in the same van with the brigand, and together represented Italy!

The moral condition of the people has exhibited some improvement since the Reformation, and Sixtus V. may be said to have headed a succession of better Popes, as he introduced a severe discipline among the ecclesiastical orders.

Macaulay, in his celebrated review of Ranke's History of the Popes, dwells eloquently upon the antiquity and immutability of the Papacy. The work reviewed presents facts which, more carefully weighed, might have abated his somewhat extravagant veneration. The Papacy is ancient, but it lacks centuries of ascending to apostolical times, and falls far short, in age, of the religious rule of the Grand Lama of the Tartars, the "Pope of the East." Its exemption from the mutations common to all things human, does not appear. Its seat was for years transferred to Avignon, in France, until the very names of some of the seven hills of forsaken Rome were for a time forgotten. It is the Sacred College which now elects the Pontiff; but history shows that Henry III. made four of them himself. The reviewer, in his comparison between the long line of Popes and the most ancient royal families of Europe, seems to overlook the circumstances that the Romish see is not hereditary, and that there is a peculiar feature inherent in the system, which multiplies, beyond what is usual in other governments, the changes of administration. The Pontificate is a government of old men. In several instances they have survived their elevation only a few months; and one was old and almost bedridden at the time, and lived only a few weeks. The elevation of a new incumbent not only occasioned just such changes among office-holders as happens with us when a new party comes into power—for they seem to have anticipated the American politician, in the vicious maxim, "To the victor belong the spoils"—but it often brought about an entire revolution in the foreign policy of the government. One Pontiff would ally himself with the French; the next would go over to the Spaniards; one while the weathercock of St. Peter's points Franceward; a new Pope is made, and in an instant it whirls about and points Spainward. And as for the elections in the Sacred College, such actions as have transpired bear an unhappy resemblance to the doings of a political caucus.

With the series of political events which, within a few years, have culminated in the destruction of the temporal power of the Pope; the unification of free Italy, and the transfer of the Italian Parliament to Rome, the daily press has made every intelligent reader familiar.

The present religious condition of Italy is sketched with admirable brevity and clearness in a paper read before the Evangelical Alliance, at its late sessions in New York, by the Rev. Matteo Prochet of Genoa. We can only cull a few facts. The terrible blows which the Papacy has of late received, have only aroused it to renewed activity. The priesthood, almost without exception, have rallied about the Pope, and accepting, with a subserviency equal to that of the dark ages, the Syllabus and Infallibility, they are laboring with prodigious zeal and industry, through the confessional, the school, and new societies, "spread like a spider's web over the entire peninsula, and adapted to every rank and taste." for the restoration of the Papacy. "Give us," say they, "the women through the confessional, and the children through the schools, and the nation is ours." As for the masses, while multitudes are fanatical and bigoted, and attached to their faith, a still larger number are merely nominal Roman Catholics, who "belong to the religion of I-don't-care," smile when asked if they believe in the Infallibility, yet cling to the Romish Church because it is the national Church. Besides these, there are the Patriots, who, until recently, have been entirely absorbed in political questions, the Unbelievers, Freethinkers, Positivists, etc., small as yet in number, but with an influence alarmingly on the increase, the "liberal Catholics," gradually separating in faith and practice from the Church of Rome, and the Evangelicals, or converted Romanists, already numbered by the thousands, and increasing. "Ten denominations," we are told, "are at work in Italy, (not as harmoniously as is desirable,) six evangelical papers are published, and the Bible circulating everywhere." The interesting paper concludes: "Italy is worked upon by three influences—the priests, who have on their side habit and indifference; the infidels, who have depravity; and the evangelists, the gospel." Which shall come out victor in

this triangular contest, the future alone can disclose. The Pope may, for a season, regain his temporal power, and Protestant nations, from reasons of state, aid in reinstating him, as they have done in the past. Europe is a vast kaleidoscope, within which new political combinations are perpetually forming. Just now the centre piece is a victorious Protestant power. Possibly, within a half century, or less, another revolution may fling to the centre the lilies of France, supporting the keys of St. Peter. For this, the Papal adherents, the world over, are working with prodigious energy: and this no doubt is the inspiration of that wide-spread society, "The Catholic Militant Union of the Cross," which a religious newspaper has very cleverly styled "the Papal International." Let us hope they will not succeed.

Eighteen centuries ago, as Paul's eyes fell upon his chains, he joyfully wrote to Timothy from Rome: "The word of God is not bound." Twenty-five years since, Kirwan was shown in a cell beneath the church of Santa Maria, in Rome, the well of St. Paul. Near it stood a pillar entwined with a chain, the very pillar and chain, said the guide, to and with which the great apostle was bound. Deeply chiselled upon the stone was the inscription, "*Verbum Dei non alligatum est.*" What mockery then!

All honor to Victor Emmanuel and a free Italian Parliament, and thanks to the Almighty Ruler of nations, the word of God is no longer bound; for the Bible, in the language of the people, is now sold or given away throughout Italy, and in Rome itself, and within sight of the Vatican, and beneath the very shadows of the Inquisition.

ARTICLE III.

LEX REGIT: LAW IS KING.

Luther says, in his *Commentary on Galatians*, "There is nothing more dangerous than to wander with curious speculations in heaven, and there to search out God in his incomprehensible power, wisdom, and majesty; how he created the world, and how he governeth it." This caution has been repeated by wise counsellors since, and is undoubtedly founded upon a substantial truth. Zophar says, in Job, "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" Paul asserts the same truth: "Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" God's nature must necessarily transcend all human comprehension. It is his glory to conceal a thing, and thus teach man what an ignorant worm he is. Except as he sees fit to reveal himself, he dwells in light which to human ken is utterly inaccessible.

While all this is so, and should not be forgotten, it is also true that God has given to his creature, man, a desire of knowledge, an inquiring mind, which seeks to exercise itself on all questions brought before it. More than this, man has, by nature, a power, intuitive and discursive, of acquiring knowledge, of apprehending, comparing, and preserving truth. Still further, God has placed the material of much knowledge within man's reach. These objects of human knowledge are all, in a sense, divine. They are all either the works or the word of God, and are thus but revelations of himself. Not only "the spangled heavens, a shining frame;" not only old ocean, whose deep roar sounds like the voice of the infinite; not only the Holy Scriptures, "given by inspiration of God;" but man himself, the masterpiece of nature, is also but an expression of the mind of God. In studying all these things, we are but acquainting ourselves with the works and ways and nature of Jehovah.

If man is an intelligent being, what object so worthy of his

study as the Being from whose creative power he sprang! What knowledge to him so elevating, so purifying, as the knowledge of the Infinite and Holy! Moreover, in what way can he so well show his reverent affection for his Maker, as by an earnest effort "to know him, and out of that knowledge to love him and to serve him?" Happily, the days are gone when ignorance was considered the mother of devotion; when one of God's professed servants could say:

"My breast, in belt of iron pent,
With shirt of hair and scourge of thorn;
For three-score years in penance spent,
My knees those flinty stones have worn;
Yet all too little to atone
For knowing what should ne'er be known."

The pious Cowper has rightly said:

"Priests have invented, and the world admired
What knavish priests promulgate as inspired;
Till reason, now no longer overawed,
Resumes her powers, and spurns the clumsy fraud."

Truth has never been an injury to any mind.

One caution, however, in these great matters, needs to be carefully observed. Says an inspired thinker: "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." In remembrance of this truth, let us conduct our inquiry into God's working, with an humble, reverent mind, seeking to know the truth alone, and praying for the guidance of that Spirit who has been promised to lead us into all truth.

Scott makes Marmion say:

"Of nature's laws,
So strong I hold the force,
That never superhuman cause
Could e'er control their course."

This is the fundamental position of the prevalent scepticism of the present day. It has, however, its extreme and its more moderate phases. According to the former, matter, instinct with force, is eternal. Its primitive form was *nebulæ*, fire-mist, star-dust.

In this original condition, it contained the subsequent universe in embryo, as the acorn is the undeveloped oak. The force, latent in matter, began to exert itself, and, by its own intrinsic, independent power, has gradually produced all the forms of mineral, vegetable, animal, and spiritual being which have since existed in the universe. It is now still working, as it has ever done; and we know not what new and yet higher beings it may evolve in the distant future. So far, man is its master-piece; but he may, as an extinct fossil, be an object of study to some future generation, as far above him in dignity of nature as he surpasses the chattering ape from which he sprung. This is substantially the theory of the astronomer, La Place, who, when asked by the emperor why he had not mentioned God in his system of the universe, replied, "Sire, I have no need of that hypothesis." It may have been that the eminent scholar, Humboldt, sympathised with these views, for in his *Cosmos* there is no reference to creative power, or to providential oversight. In plain words, this is a theory which altogether dispenses with God as an unnecessary "hypothesis," installing in his place, blind, material force, as the sovereign of the worlds.

There is, however, a less radical form of the same general belief. According to this, the original star-dust was not eternal, but sprung from the creative hand of the Omnipotent, who endowed it with force and ability to work out the destiny of the universe, without any help or supervision from him. In a still more modified shape it is presented by the illustrious Darwin, who begins with "life, breathed by the Creator, with its several powers, into one or more original forms." The essential idea, however, of this particular school of thought, is well given by one of its ablest and most candid advocates, Mr. Wallace, who divides with Darwin the honor of the discovery of the law of "natural selection." He tells us that the sole agency of the Creator consisted in his so coördinating the laws of nature "at the first introduction of life upon the earth," as that they should "of necessity," and "by themselves," accomplish all that has since resulted. A simple and common illustration will make the idea clear. An artisan constructs a watch, according to certain estab-

lished principles ; he winds it up so that the natural force of the spring may exert itself ; he sets the pointers right, and then leaves the instrument with its internal forces to work out its intended purpose. So the universe, as a piece of automatic machinery, has been so constructed that it runs its course by virtue of its own inherent and independent forces. These forces are so perpetual, and so perfectly adjusted to each other and to the end sought to be reached, that they necessarily, and of themselves, without any superintendence by the Creator, evolve all the results contemplated in the formation of the universe.

It will be at once seen that the theory of La Place was absolute Atheism, dispensing with God both as a Creator and as a providential Father. Wallace, Huxley, Darwin, Tyndall, Spencer, and all that class of evolutionists, entirely repudiate the charge of Atheism. Some of them occupy a purely negative position. As scientists, they know nothing of God. He belongs to a region which is unexplored and unexplorable by human philosophy. So they neither affirm nor deny his existence. Others of them, as we have already seen, admit his existence, and attribute to his power the work of original creation. Their scepticism is not as to creation, but as to God's present, personal providence. They assert that there is no need for his direct superintendence of the universe ; and that the most careful, critical observation shows that he has committed the worlds to the dominion of *law*, which now sways an undisputed sceptre over the universe of matter and of mind. Jehovah no longer concerns himself with the affairs of men or of worlds, but having committed all things to the control of law, he has withdrawn to the solitude of his own infinite meditation.

This view seems to militate so directly against the scripture doctrine of Providence, shutting the Deity off from all personal sympathy and intercourse with his creatures, making a miracle impossible, and denying the efficacy of prayer, that the whole Christian world has been stirred to its profoundest depths to meet and answer this subtle foe. It is sad to think that many of these defences of our holy religion have shown more of ignorance and spleen than of well considered argument to strengthen the

startled faith of the feeble. To meet this new Richmond, one knight, however, has appeared upon the field, who has shown himself in every respect a champion worthy of his renowned antagonists.

The Duke of Argyll, whose son is husband to one of Queen Victoria's daughters, the highest dignitary of the Scotch nobility, an elder in the kirk of Scotland, has entered the arena as the David of our Israel. It is not too much to say that his work, "The Reign of Law," is a satisfactory vindication of special providence against the assaults of these its latest foes.

The development philosophy says that the world is now under the sway of physical, necessary, fixed laws, which operate by their own independent force. These laws are absolutely unchangeable, the Deity himself having put them beyond the reach of his own interference. Special providences, answers to prayer, miracles, are absurd and altogether out of the question. The Scotch nobleman admits that we are under a reign of law, and that these laws are constant, because they are perfect. But they are not independent of the Being whose sovereign enactment gives them validity; nor does their unchangeableness prevent his personal superintendence of the universe, and his interposition in its affairs, whenever he may see best. This is the interesting and important part of his argument. Law reigns and law is constant; but Jehovah reigns through law, and its very constancy is not only a matter of his ordination, but is the very means which he employs in all of his special providences. Through fixed, unwavering law, he hears prayer and works miracles.

What is law? This is of course a fundamental question in this discussion. With reference to this argument, the Duke shows that the word is used in some five different shades of meaning: 1. "Simply an observed order of facts." 2. An observed order produced by some unknown force. 3. An individual force, more or less known. 4. "Combinations of force," for "the fulfilment of purpose, or the discharge of function." 5. An observed "order of thought."

These meanings may all be reduced to three: 1. Law is sim-

ply a generalised *fact*. 2. Law is *force*, known or unknown, single or combined. 3. Law is a generalised *thought*. It is in the second of these senses that it plays so important a part in the relations of God to his universe. We speak of the law of gravitation, and we mean the force of gravitation. The fact of the existence of these forces, as operating in nature, cannot be questioned. But after all, what are they? Three opinions have prevailed.

1. That they are but another name for the omnipotence of the Deity, exerting itself directly in the world of matter and of mind. Many not only pious but profound minds have entertained this view. His Grace of Argyll seems to lean in this direction. He says: "Even if we cannot certainly identify force in all its forms with the direct energies of one omnipresent and all-pervading will, it is at least in the highest degree unphilosophical to assume the contrary—to speak or to think as if the forces of nature were either independent of, or even separate from, the Creator's power." While there are some difficulties in the way of this view, there are powerful reasons which recommend it to the thoughtful.

2. In extreme opposition to this idea of natural force, the positive, materialistic philosophy presents itself. It assumes that force is either a self-existent, independent, uncreated reality, or that, if a creature, it has obtained its independence, and now operates by its own efficiency. According to it, natural force binds the Deity himself, and gives him his bounds that he cannot pass. Either of these positions involves an absurdity. That natural force is finite, and yet uncreated, is impossible. That it is finite and created, and yet limits the infinite and uncreated, is, of course, out of the question. That it is infinite and uncreated, makes it the Deity himself.

3. As an intermediate position, it is asserted by others that force is a created servant, by whose secondary agency Jehovah accomplishes his purposes upon the earth. It has a separate but not an independent subsistence. It is merely the instrument with which the Almighty acts. This is the view held by the majority of conservative thinkers; and to it, perhaps, no insuper-

able objection can be made. As far as we are now concerned, there is no irreconcilable antagonism between this and the first opinion presented.

We will now seek to apply the principles already presented more directly to the relations subsisting between God and the universe. These will be discussed under three heads.

I. God's relations to the universe as its *Creator*. Here, in meeting the scepticism of the present day, we must remember that it does not assume, as we have already seen, the form of absolute or dogmatic Atheism. Prof. Tyndall especially disclaims anything of the kind, asserting that science, as such, has nothing whatever to say either for or against the existence of a Creator. Prof. Huxley is, perhaps, even more explicit. He says: "It is, and always has been, a favorite tenet of mine, that Atheism is as absurd, logically speaking, as Polytheism."

In connexion with this, another fact, too frequently disregarded, must be carefully observed. The word create, as used even by thinking men, is often employed quite ambiguously. It has two well-defined meanings, which must not be confounded with each other. It is used, in the first place, to denote the absolute origination of a thing, the making of something out of nothing. This is its meaning manifestly in the Westminster Chatechism, where we are told that "the work of creation is God's making all things out of nothing." This is absolute creation, and is an infinite act. The absolute creation of an atom of matter requires omnipotent energy to effect it. No man, no company of philosophers, has ever been able, with all the scientific appliances, to accomplish such a feat. Indeed, man has never even witnessed such a result in the process of accomplishment in the laboratory of nature. Yet, unless matter is eternal, there was a time when the infinite God brought its elements first into being by direct exertion of his omnipotence.

But the word create is also used in a secondary, relative meaning, to denote the giving of a new form to old material. So Moses tells us that God made the vegetables and land animals from the elements already created in the earth; that he made the fish and fowls from the waters; that he made man from the

dust of the earth, and woman from the body of man. Human power can, in this sense, create. Thousands of things, for beauty or for use, are thus made by the mind-directed muscles of men.

In discussions upon God's work as Creator, this distinction is not sufficiently regarded. Just here we have to make our most serious criticism upon the valuable work of the Duke of Argyll, to which we have already referred. As we have already seen, he accepts the truth of the universal reign of law; that all things, under human observation, are accomplished by the operation of constant forces. Moreover, he gives us a criticism of the word "supernatural," so frequently used in these discussions. In his view, it should not be applied to represent a "power independent of the use of means." He inclines to favor the position taken by Mansel, that the supernatural is simply *superhuman* power directed by a superhuman knowledge in the use of natural forces. He says: "There is nothing in religion incompatible with the belief that all exercises of God's power, whether ordinary or extraordinary, are effected through the instrumentality of means." As a Presbyterian elder, what does he say to this statement, taken from the Westminster Confession of Faith: "God, in his ordinary providence, maketh use of means, yet is free to work without, above, and against them, at his pleasure"?

But more specially let us recur to the distinction just made between absolute and secondary creation. In absolute creation, at the original introduction of matter, did God work "through the instrumentality of means?" If so, what were the means? Do you say, natural forces? Well, these natural forces, are they separate from the Deity? If so, when were they created, and what means were employed to produce them? Is it not manifest that when we trace the matter back far enough, we must come to the Infinite, the Absolute, from whose omnipotent wisdom, force and matter and mind must all have directly proceeded, without any secondary instrumentality? To use the Duke's own language: "The very idea of a Creator involves the idea, not merely of a being by whom the properties of matter are employed, but of a being from whose will the properties of matter are derived." Here we show that law, in the sense of natural

force, must have been subsequent to, and, in fact, created by the omnipotent. If, then, the elements of matter and the natural forces were created by the Almighty, absolutely, without the use of means, is it logical, or in accordance with the truth, to assert that the Deity, either as a matter of necessity or as a fact, is limited to the use of secondary agencies in the accomplishment of his purposes? Most manifestly not. As God has worked without means, (and in this has shown himself to be the Omnipotent, infinitely above man, who is strictly limited to them,) is any justified in saying that he either cannot, or in fact does not *still*, in this way, show his superiority to the works of his hands? The denial of this involves the denial of God as the absolute originator or creator of the universe.

In the secondary work of creation, the compounding of the elements into minerals, the formation of vegetables and animals, in their successive species and genera, we have no doubt whatever that the Creator makes use of natural forces, with their invariable laws, as the means for the production of all these works of his hand. He created the elements and the forces of nature for this very purpose. With regard to this secondary or relative creation, the statement of the Duke, that God works only through the instrumentality of means, is, perhaps, strictly true.

In all this discussion, we understand by *means*, finite, created, secondary agencies or causes. If it is meant, when it is said that God works only by the use of means, that he does nothing without a plan, or without suitable resources, either within or without himself, then there can be no question as to the truthfulness of the statement. When he created the original forces or elements of matter, he must have possessed the means of doing so, or it could not have been done. But these means were, and must have been, within himself, a mystery beyond finite comprehension.

II. God's relations to the universe, in the *ordinary* works of *providence*. This is the most practical portion of our discussion. It will require but few words, however, as the principles underlying it are simple and easily stated. It is, perhaps, the favorite thought of the present scepticism to show that God's providential

control of his creation is both unnecessary and impossible. They say that God created the elements and the forces, endowing them with every needed power for the evolution of the universe; that he set them to work, and, as his presence was no longer necessary, he left them to work out the grand problem of created being; that the elements have their definite laws of attraction and repulsion, and the forces their fixed, unalterable powers of action and reaction, so that, even if the Deity might wish to do so, these are beyond the limit of his interference. Providence, then, is both unnecessary and impossible.

Providence is not unnecessary, 1. For the sake of the elements and forces themselves. Has any created being the power of self-existence? Can man, even, by power of his own, perpetuate his own existence a single moment? No, it is in God that we live. For each second of our continued being we are dependent upon his preserving care. So for the continued existence and efficiency of all the natural forces, the sustaining power of their Creator is necessary.

2. Providence is more especially needful for God's higher, spiritual children; for man, as a moral, intelligent being. What would be the moral impression produced upon mankind generally, were they made to believe that God had withdrawn from all personal concern with his children upon the earth? What would be the effect upon suffering virtue, as we so often see it, struggling with the adversities of life? What influence would it exert upon the vicious and depraved? If there were no present God to whom we could pray; no living Judge, to whom our actions are hourly manifest; if we are but parts of an inexorable system of material machinery, what motives to virtue and what restraints to vice would be left to elevate man in the scale of moral excellence? Moreover, it is even more important to reflect what intercourse, what praise, what gratitude could there be in man's relations to a God who had thus abandoned him to the relentless working of a blind materialism?

God's personal providence is not impossible. We know and admit the definite laws of nature; we know and admit that constancy, invariable constancy, is one of the laws of force; we

know and admit that law reigns coextensively with the created universe. While all this is true, there is still room for God's personal providence towards his creatures. If God is the author of these laws, which are so uniform, could he not arrange them in such a way as that they would accomplish, by their natural working, his providential purposes? Has he not, in fact, in his infinite wisdom, done so? But one may ask, How can he heal the sick, relieve the poor, or send rain upon the earth, if all these things are under the control of invariable law? This is the very point, and just here we have the main thought of the Duke of Argyll's book. Food has its definite laws, which are uniform, and beyond my control. Have I not, however, as a will *separate* from the food, the power to eat or not to eat, as I may judge to be best? Fire has its laws, the combustible materials of our houses have theirs, and water has its. Now, knowing these things, have I not power to keep the fire from contact with my dwelling, or if it should thus come into contact, have I not power to use the water for quenching the flame?

What are the facts thus developed? Force has its laws, unchangeable as the nature of Him who established them. But mind, even finite mind, being separate from these forces, can use or not use them, and can use them in such quantities as desired. Moreover, these forces limit, counteract, overcome each other. It is, therefore, within the power of an independent intelligence, so to combine them as to modify and endlessly vary the effects produced. It is thus that God works in his providence toward us. It is not by changing laws, but by using and combining them in such a way as, through them, to effect the end which he may desire. So that the reign of law and the uniformity of force, instead of preventing the possibility of providence, are really the very means by which Jehovah hears prayer, controls the nations, sends the rain, and heals the sick.

As Atheism is the special opponent of the theistic doctrine of creation, so Pantheism is that form of unbelief which militates more particularly against the doctrine of providence. There is no difficulty in our admitting definite forces and unvarying law, if we clearly apprehend the Deity as an *extra-mundane* Being,

possessed of intelligence and will. Just as the farmer, an intelligent power separate from the soil, the sun and the seed, makes use of their fixed laws to the securing of his harvest ; just as the physician, an intelligence distinct from his medicines and patients, is able to apply with confidence the determined forces of the one to relieve the law-regulated maladies of the other ; so God, a wise and free Being, apart from his universe, can employ its exact forces, with their unchangeable laws, to the securing of his own wise and benevolent purposes. The denial of providence thus has its root in Pantheism, or else must logically issue in it.

III. God's relations to his universe, in the *extraordinary* works of his providence, present to us a theme upon which the ablest minds of the race have spent their full force.

Here our first need is to discriminate with clearness between the ordinary and extraordinary works of providence. What is the differentia of each ? Thinkers will probably divide themselves into two classes upon this question. Some will maintain that the distinction between them is, that the one class are usual, frequent ; while the other are simply unusual and rare ; that, in God's relations to them, and in their relation to law, they are otherwise just the same. If this be accepted as the true difference between them, then the extraordinary providences should not present any peculiar difficulty to the mind. One may not visit Europe more than once in a lifetime, while he may go to his office every day. There is, however, as little trouble in conceiving of his personal action in the one case as in the other. So Etna or Vesuvius might not have an eruption more than once in several centuries ; Venus may allow over a hundred years to pass between her transits across the sun ; and yet we have no difficulty in seeing that these events are brought about by God in the use of natural means.

Most men (at least those of a sceptical tendency,) will say that there is a broader line of demarkation between the ordinary and the extraordinary than this ; that there is a deeper, more essential difference ; that the former are due to the operation of manifest, known, natural causes, while the latter are produced, if at all, by occult, unknown, supernatural agencies. To take an

illustration which will bring out these two opinions, let us consider the origin of species. The origination of a species—is it an ordinary or an extraordinary providence? Those who maintain the first view as to the difference in question, answer without hesitation, that it is an unusual, and, therefore, an extraordinary display of creative or providential power. Darwin, however, expects canonisation as a scientific saint for having discovered and proven, as he believes, that species originates in ordinary providence, by the law of natural selection. He must, therefore, classify it, upon the second basis of division, as simply an ordinary effort of nature, inasmuch as it is brought about, according to him, by known and natural agencies.

Let us examine for a moment this second basis of division. According to it, the ordinary providences are due to known and natural causes, the extraordinary to unknown and supernatural. Let us look at these causes which are said to be so well known. Take any of them—the most familiar will serve our purpose best—gravitation, if you please. It is observed that bodies attract each other directly as their weight and inversely as the square of their distances from each other. This accords with universal observation. We call this attractive force gravitation. What, now, do we know about it? Anything beyond the mere fact of its supposed existence? Can any philosopher tell us how it operates, why it should operate, or what is its origin? Have we not here come to a depth beyond the plummet of human science? Take the motion of the earth around its axis. We know that it does thus move, that some force must impel it. What is that force? Can we do more than merely give a name to it? Take crystallisation, one of Tyndall's natural wonders. It is, indeed, most wonderful to observe the lifeless particles of matter marshalling themselves into the most complicated and yet beautifully regular and symmetrical forms. This is done by the force of crystallisation, we say. Ah, yes; but what is this force of crystallisation? We know nothing about it, and so we flatter our ignorance by giving it a name, and claiming it as a familiar acquaintance. So it is with all the so-called known and natural causes. Because the facts, of which they are the attempted explanation, are to us fa-

miliar, we have learned to give a name to the force whose effects thus pass under our daily observation. That is, when these effects are usual and frequent, we name the cause producing them, and call it known and natural. Whether, however, we pursue the line of matter or of force, we finally come, in either case, to elements, ultimate principles, which defy the analytic crucible of man.

We now ask ourselves whether there are not possibly and probably many other forces operating in the universe, whose effects we have never observed, to which we have never given a name, and which are to us entirely unknown? No one will dispute this. When these forces do come within our observation, but at rare intervals, are we not prone to doubt their existence on the one hand, or to call them supernatural on the other? History is full of illustrations of this fact as to vital, chemical, and astronomical forces, as, for example, in the case of eclipses.

Here, again, let us take the origin of species as an example. No such fact ever came under human observation, as the origination of any species, either vegetable or animal. For nearly six thousand years men had lived, thought, and wrote, believing that all species were contemporaneous in their origin, and were due either to chance or to an original creative power. Within the present century this was found to be a mistake. Geology gives us indubitable evidence of the perishing of certain species and the introduction of others, since the beginning of things. When this fact was announced some believed, but many doubted. There are some men to-day, intelligent upon other questions, who refuse to believe it. Of those who accept it as a fact, a few say that the origin of these new species, as of all things else, was accidental or fortuitous. Others, believing in a divine creation, affirm that their introduction was supernatural, due to the immediate efficiency of the Almighty Father. Darwin and Wallace think that they have discovered a natural law, which will account for the occasional perishing of the old and the introduction of the new species.

Let us now ask ourselves whether, if the origination of a new species was a fact which occurred frequently within human ob-

servation, all of us who believe in God's government of his universe by natural law, would not at once give in our adhesion to the existence of a biogenetic or pangenetic force, as amongst the secondary agencies of his providence? We would know nothing about it, except the fact of its existence from the witnessed effects of its power. Yet we would give it a name, call it manifest, known, and natural, and fancy ourselves very wise about it. It is just so, we venture to say, with the recorded miracles of the Scriptures. Were they frequently performed and familiar to us, we that hold to a providence of natural law would not be long in domesticating amongst the family of forces a teratic, dynamic, semeiotic, ergotic, or hagio-pneumatic power. as the natural cause of these well known events.

From these observations it seems difficult to maintain that the distinction between the extraordinary and the ordinary providences, is any other than that the one are unusual and rare, while the other pass often under human observation. It seems at least doubtful whether it can be successfully maintained that the former are the works of God by means of secondary agencies, while the latter are the fruits of his immediate efficiency. We are willing, however, to admit that there is this fundamental difference between them.

Miracles are the most interesting class of the extraordinary providences. Some special remarks upon them will conclude what we have to say.

If God created the original elements and forces without the use of secondary agencies, there is no physical impossibility in the way of a further immediate exertion of his omnipotence. If, then, a miracle be the direct effect of Almighty Power, without the use of means, it is surely not impossible to God, who could create a universe out of nothing.

Again, if God is a Being who has made the laws and forces of nature, and is himself separate from and independent of them, then there is no reason why he may not, upon suitable occasions, use certain forces which are not ordinarily called into exercise; or may not employ the every-day laws of nature in such a combination, or with such a degree of potency. as is not usual. Either of these

would be such an extraordinary act of his power as would be considered a miracle.

So we see that the physical possibility of a miracle, if it be regarded as an immediate exertion of omnipotence, is apparent from the creative power of the Deity; if it be considered simply an extraordinary use of the natural forces, it is equally manifest from God's providential character as separate from his own laws and forces.

Miracles belong to the domain of law, just as truly as do the systematic movements of the planets. From their extreme rarity, and from the further fact that they were all performed before these latter days of critical, scientific observation their laws are not so well known to us as many other facts of providence. A few of them, however, are clearly manifest. They were all beyond the power of human effort in the use of natural agencies. They were superhuman. This is their first law. Again, none of them were done to gratify human curiosity. They were not tricks of legerdemain. Again, none of them were cruel or silly; they were merciful and dignified. Again, they were never needlessly multiplied; even in their own age, they were extraordinary acts. Again, they were never done in the interest of a lie, whether of fact or of principle. Again, they were always wrought with one definite object in view, namely, to accredit the revelation of divine and redeeming truth. Such are some of the laws of the miracle, and we dare say that they are just as fixed and as natural as those which hold the stars in their courses.

Here we might stop, but we are tempted to say a word on the moral aspects of the miracle. The strongest objections to them come from this source. For example, it is said that a miracle, if true, would be a betrayal of capriciousness in the Deity, as it is manifestly a radical change from his ordinary mode of operation. To this the answer is ready. *These changes were a part of the original plan.* The century plant is watched from its first springing above the soil, for days, weeks, months, years, decades. During all this period, it is flowerless, and a hasty judgment would class it as such. Finally, however, it blooms. Is this a sudden and unprovided-for change? No; that flowering was a

part of its development from the original germination. Just so, the miracle is not a parasite; it is but the bloom upon the millennial plant of providence.

Geology tells us that new species of vegetable and animal life have, from time to time, been introduced upon the earth. Now, whether these were developments or direct creations, they show that nature does not present an even and unvarying play of the forces. There are, from time to time, novel combinations and extraordinary exhibitions of the vital energies. These well known facts are as extraordinary providences as are any of the alleged miracles. They were unusual, and yet they were a part of the original plan of the universe; and just so are the Scripture miracles.

But again, it is urged that it is contrary to the dignified wisdom of the Creator, that he should interfere with the ordinary course of nature in causing the sun to stand still, in withering a fig-tree, in restoring life to a few dead people. This brings up what may be considered the most interesting point in the whole discussion of miracles. By means of the correlation, conservation, and constancy of the forces, God has, without doubt, established throughout his universe a uniformity of nature. This has certainly been done, and it has been wisely done. For man's sake, it is an inestimable blessing that it is so. The sun has its regular time to rise and to set; trees do not wither suddenly, without some natural cause for it; the dead do not return to life. What basis could there be for human calculation, if this were not so?

The point now is, that, if infinite wisdom has ordained this uniformity, the same wisdom could not violate it. Let us look at this. Wisdom is shown in the use of the best means for securing good ends. The constancy of natural law is the means chosen by infinite wisdom for all the ordinary purposes of the universe. We can readily see that it best meets those purposes. If, now, some high and holy end can be secured by a temporary variation in the ordinary course of natural procedure, may it not be wise thus to vary? But is there any object of sufficient importance

to justify a variation in the ordinary operation of the laws of the universe?

It is sufficiently manifest that man is the noblest being upon the earth. His interests are the highest of all earthly interests. It is equally apparent that his spiritual needs are by far the loftiest that he feels.

"On earth there is nothing great but man ;
In man there is nothing great but mind."

It is just as manifest that man's spiritual nature is a wreck. He feels himself a depraved culprit, a prodigal son in despair, far from his father's house. If, now, to attest his message of peace, pardon, and purity, his heavenly Father should accompany it with such superhuman evidences of its genuineness that imposture could not counterfeit them, who will say that his love has not given good counsel to his wisdom? If the staying of the sun, the withering of a tree, the raising of the dead, will cause man to see that the message which he hears is the revelation of God's scheme of salvation to him, we surely cannot affirm that the end is too trivial for the extraordinary means used to reach it.

In plain words, the use of a miracle is not to make men stare, as at the tricks of a magician, but for the high purpose of authenticating a revelation of life and death from God to man. Is the end, the salvation of man, worthy of the means, the temporary variation in the course of nature? If so, its wisdom cannot be impugned.

All this is true, even though a miracle were a providence absolutely *sui generis* ; that is, not only an immediate act of God, but directly violative of his ordinary natural laws. A miracle, however, is not necessarily a violation of the ordinary laws of nature. It may be a mere suspension of them. It may be even less than this: it may be simply a variation in the laws; the operation of a new and unusual force, which, by its superior potency, overcomes the ordinary law, just as gravitation overcomes the projectile force with which a ball is sent from the mouth of a gun.

We have seen that law reigns throughout the universe. God has done all things regularly and systematically. Thus he cre-

ated the worlds, and thus he governs them, both in his ordinary and extraordinary providences. There never was a chaos, and we are sure there never will be. There never was an accident. There never was an event without an adequate cause producing it. "Order is heaven's first law," says Pope. As it presided over creation, as it rules over providence, so it will spread its benignant wings over the final consummation, when "the good shall be uppermost and the evil shall be undermost forevermore."

ARTICLE IV.

THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST.

Jesus : His Life and Work, as narrated by the Four Evangelists. By HOWARD CROSBY. University Publishing Company, New York. 1871. 1 Vol., 8vo. Pp. 551.

The Life of Christ. By the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, D. D., LL.D. Robert Carter & Bros., New York. 1871. 3 Vols., 8vo.

The Life of Christ. By FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D. D., F. R. S., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Master of Marlborough College, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. "*Manet Immota Fides.*" E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. 1874. 1 Vol., 8vo. Pp. 472.

It was the purpose of the writer to add to the above list the "Sketch of the Character of Christ," by Dr. Schenkel; "The Life of Jesus," by Strauss (*Leben Jesu*); and Renan's "*Vie de Jesus*," in order to collect under one head all the more prominent works of late years upon the general topic. The necessity for this array of authorities appears the more urgent, as the Scripture narratives upon which they are all builded, say next to nothing touching the example of the Lord. That which divine inspiration has omitted, human imagination has attempted to supply; and, in the cases of the eminent authors above enumerated, with the purest motives, doubtless, and in the hope of in-

structing and elevating the Church. On account of this last consideration, the names and books of the avowed enemies of orthodox theology are omitted; although, as matters of pure speculation, their heretical hypotheses are erected upon precisely the same foundation as that relied upon by the evangelical authors, and that upon which the Apocryphal Gospels were constructed. That is to say, events that God has concealed, and that authentic history has not recorded, which may or may not have occurred in the life of the Lord, and which are frivolous, or foolish, or profane, as recorded in these imaginary annals. The example theory, as most ably set forth by Thomas a Kempis, Ascetic and Papist, has been received with favor by Christian professors for three or four hundred years, and has served to lacerate the hearts of multitudes of godly people afflicted with mental dyspepsia, but has never given one grain of comfort to any suffering saint.

The Bible assigns three offices to the Lord Jesus, and all orthodox standards are constructed upon this basis, namely, that Christ, as Redeemer, executes the offices of prophet, priest, and king. The Gospels are therefore devoted to the description of this threefold official life; and it is perhaps safe to say that nothing is related by the four evangelists, besides the prophetic teaching of the Lord, or his priestly or royal acts. All the common events of daily life, as referring to the Lord, are excluded from these narratives. And it is specially held by Presbyterians, that the Bible is emphatic in its silence, as well as in its utterances.

I. The first argument is here indicated. Inasmuch as nine-tenths of the human life of the Lord on the earth has been hidden from human scrutiny, it is unsafe for uninspired historians to fill up this gap. The Apocryphal Gospels are notable examples of the failure that must attend such essays. And the three works whose titles appear at the head of this article, do precisely what these Gospels professed to do, to wit, instruct the Church in matters which God had failed to reveal. In describing the possible boyhood, youth, and early manhood of the Lord Jesus, Dr. Farrar frequently refers to the false Gospels, always carefully repudiating their authority, yet always noting their *quasi* confirmation of the events he has imagined. For example, he quotes (page 44)

from the 11th chapter of the apocryphal history of Joseph the carpenter, a long passage, in which the Lord himself describes the home-life at Nazareth, and then adds: "This passage I quote for the sake of the picture which it offers of the unity which prevailed in the home at Nazareth." But the fatal objection remains—either the apocryphal history is true, or the picture is a mere fancy sketch, without moral value, and certainly chargeable with profaneness.

A life of Christ, that would omit the events which the Bible omits, could have no practical value. That life has been written four times by inspiration, and each reader is competent to apprehend for himself all the lessons divine wisdom and love intended to communicate by the record of events. But the authors of these volumes could not find in the Gospels the lessons they sought. Their pious object was to utilise that mysterious life by extracting from it examples for human behavior; and these, being scarce in the canon, they would furnish in their commentaries. There is no more moderate estimate to be placed upon their labors. And the conclusion is herein reached—that God, with a brief exception, having purposely withheld from mortal knowledge thirty years of the Lord's life on the earth, it is fair to infer that the acts of these thirty years were not exemplary, in any true and proper sense. We cannot be told to do certain things because Jesus did them, if his doing of them rests upon no better authority than a fancy biography. The readiness manifested, both by Doctors Farrar and Crosby, to accept the *general* statements of Apocryphal Gospels, even as *possibly* true, is a lamentable proof of the inherent weakness of the whole system. None of these fables, after eliminating the grosser portions of them, will compare with the mythology of the heathen Greeks in beauty of construction; and if they are less faulty in their morals, it is because they inculcate no moral lessons whatever. They are perhaps the most monstrous absurdities of ancient times. Driven, as Dr. Farrar is driven, once and again, into fragmentary quotations from these fragmentary histories, it is fortunate for the Church that he has not gone further astray. In speaking of the Lord's natural kinsmen, he says: "There seemed to be in them a

certain strong opinionativeness, a Judaic obstinacy, a lack of sympathy, a deficiency in the elements of tenderness and reverence." How Dr. Farrar attained this intimate acquaintance with men who are barely mentioned in sacred and profane annals, is one of the inscrutable mysteries of *modern* times.

It is important to state clearly, at this point, the true relation of the Lord's earthly life to the lives of men.

The divine Son of God became man for the redemption of man. The inexorable justice demanded a substitute, who should bear the nature to be redeemed. And the substitute must needs be holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. It must needs be a Lamb without spot or blemish, who should take away the sins of the world. And he must needs be very man, endowed with all the normal attributes of the race. His human life was like all other human lives, in that it was sustained by food and drink, and was destructible like any other human life, by assaults upon vital organs. His fast of forty days was a real fast. His slumber upon the stormy lake was real slumber, following real fatigue and repairing the forces of his mortal frame by rest. The denial of any attribute of his true and proper manhood, is as fatal as the denial of his essential divinity.

The next point relates to the immaculate purity of this human life. It was sinless, every moment of it, from the manger to the sepulchre. So utterly free from taint, that every *thought* of the man Jesus was in exact accord with the moral law. There was never a transient instant in his conscious life wherein he failed to love God supremely, or failed in the gentle charity due to the members of the human family to which he also belongs. Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. And if there be any peculiarity about his relation to the second table of the Decalogue, it must consist in the obligation that demands brotherly love, which is a manifest enlargement of the obligation merely requiring *neighborly* love. This seems to be the drift of the argument in Hebrews ii. 10-18. "He taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold." He was holy, wise, and loving, in every pulsation and respiration. He did no

sin, neither was guile ever found in his mouth. The declarations of Scripture are clear upon this point, and the whole scheme of redemption is builded upon his spotless innocence. It is historically true and logically necessary.

Now such a life is the highest possible type of human life. Not only could no man excel the Lord in holiness, but no man can *conceive* of a superior holiness. His life exhausted the possibilities of human excellence. Therefore this life was necessarily, *ipso facto*, exemplary. Whatever Jesus did as a mere man, all men should do; and to utilise this natural life of the Lord, as exemplary, it is only necessary to do two things: first, to ascertain what acts of the Lord are recorded in Scripture, which is the only authentic record; and secondly, to show that such acts were non-official in their character. Because it is not permitted to men to use the words of the Lord in their ordinary conversation, or even upon extraordinary occasions. It can never be proper, or otherwise than profane, for a man to stand by a corpse and say, "Young man, arise!" This act of the Lord was not exemplary. It can never be other than profane for the holiest saint to give up the ghost saying, "It is finished!" There was nothing exemplary in the behavior of the Lord amid the awful scenes of Calvary. And beginning with the calling of his disciples, when he said, "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men," it is probable that no word or act of Jesus is recorded, that has not some relation to his official work. If any reader doubts this proposition, let him take any one of the four Gospels, and hunt for an example, and having found it, let him imagine the actor or speaker to be Peter, or James, or John, and see if it would seem decorous in such a case. Even in the instance where the Lord plainly asserts that he "set an example," to wit, in the act of washing the feet of the disciples, this act would lose all its significance if Peter had been the actor. In the midst of the transaction, the inevitable limitation is noted: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me!" Peter could not have used such words with any propriety. And the entire force of this act, which was surely official, in that it typified the cleansing grace of Christ, in so far as it was exemplary, is also noted; "If I, your

Master and Lord, have done this, how much more should ye, the servants and subjects," labor for each other's purification. It is true that a sect exists in this country, whose distinguishing characteristic is the literal performance of this ceremony, as a sort of sacrament added to the two that are enforced by the Lord's express command. But no such observance has ever been common in the Church, and could not be, in the nature of the case, if only because the sandals of apostolic times and countries have been superseded by other styles of dress. If the example, therefore, could have no literal application to all ages and all localities, as the Lord certainly knew, it is not possible that he intended to add the act itself as a rite for Christian observance. If it be said that he intended to give an example of condescending charity, the force of his concluding words above quoted, is lost, as the antithesis between "Master and Lord," and "servants and subjects," are plainly the points in his exhortation.

The only other Scripture in which the Lord's example is plainly referred to, is in 1 Peter ii. 21. In this case, the passage is in the midst of an exhortation to slaves to yield uncomplaining obedience to forward masters, and the attitude of the Lord towards his persecutors and enemies is quoted. And the limitation is here, also, immediately added, showing the Lord's behavior was official and vicarious, and therefore inimitable—"who his own self bare our sins," etc.

These two passages of Scripture are the only formidable texts that can be found to support St. Thomas a Kempis. The explanations offered thus far, will serve to show their necessary limitations. And in the progress of this discussion, these scriptures, and such others as seem to give color to the theory of the Lord's example, will be referred to. In Peter's Epistle, the word translated "example," signifies a "headpiece," as the copper plate line at the head of a copy-book, intended to show absolute perfection of calligraphy, to which the pupil rarely attains. In the Roman Catholic communion, they still preserve a travesty of the scene recounted in John xiii., where a dignitary of that communion washes the feet of twelve small boys, and kisses them also; thus going a little beyond the record. If these persons

obey the spirit of the commandment in John xiii. 15, the whole business is involved in confusion. The foot-washer does assert his apostleship, but the little boys are certainly not apostles also; and the foot-kissing not being commanded, is a human invention, and therefore renders the rite idolatrous. It is not quite so bad as the celebration of the mass, but it is in the same category. It seems far more satisfactory to explain the passage, and the act itself, by the key the Lord furnishes: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." And so the meaning would appear to be in some way typical of the washing of regeneration. And the force of the example, as if he should say, "After this manner do ye one to another;" that is, "As I have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet."

If the Popish ceremonial is thought objectionable and chargeable with "will-worship," which is idolatry; and if the only other *apostolic* communion does not observe the rite, we are driven to seek some explanation that will satisfy the mind. What was the specific example set by the Lord? If it be said it was an example of condescension, it is not so forcible as his wonderful self-abnegation throughout the years of his ministry, or his original and amazing condescension in becoming incarnate. Moreover, in the very performance of this mysterious act, he says, "I am your Lord and Master."

The conclusion of the argument upon this point and these passages may be thus stated: In the Gospel, the King and Prophet performs a ceremony, not a part of regal or prophetic duty, and announces his act as an example to servants and subjects. In the Epistle, the Shepherd and Bishop of souls enforces unanswering submission upon slaves; and the apostle quotes his silence—"As a lamb dumb before her shearers"—as an example for their imitation. And as the full application of these illustrious examples is impossible, in the nature of the case, some other meaning must needs attach to the words.

II. All the actions of men that have a moral quality are provided for in the moral law. No act can be imagined, as terminating upon God, or as terminating upon man, that is left undefined in the Decalogue. There are multitudes of actions that are

indifferent, or whose ultimate influence in the great chain of causation cannot be scrutinised by finite powers, and the exact relation of these to the law cannot be detected. Nor do they have any force in determining the moral status of the actor, inasmuch as the human conscience does not take cognizance of them. They may, therefore, be said to have no relations. But whenever the acts, the words, or the thoughts or intents of the heart of man, touch any relations subsisting betwixt God and man or betwixt man and man, the precise duty may be found expressed or implied in the Decalogue. Nothing less than this would be possible in a God-given law. And no law not given by God could have this scope and application. The gospel does not make void this law. On the contrary, the gospel enforces, explains, and corroborates the law as the unique rule of duty; imperative, certainly, while time endures, and, in its cardinal principle, the method of human existence throughout eternity.

It has already been stated, as emphatically as may be, that the human life of the Lord Jesus accorded with this law in every jot and tittle. But no Presbyterian can be found to assert that this law is any the less imperative upon humanity, as a rule of duty, on account of the Lord's obedience. If the Lord had never become incarnate, the obligation resting upon men, as the creatures of God, and as the members of the same race, would have been precisely the same. It is the obedience, viewed as the ground of a justifying righteousness, that is affected by the incarnation; and this important distinction cannot be too carefully noted. The law does not add a fragment of his perfect obedience to the fragments of man's imperfect obedience, and so make a perfect righteousness. But by one offering he annihilates the penalty of multitudinous offences. This very nearly exhausts his relation to the law, as affecting the race he redeems. The law abides as the rule of life, and is obligatory upon all men as the expression of the will of God, and as the normal condition of the race. "Love worketh no ill to one's neighbor, and therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." God has written upon dead matter something which men term the law of gravitation, imperative and uniform, and it is found pervading all space, so far as human inves-

tigation has penetrated. It is doubtless wise and beneficent in its operation, but it is an arbitrary law, having no moral quality, *per se*. But the law revealed for the government of intelligent creatures, is not only imperative, because revealed by God, but is also ethically perfect, and precisely adapted to the highest development of the race. Verily; if righteousness had been possible under any law, it would have been under this law.

There is therefore no duty conceivable that does not grow out of the *relations* which God has established, and with which the law deals. Man must love God, because God is his Creator and Father. Man must love his brother, because God hath made of one blood all nations to dwell upon the face of the earth. Consequently, the vagaries of modern ethnological philosophers, who essay to prove a diversity of races, are not only foolish, but also profane. The essential unity of the race is as necessary, morally, as it is demonstrable by scientific proof. In the specifications of the Decalogue, all human relations are recognised, all relative duties are enforced, and all relative rights are conserved. And upon this secure foundation all the exhortations of Scripture, especially in the New Testament, are based. In the Old Testament, the volume of exhortation relates rather to the first table of the law. But in the Epistles, the duties belonging to rulers and subjects, masters and slaves, parents and children, and husbands and wives, are specially considered and all other duties possible or thinkable, provided for in the frequent exhortations to "brotherly love."

Keeping in view the cardinal fact that duties are not predicable where no *relation* subsists, the argument upon this head may be briefly stated. The example of the Lord cannot possibly apply to many of these relations. He was not a husband or father. That which a man is bound to do as husband or father, the Lord never did, and therefore set no example for human imitation. It is true that he is called the Husband of the Bride, his Church; and also the Everlasting Father; and it is also true that these earthly relations are the shadow of those eternal relations indicated by the titles given. But in the exercise of the high prerogatives of

Husband and Father, Christ performed no deeds that man may imitate.

Again : Christ was neither a master nor a slave. He did not own a slave, so far as the record goes, and he was certainly not himself in bondage. And yet, in the two cases already quoted, where his "example" is plainly inculcated apparently, namely, in the 13th chapter of John's Gospel, and in the 2d chapter of 1st Peter, these identical relations are introduced. But the candid reader will admit that the exhortation in either case cannot come under the category of examples, as the word is commonly used. "Because I, your Master and Lord, have done this, ye, the peers one of another in your common subjection, should also do it." It is far above an example. And so in the other scripture. The Prince of the house of David, who was never in subjection to mortal man, endured reproach, reviling, dishonor, and death, without retaliation, but was prevented by the august majesty of his person and character from becoming a perfect example to bond slaves, in yielding uncomplaining obedience to their own masters, even when unjust and froward. The other relation above suggested—that subsisting betwixt ruler and subject—is akin to that just discussed, and is disposed of by similar reasoning. He was the rightful King of Israel ; but no royal act of his is recorded that earthly monarchs may copy. He inculcated the duty of obedience to Cæsar, and died under the infliction of a Roman penalty, but herein set no example for citizens of monarchies or republics, who owe allegiance to authority. He was far greater than Solomon, and consequently was greater than Pontius Pilate, or Herod, or Cæsar. Therefore, none of his *acts*, done under the domination of these potentates, furnish an example for men. He made himself of no reputation, and took upon himself the form of a servant, for human redemption ; but men cannot imitate him in this, if only because he was really a King in disguise all the time, and the royal crown and vestments were hidden under his humble garb. There will also come a time when he shall show the universe the splendor of his regal state, but herein he can teach no lesson to earthly rulers, if only because they can never become the Kings of kings.

Still confining attention to the second table, let it be noted that the Lord Jesus could not set an example to men, even in the broad duties that are indicated in the general law of neighborhood. This High Priest can be touched with the feeling of human infirmities, and was tempted in all points like other men, yet without sin. But having no sin, he could feel no remorse. Having no sin, he could not repent. Doing no wrong or violence to any, he could not make restitution. So, in all these exercises of mind and heart, he could set no example for human imitation. Repentance and restitution are not only among the indispensable exercises of the regenerated saint, but they are universal to the family of man. There is none that sinneth not; and the gracious work of repentance is as continuous and universal among the children of God as their respirations. And notice that repentance is a grace that is coupled with faith, salutary, beneficent, and tending to life. And so with the confession of sin and ill-desert; of unprofitableness as well as guilt: all of these common exercises were totally unknown to the immaculate Lord. His example failing humanity here, it is fair to conclude that similar limitations would hinder its operation in all the relations of life.

To go back a step: Suppose man had never sinned, or that the effect of Adam's sin had not reached his posterity—then the formulated law that was codified on Sinai, and which, in its last analysis, is reduced to the exercise of love, would have still been the exact rule of human life. A holy race of men, without the remotest taint of sin, could attain to no holiness above the requirement of this law. And so the incarnate God, in such a case, could set no example before men, in the performance of human duties; because all men, unfallen, as will be the case with all men who are restored by sovereign grace, find the obedience to the divine rule as natural as their pulsations. Repentance shall be no more remembered, when its tears are wiped away from all faces by the loving hand. Faith shall be lost in the vision of its object; but, as Paul argues in 1 Cor. xiii., this glorious love—the life-principle of the soul, the medium in which its eternal energies shall be developed and manifested, love—shall abide forever. It is the kernel, the active principle, the entirety

of the law. Now, in the exact track of this blessed law of love, all the exercises of the new man in Christ must fall. It is faith that works by love that purifies the heart; and, in the last analysis, this act of the soul terminates upon Christ, his person and his work. If it is said, faith is the credence given to God's testimony, it is still God's testimony concerning his Son. And this act or attitude or emotion of the soul is not predicable of Christ, the ultimate object of faith. Therefore, he could present no example of the exercise of this grace in men, and could not be a model for their imitation. He could not exercise saving faith in himself, and no other kind of faith is of any value to humanity. Dr. Crosby teaches that Jesus overcame Satan in the wilderness by the exercise of faith. It is one of the most monstrous of his postulates. Dr. Hanna, more cautious, suggests that he overcame by "the word of God, the sword of the Spirit," implying that Jesus triumphed by his quotations: "it is written." It is safer to give Dr. Hanna's exact words: "But if it be to the very same temptations as those which beset our divine Lord and Master that we are still exposed, let us be grateful to him for teaching us how to overcome them. He used throughout a single weapon. He had the whole armory of heaven at his command; but he chose only one instrument of defence, the word, the written word, that sword of the Spirit. It was it that he so successfully employed. Why this exclusive use of an old weapon? He did not need to have recourse to it. A word of his own spoken, would have had as much power as a written one quoted; *but then the lesson of his example had been lost to us.*"—Vol. I., p. 204, 205.

It fits precisely in the line of this argument to show into how many serious errors so godly a man as Dr. Hanna falls, when mounted upon the example hobby.

First. We are not exposed to the same temptations. The devil never tempts us to turn stones into bread; to cast ourselves down from some pinnacle of a temple; or to fall down and worship him.

Second. The Lord did not repel the devil by quotations. He was met by counter quotations, just as the enemies of divine

truth to-day quote one passage of Scripture against another. The text from the 91st Psalm—"He shall give his angels charge concerning thee"—was as true as any that the Lord presented. The adversary was defeated by the majestic command, "Get thee behind me, Satan;" or as the old Latin reads: "*Vade retro, Sathana!*" a command, urgent, imperious, and irresistible.

Third. The sword is, or at least was, not a weapon of defence. Sword-play is comparatively a modern invention. Of old, warriors relied upon the shield and breast-plate for defence, and the sword for assault. Moreover, the sword of the Spirit, "the written word," was not known to many a saint who lived before Moses—such as Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the devil doubtless assaulted each one of them.

Fourth. The "panoply" to which Dr. Hanna refers, is that mentioned in Ephesians; and there, the "shield of faith" is the *very* weapon the apostle commands in conflicts with the adversary, as being specially fitted to quench all his fiery darts. But, in point of fact, the Lord did not use either the Scripture word or the shield of faith in that mysterious encounter. The conclusion seems irresistible, that Dr. Hanna is inaccurate, illogical, and unscriptural in this unfortunate exegesis. Intent upon finding an "example," he falls into four several absurdities, thus furnishing himself both an example and a warning to other theologues who have fallen into the same unhappy drift.

Schenkel makes Christ a Redeemer, because he released mankind from the errors of Judaism and heathenism.

Strauss makes the miracles and the resurrection of Christ mere myths, and potentially reduces the identity of Jesus to the level of the identity of Apollo.

Renan makes Christ part hero and part impostor, yielding to the clamor of his disciples to perform pretended miracles, and allowing his virtuous impulses to be overruled by love of country and countrymen.

Crosby makes Christ a man, unconscious of divinity, mistaking Satan for a holy man, and limited to the ordinary supports of divine grace; no better furnished than prophets and apostles, to

whom supernatural interference, *ab extra*, was the exception, and not the rule. (P. 83.)

Hanna makes Christ so frail, that he dared not "trust his pure eye to repose upon the magnificent panorama of earth's kingdoms, as if this temptation were one which even he could not afford to dally with." (Vol. I., page 199.)

Farrar, less heretical and more cautious, does not put forth any startling hypothesis. He only *hints* that the Lord knew the secret history of the Emperor Tiberius, who came nearest to supreme lordship of the world. And as this miserable monarch found all his possessions but dust and dross, the Saviour would not yield to the temptation to sin for the sake of such unsatisfying gains. It was he who taught, "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" (P. 63, 64.) It is but just to say, however, that Dr. Farrar's biography is the least objectionable of the six here enumerated. In the main, he teaches the truth, and does not even make his episcopacy very prominent. His only fatal error is the attempt to improve upon Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. There is only one other "Life of Christ," uninspired, that is likely to become famous. It is only half-written, and has so positive a commercial value, that the publisher holds an insurance policy upon the life of its author, lest he should happen to die before the second volume is prepared.

The three Christian biographers have manufactured their addenda to the Gospels for the sake of utilising the example of Christ. The three unbelieving writers reverse this order, and account for all the historical events in the Lord's life, by comparison with the ordinary lives of men. Paul seems to have selected a different theme in preaching, not example theories, but Christ crucified, the power of God and the wisdom of God.

III. Up to this point, the argument has been based upon commonly received Christian doctrine, upon fair, logical inferences from revealed truths, and upon the prime fact that God has not caused an inspired history of the Lord's non-official life to be written. It will be admitted that his official acts could not be properly imitated by men. But nothing herein asserted must be construed into a denial of the necessary exemplary character of

the life of Jesus Christ. As it was the very perfection of holiness, in all the relations he sustained to God and to men, no higher standard of human excellence can be imagined. Nor is this all that must be said in apparent support of the example theory. The two passages of Holy Writ—John xiii. 15, 1st Peter ii. 21—cannot be disposed of without some satisfactory explanation. In the first of these, the word *ὑπόδειγμα* has undoubtedly the sense of example, and is so used by Clement of Rome, who applies the title to Paul, as the grand “example” of endurance. The best lexicons give the meaning of the noun, primarily, as “sign, token, mark,” and secondarily, as “pattern.” The verb, *ὑποδείκνυμι*, is rendered, “to show underhand or secretly; to give a sight or glimpse; to indicate one’s will; give to understand;” and secondarily “to show by tracing out; to mark out; and hence to teach by example.” The word employed in 1 Peter ii. 21 is different. It is *ὑπογραμμός*, *ὑπο* and *γράφω*, and is rendered “to write under, subscribe, sign;” secondarily, “to write under another’s dictation;” and thirdly, “to write to be copied.” The significance of the noun, therefore, is, “writing-copy, pattern, model,” “copy-heads for children, containing all the letters of the alphabet.”

It would be idle, as well as uncandid, to deny the significance of these and cognate expressions in the New Testament. And it would be specially uncandid to deny that such expressions form a fair basis upon which the theory of Christ’s exemplary life is erected. It is no part of the present purpose to slight or override even the faintest suggestion of Scripture. But it is the whole of this purpose to indicate the necessary modifications and limitations that must be observed in applying these terms to the Lord, to his person or his work. And just as his relation to the Father, as the eternal and only begotten Son, differs from the relation of the saint to the same Father, so all the acts of his human life differ from those of the saints whom he is not ashamed to call his brethren. There is a necessary *resemblance* without a possible *similarity*. The life itself, in his case, was derived directly from the Father; for although he was the seed of the woman, and made of her substance, he was not begotten of man; he was

not the son of Adam, by ordinary generation, and he inherited none of the guilt or pollution or bondage of sin. Therefore, his character and conduct so far differed from those of ordinary men, that the acts which would serve as examples, if he had been mere man, are transformed into illustrations when performed by the God-man. They are "signs and tokens," but not "examples," in the common acceptance of the word. They may not be imitated. When he says, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart," he exhorts them, not to imitate his meekness, but to be *instructed* by him. The yoke he offers is not the yoke he wears, but the yoke of discipleship. He says, "his yoke is easy and his burden light," which could not be said of the awful load of human guilt that was laid upon him. And he refers to the meekness and lowliness of his character as the illustration of the graces; and the more illustrious because of his exalted station as the infinite Son of God. Moses, also, was noted for meekness; and in view of his status as the son of Pharaoh's daughter, the special messenger of God, and the great lawgiver, his meekness was remarkable; but as Christ the Son is far above Moses the servant, so the exhibition of meekness in the character of the Saviour is, by the same measure, more emphatic and illustrious.

The above suggestion applies still more forcibly to the scene recorded in John xiii.; not merely on account of the contrasts he himself announces—"Ye call me Master and Lord"—but remarkably at the introduction of the narrative at the 3d verse: "Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God," washed his disciples' feet. If humility and charity were the lessons inculcated, and if this *ὑπόδειγμα* was for *imitation*, why should John so carefully note the supreme authority and essential divinity of Christ at the outset? And if the act be regarded rather as a "sign" and illustration of these virtues, how plain the lesson, how matchless, *inimitable*, the condescension!

So, also, in fulfilment of the old prophecy—as a lamb dumb before her shearers, he opened not his mouth—and Peter calls the attention of earthly servants to this illustration, this "head-

writing," as showing the highest pitch of patient endurance under suffering. But while it was by "wicked hands" this Lamb without blemish was reviled, persecuted, crucified, and slain, it must not be forgotten that the "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" had fixed the exact proportion and limitation of insult, reproach, and suffering. And the dregs of that cup must needs be drunk, to accomplish the deliverance of an elect seed. No drop added; no drop spared. The servant exhorted to yield obedience to his forward master, could not compare himself with Christ, who endured the penalty exacted by a *just* God from the sinner's substitute. And therefore Peter adds immediately, "who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." Although he could have commanded the attendance of more than twelve legions of angels, when reviled, he threatened not. No mere man, suffering under monstrous wrongs, even unto death, could fail to avail himself of methods of deliverance without sin. It is not allowable for man to endure crucifixion, if he can escape by invoking the aid of God, or angels, or men. But it was not allowable for Christ to escape. It was not possible for that cup to pass from *him*.

Finally, upon this point, notice one other suggestion. The life of the saint he lives by the faith of the Son of God, who is exalted a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins. Israel repents, has his sins forgiven, and lives by faith. In all of these exercises he can find no example in the Lord's life. But the saint shows his faith chiefly in prayer. He supplicates an invisible God by faith. He pleads the merits and intercession of an invisible Saviour, and seeks the guidance and sanctifying grace of an invisible Spirit. In times of doubt and distress, prayer is frequently the solitary refuge of the child of God. So, if there could be any exercise in which Christ would instruct his people by example, surely this were one.

Well, he has left upon record several prayers. "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am!" Does it seem decorous for men to use these words in their supplications? May the dying pastor, surrounded by his faithful flock, his spiritual children, offer this petition? At another time

he prays: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!" May the saint, in the midst of dire anguish, use these awful sentences? At still another time he prays: "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do!" And the divine grace and mercy, illustrious in the hour and article of death, prove this majestic utterance to be the very voice of God! The first martyr, seeing Jesus, and transformed by the vision into the same image, comes as near as may be to an imitation of his Lord, when he prays, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." But there seems to be manifest a vast difference in attitude and intonation.

But the Lord Jesus taught his disciples to pray. There is a prayer on record, called "The Lord's Prayer," that is ascending into the ears of the Lord God of Sabaoth, from infant tongues, from the earnest heart of the matured man in the full vigor of his strength, and from the tremulous lips of age; from all quarters of the earth; from crowded cities; from quiet rural homes; from crowded assemblies of worshippers; from the solitary suppliant in the secret chamber; from rich and poor; from the learned and the ignorant; wherever the name of God and the story of Redemption is known, this one prayer—so simple, so wise, so comprehensive—goes up like one uniform pulsation from the great heart of humanity. No want of man, for his soul or his body, can be imagined, that is not included or implied in this wonderful composition. Who but Jesus could have compressed the totality of human experience in these few petitions?

The argument terminates here. Jesus could not offer that prayer. He could not pray, "Forgive my trespasses; lead me not into temptation." And when the prayer was announced, he said, "After this manner pray *ye*."

It only remains to say a word or two touching the ground of this discussion.

The Church, in some of its branches, is drifting into Deism. In how many so-called Christian pulpits is the belief in a Divine Revelation totally banished as a topic for consideration? In how many more is the idea of plenary, verbal inspiration, openly scouted? In how many more is the true and proper divinity of Jesus Christ buried under unmeaning allusions to his divineness?

And in this drift towards blank Arianism are found multitudes of teachers, who discover no use for the history of Christ, except so far as his example teaches patience, forbearance, meekness, rectitude, or goodness. Christ in the wilderness, fulfilling the terms of the covenant, and making a righteousness for imputation, is only Christ teaching by example how to quote Scripture, like the anchorites of olden time, mumbling texts to exorcise or repel the devil. Christ upon Tabor, in effulgent glory—clad in robes white and glistening, showing to a few favored disciples a glimpse of the ineffable glories of his coming kingdom—is only Christ teaching by example the natural results of purity of life and morals. And Christ expiring under the curse of a broken law, expiating the sins of an apostate race, exhausting a penalty due to all that race throughout all eternity, is only Christ shewing by example how a hero and a martyr can die!

The beginning of this horrible teaching may be found, perhaps, in the low estimate of the divine Lord, that makes men so prompt to see Jesus the man, and so shy of Christ the Lord. Anything he said or did, that may be explicable upon the ground of his mere humanity, is seized and utilised as an example. May it not be more accurate, and perhaps less profane, to say that his earthly life—pure, spotless, holy in his glorious manhood—furnished numberless *illustrations* of human virtue, to be reverently studied, but no example for mortal imitation? In so far as human motive can be certainly known, it may be said that no motive save jealousy for the honor and glory of the Lord Christ has prompted this argument, which is humbly laid at his feet.

ARTICLE V.

ORDINATION, WITH THE LAYING ON OF THE
HANDS OF THE PRESBYTERY.

The apostle Paul exhorts Timothy not to neglect a certain *χάρισμα* or *gift* which came to him by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. Now Timothy was an evangelist, which office is always an extraordinary one, but in his case was very especially extraordinary, seeing that prophecy had pointed him out as chosen and called of God. And yet, all extraordinary as was the call and the whole case of Timothy, we find, nevertheless, that he is ordained by the Presbytery with the imposition of their hands! The question which we have to propose, then, is, What is this thing of ordination with the imposition of hands?

I. The Congregationalists make very little of it. The main point, according to their system—perhaps we should rather say the *only* point—being election by the people. It is quite natural they should disparage ordination as the act of officers, since they place the government of the Church so entirely in the hands of the people. It would, of course, not consist with Congregationalism to make much of the officers, or of any action in which they are prominent.

But Rome runs to the other extreme, making too much of ordination. So far from its being with them an affair of the people, it is not even an affair of the officers of the Church, but is an act always of *one man* alone—the bishop. Rome also makes it a sacrament. And she holds that it imprints always an indelible mark on the man who receives it, of which he never can get rid. The Romish theory likewise teaches that the Holy Spirit is conferred necessarily and always in ordination, quite irrespective of the moral character of the man, and that this gift of the Holy Ghost makes the ordained to be a priest, and invests him with supernatural grace. He offers a true sacrifice to God, and makes a real atonement for the sins of men, every time that he performs

the mass. And this character once impressed, never can be taken from the man—once a priest, always a priest.

Prelatists also hold ordination to be a ministerial—that is, a *clerical*—act purely, and also the work of one man—the bishop. They also allow the bishop to say to the ordained, Receive thou the Holy Ghost. They also call their ministers priests, and likewise *clergy*. We would not charge on all of them the Romish ideas of ordination, but certainly they all do use Romish expressions on this subject.

But even many who are called Presbyterian also seem to look on ordination as a *quasi* sacrament, and to hold, in some sense, that it impresses an indelible character. “Once a minister,” say these so-called Presbyterians, “always a minister;” there shall never be allowed any demission of the office; there shall be no way of one’s getting out of the ministry, except by death or deposition. Such Presbyterians resemble Rome and the Prelatists, in making ordination a *ministerial* act. Squinting at apostolic succession, “no man (say they) can give an office which he does not hold himself;” and so they object to ruling elders laying on hands in the ordination of the minister. No man, forsooth, can give an office which he does not hold himself, as though it takes a President of the United States, and not merely the Chief Justice, to inaugurate the President; as though the dead king must inaugurate his successor; as though coronation is not always by the Pope or the archbishop; as though Moses, who inducted Aaron into office, had necessarily himself been high priest before!

In the safe middle between these extremes, (where truth is always found,) stands the true Presbyterian doctrine of ordination. We follow Scripture, and make ordination not the act of the people directly, but only through their representatives; and yet, on the other hand, not the act of ministers, as such, much less of one minister, officially exalted, contrary to the Scriptures, above his brethren, but the act of the Presbytery. “With the laying on of the hands of *the Presbytery*,” says the apostle to Timothy. The Scripture teaches us to unite together the people’s election, and the setting apart by representatives of the people. Both these elements enter essentially into a scriptural ordination.

What is a Presbytery? It is an eldership; that is, a body of elders or of presbyters. Well, what is an elder or presbyter? He is a ruler or a bishop, that is an *overseer*, (*ἐπίσκοπος*, *episcopus*, *biscop*,) of the flock. The presbyter or bishop is not necessarily a preacher. Preaching is one thing, and ruling the church is another thing; although the two works or offices do possess certain very close relations; for the preacher necessarily rules, on a grand scale, in the very act of preaching the all-controlling Word, while the ruler or bishop of the Church necessarily teaches, whenever, in his ruling, he applies the same enlightening truth of God. But presbyters are not always preachers, and the business of presbyters, *as such*, and of *the Presbytery*, is ruling, and not preaching. So, then, ordination being of the Presbytery, *as such*, it is not of the ministry, but of the ruling elders—it is not a ministerial act, but an act of government. It admits a man publicly and officially into church office, which of course is an act of the rulers of the church. In a free commonwealth, such as the Church is, it would never do for a *caste* like that of the preachers, to have the power of appointing or ordaining all the church officers. Such a power can be safely or properly lodged only with the representatives of the people, viz., the presbyters of two classes in a lawful Presbytery assembled.

Ordination being, then, of the Presbytery, it cannot be in any sense a sacrament; for the sacraments are not committed to the rulers or representatives of the people, *qua* rulers or representatives, but are to be administered only by ministers of the Word. It communicates no supernatural grace, coming down in regular transmission through clerical hands from the very apostles. There is nothing mysterious in ordination. It is not a *charm*; although on the other hand it is not a *mere form*. It has a significance and it has a history. We get it from the apostles, and they took it from the Old Testament Church. It means dedication, consecration, setting apart, acknowledgment, recognition, inauguration. Done by the Lord's appointment and authority, through and by his Church, it is done by himself. It devotes a man to a certain service for life. It lays him on the altar, as belonging to Christ and the Church in this particular work. Of course, it signifies

also acceptance of him by the Lord and his Church as thus consecrated, and accordingly it vouchsafes to him support and help and comfort and grace and success. Surely, surely, the admission of any man to church office by the Lord's authority who established the office and appointed the mode of induction into it, surely this can be no empty form, but there are involved on the one side very solemn duties, and on the other side very gracious aids and supports.

In the case of an ordination to the gospel ministry, the solemnity of the duty involved becomes absolutely terrific. What a tremendous burden that is which the ordained man consents to have bound upon his shoulders—the care of souls! He becomes willingly responsible, in a certain just and proper and fearful sense responsible, for the salvation or perdition of immortal spirits of men. He agrees to take the charge of so many souls, and to answer to Christ for them at the last day. Oh, awful ministry! How can any poor sinner assume an office awakening so much dread? Is it any wonder that good men of old, called by the Church to this so alarming work, would run away, would endeavor to hide, and so escape, crying out, when discovered and brought forth from their concealment, “*Nolo episcopari, Nolo episcopari*”—*I don't wish to be made a bishop, I cannot assume the care of souls!* Is it any wonder we should maintain that no man must ever *volunteer* absolutely to enter this service, but every true minister be called directly of the Holy Ghost, the call being primarily a call from God himself, and the Church only attesting and seconding that call? Is it any wonder that every true-hearted, humble-minded, modest, generous, noble, unselfish, God-fearing, Church-loving man, whenever called to this awful ministry he finds himself standing upon the terrific threshold of this divine office, is, and needs must be, full of fears as he looks forward to the task then being committed to him, and will find himself casting wishful glances around him, to discover if he may not yet escape the dread obligations that are impending? Show us a man that is absolutely without all such fears, and we will show you one whom the Spirit never moved to aspire to this office. On the contrary, show us the man who trembles under the terrors

of the great commission, and though impelled by secret motivations within, yet feels his utter incompetency and unworthiness to undertake the work, and we will show you one that wears, patent to every eye but his own; the seal and certificate of the Holy Ghost that God both calls and anoints him to preach the gospel. We hazard the assertion, that this will be found (allowing something necessarily for differences of mental and moral constitution,) an invariable and a safe rule of judgment, both for the man and for his counsellors. Would to God that there was apparent in many of our candidates more of the shrinkings of a modest, humble, reverential spirit, and that our Presbyteries would more diligently inquire for these marks and signs of a veritable call to the ministry!

II. But let us go into a more particular examination of the Scripture authority for ordinations by the Church. We shall find it in Mark ii. 13, 14, where we read how our Lord first calls and then ordains the twelve apostles; in Acts xiii. 3, where evangelists or missionaries to the heathen outsiders are ordained with imposition of hands by the Presbytery of Antioch; and also in 1 Tim. iv. 14, where Timothy is in like manner ordained a missionary or evangelist, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery; in Acts xiv. 23, where Paul and Barnabas ordain elders in every church, who must, of course, have been ruling elders rather than preachers, for a plurality of rulers was needful, but only a single preacher to each little church; and also in Titus i. 5, where Paul tells the evangelist (who had the needful extraordinary power,) to establish an eldership or presbytery in every city; and finally, in Acts vi. 6, where the apostles ordained, with the laying on of their hands, seven deacons to minister to the Gentile believers.

That the gospel ministry is an office divinely instituted, into which suitable men are to be inducted by the Church from age to age, appears also from the official titles which set it forth in the word. These titles indicate that the office is permanent. They are called in Scripture pastors or shepherds, rulers, bishops or overseers, stewards, angels or messengers, heralds, and ambassadors. The works and duties signified by these titles are as need-

ful now, and will be to the end, as needful for the Church's edification and enlargement, as they were at the beginning. Moreover, every one of these titles is significant of such office as no man may ever assume to himself. The shepherd must needs be appointed by the Lord of the flock; the ruler in the Church by its Head; the steward of the mysteries of God by him who reveals those mysteries; the herald or ambassador by the King himself. But ordinarily, the King and Head of the Church acts through and by her as his agent on the earth. And so now as of old, and down to the very end, men are to be set apart by the Church with divine authority to the gospel ministry. This is what ordination means: the men whom our Lord calls to preach, must be set apart with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. And it is Christ himself who calls on his people to reverence and highly esteem and submit to and obey in the Lord such as are thus consecrated and set apart; Christ himself it is who requires his people to communicate to such all good things required by them, because so hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel shall live of the gospel.

Still further, the ordinance of the gospel ministry may be maintained to be a permanent, divine institute, from—

1. The apostolic commission, where the Lord says to the first ministers of the Word, "Go ye into all the world, and preach;" and "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end."

2. The Lord's giving pastors and teachers to edify his body till we all come to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

3. His declaration that the gospel of the kingdom is to be preached to all nations, down to the end.

4. From the preaching of the gospel being God's wisdom and power, God's ways and means of saving men.

5. And from Paul's charge to Timothy, that what he had himself learned from him, the same he must commit to faithful men, who should be able to teach others also.

III. This will suffice to set forth the authority for ordination with the imposition of hands of the Presbytery. And now the question arises, Is ordination always the same thing, or are there

different kinds of ordination, as when a session or a presbytery perform it, or as when a deacon or an elder or a preacher is ordained? The question is not difficult, and the answer is plain and easy. The diaconate differs from the presbyterate, and the work of the two kinds of elders differs, and the ordaining bodies are also different. Yet ordination in all these cases is the same thing. It is to be always the act of a court of Jesus Christ; always by imposition of hands; and always to some definite church office and work.

This plainly appears from what has been already set forth. Ordination is not a sacrament, and does not belong to ministers as such. It would be totally subversive of the representative system of church government revealed in the Scriptures, if a separate class of men like ministers, standing necessarily by themselves in sundry important particulars, and constantly liable, as all church history shows, to grow to be lords of Christ's heritage, should have committed to them as such, the appointment or the induction into office of any church officers. Ordination must needs be by presbyters, and not preachers—ordained preachers being, however, always themselves presbyters. Nor may one presbyter ever ordain any man. That would be Prelacy, which carries us at once half way to Rome. According to the New Testament system, no one man can ever do any act of church rule.

Ordination, therefore, is always by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. It follows that our Book is defective in Chap. XIII., Sec. IV., where it says, "The minister shall proceed to set apart the candidate by prayer to the office of ruling elder or deacon, as the case may be." How can a minister alone ordain anybody? How could one presbyter do it? It requires the representatives of the people, assembled in a lawful church court. Paul and Barnabas ordained not one elder, but *elders*, in every church; a plurality of elders are necessary for every act of church rule, for the Church is a free commonwealth, governed by her representatives. Outside the regular church state, a single evangelist, being an extraordinary officer, has all the powers of a Presbytery in full; the system possesses all needful elas-

ticity. But where duly organised, the Church is to be governed by her "congregational, presbyterial, synodical assemblies." The whole college of the apostles ordained the seven deacons, and shall one ordinary minister now assume to set men apart to such an office? Yes, and they ordained those deacons with the imposition of their hands; and is it now to be held too much for the hands of one ordinary minister to be laid upon them? But if deacons must needs be ordained with the imposition of hands now as in apostolic times, *a fortiori* elders are entitled to the same measure of respect. But our Form of Government inconsistently prescribes that the minister alone shall ordain these officers, and that by prayer only, without the imposition of hands. *Inconsistently*, we say, for this does not consist with the most fundamental principles of our system; it is prelatic. Nor does it consist with the clear provisions of the Book in Chap. XV., Sec. XIV., on the ordination of the minister, where it is distinctly prescribed that the ruling elders shall act their proper part as presbyters. If they can lay on hands in Presbytery assembled, and that upon the head of the highest church officer, why can they not, in session assembled, still act as presbyters, and lay hands on deacons and elders? Are not all our courts, in their own nature, exactly the same thing, viz., bodies of presbyters? The difference which our Constitution (not the Scripture,) makes between Session, Presbytery, Synod, and General Assembly, dividing out to each one its proper share of the government of the Church, is not that difference one of the mere *circumstances* left to human discretion? It involves no principle of the revealed system; it constitutes no substantive part of the government. The courts, in their own nature, are all precisely the same thing, each being naturally as competent as the other for every work. But we put the ordination of the minister for the sake of convenience and propriety, into the hands of the *classical* Presbytery, while that of elders and deacons is committed to the *parochial* Presbytery, that is, the Session. But never could our system, fairly apprehended and applied, commit the ordination of either church officer to the minister. Who but the members of the court of which the candidate for the elder-

ship is to become a member, should have the induction of him into office? And if they are competent to induct an elder into his office, why are they not also competent to induct the deacon? What is the minister in any session except simply that member of the body who presides? Surely he does not wield all the powers of the body, and surely they ought not to be put under his feet.

There is but one view, so far as we can see, which might justify the language of our Book. Make the minister the mere agent of the session in their ordination of their new colleague, and the language of the Book may be defended as Presbyterian; just as in the case of the minister it would be a perfectly regular ordination with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, to have five, or three, or even one man appointed by the body, if necessity or convenience demanded this, to lay on hands upon that present occasion in its behalf. But who ever heard of a session ordering the minister to proceed with the laying on of hands on its behalf?

To that eminent Presbyterian authority, Dr. Samuel Miller, of Princeton Seminary, it was a matter of astonishment that our Book should be so inconsistent here; and in his work on the Ruling Elder he laments this inconsistency, as not admitting any defence. But he says the explanation is, that at first they conceived of the ruling elder as a temporary officer, and accordingly regarded it as incongruous to ordain these and the more permanent teaching elders with the same rite. We hope we may be pardoned for our apparent presumption in saying that we conceive we can suggest a better explanation than this of our revered teacher.

But is not this just what, from the nature of the case must always be expected to happen? In questions of church government, as in many other departments, how can it be possible that the first inquirers shall draw always the safest conclusions? Continually we find men arguing that such and such a view must needs be the right one, because the Church of Scotland, for example, held that view. But in matters of revelation like this, have we not a divine standard of appeal? And is it not quite

possible for a subsequent age to develop out of the Scripture principles a better understanding of what is revealed, than men at some earlier period enjoyed? Nay, is it not absolutely certain, that such a better understanding has often been attained as the ages have rolled on? Accordingly, it by no means follows, that a given view is sustained by the Revelation, because that great teacher, John Calvin, for example, held the same, although his judgment is always so much to be respected. So, too, it by no means follows that the men who made the First Book of Discipline of the Scottish Kirk knew better what the Scriptures teach about church discipline, than the men who drew up the Second Book, twenty years later. And it cannot be asserted with any safety, that that Second Book, because older, contains, therefore, a better Presbyterianism than what our fathers produced in 1787; nor yet that the statements of those fathers, as to the ordination of elders and deacons, are a juster exhibition of the principles of our divinely revealed system than Dr. Miller's, who came so long after them; nor yet that the venerable Princeton Professor had necessarily a better apprehension of all such matters than any one now living can pretend to; nor that we, who are the true *ancients* in this case, shall not one day have successors after us, able to improve on our views. From age to age, does not God's word stand the one arbiter of all questions relating to the Church? No revision do we want of the Confession of Faith, (which some in the Northern Church have lately proposed,) because the men *are not*, as we believe, who can improve upon its statements, except, possibly, on one or two secondary points. But confessedly our Form of Government is in many things grievously defective. Manifestly, for example, as to the evangelist and as to the deacon, the Church has outgrown that Form. But the Church has not outgrown, and never can outgrow, the perfect word of God. We have outgrown the Scotch Kirk, whether of the one or of the other of her two Books of Discipline. We have outgrown the Book our fathers made in 1787. We have outgrown Dr. Miller, and can, on some points, correct and improve on the conceptions he formed. The simple reason is, that we have in our hands the divine word, and with the help of

all these our revered and trusted predecessors, who stood fast in their day against Romish, Prelatic, and Independent errors, we can go to the Word for ourselves, and thence derive light which our wisest fathers did not see. "Thy testimonies are wonderful;" "thy commandment is exceeding broad."

The suggestion offered by the venerable Princeton Doctor, as to the way our Book came to be so inconsistent touching the ordination of elders and deacons, is in the right direction, as we believe, but it does not go far enough. We venture to add to it some statements. In 1560, when Knox and others drew up the First Book of Discipline, their notion was that imposition of hands was a mere relic of Papacy, and therefore they would none of it. But by 1580 they had learned better; and so Melville and others provided expressly in the Second Book for the imposition of hands in every ordination, as being scriptural, and therefore proper. In this case, however, it proved, as it always must, a much easier thing to correct an erroneous doctrine than to reform an erroneous practice. Gradually they got to ordaining ministers with the laying on of hands; but as to the elders and deacons, they could not get the practice right. Nor have we ourselves yet got it right every where throughout our Church. The trouble is, that our American fathers just followed the Scotch grandfathers in their unscriptural practice, and in many parts of the Presbyterian Church in this new world, we are just following our fathers in the same; although we can hardly fail to see that wherever this is done, a little Presbyterian prelate rises up and exhibits himself in the Moderator of the Session, who makes deacons and elders in a way he considers better than what the apostles practised.

As illustrating the difficulty of reforming the wrong practice that was begun in 1560, Calderwood, who lived during the period that followed the Second Book of Discipline, (1575-1650,) says in his *Altare Damascenum*, (p. 689,) that so late as his time, many even of the ministers were ordained without the imposition of hands! He also declares that elders have precisely the same right to it as ministers.

There is a further suggestion which may help to explain the

manifest inconsistency Dr. Miller points out. When, in 1787, our fathers undertook the revision of the very imperfect Westminster standard of church government, they could find there no provision for the ordination of ruling elders. In fact, the Second Book of Discipline, which is so far superior as a Presbyterian symbol, does not contain any. This defect, therefore, our fathers must needs remedy, and so they proceed to prepare, *de novo*, a chapter on the ordination of such officers. In making it, they clearly perceived the necessity there was for providing some way in which this office might, in certain cases, be demitted without censure. But this was a step they could not conceive of, (as many amongst us now cannot conceive of it,) in reference to the minister; for, "once a minister, always a minister." Accordingly, therefore, they make a broad distinction between the two ordinations, by prescribing that the one shall be with the laying on of the hands of a Presbytery, and the other shall not!

IV. And now we proceed to the next point, and consider the paradox, that whilst ordination is always the same, yet for ministers of the Word there are two different ordinations. In the one case, a man is ordained to the pastorate; in the other, he is ordained to be an evangelist or missionary to frontier and destitute settlements in his own country, or else to foreign lands. Besides these two ordinations—two, and yet one—our Book, following the Scripture, knows none else.

In all ages of the Church, and in all portions of it, *sine titulo* ordinations have been condemned. Let us explain the origin and meaning of this term. In the fourth century we meet with two kinds of Churches: 1. The *martyrion*, that is, the church edifice built at the place (outside, generally, of the habitations of men) where some martyr laid down his life; and to this building the people would repair annually to pay honor to the memory of the faithful witness, which custom tended to the worship of the saints. 2. The *titulus*, or parish church, where the people attended for worship continually. Ordination *with a title*, was that which took place when a man was called to the charge of some *titulus*, with a pledge of the needful support, which sometimes was furnished by the people, and sometimes was derived from endow-

ments to which that church had a title. Ordination *without a title* (*sine titulo*) was what the Council of Chalcedon called "absolute," and which it strenuously forbade; they were ordinations without any place of service officially assigned to the ordained, or any provision for his support. Calvin says this decree was most useful, for two reasons: first, that the Church might not be burdened with superfluous expense; and secondly, that ordained ministers might understand that they had received not a mere honorary office, but were set apart to a labor they were bound to perform. There are two points to be guarded with care: men are not to obtrude themselves into churches without a call, and the people are not to have the labors of a minister without providing for his support. Both these are amply protected in the form of a call furnished in our Book. The man is to be approved by the people, after an adequate trial of him, (he also trying them at the same time,) and they are earnestly to call him to be their pastor; but they must evince the sincerity and the earnestness of their desire for his labors, by the competent support they promise him. We all know the law of demand and supply. Whenever cotton or any other product is in demand, the price offered for it will rise. Whenever the price is low, it is said at once, There is no demand. If a people really wish for a certain minister's labors, they will offer him a fair support. Where a competent salary is not promised, it is idle to say there is any real demand for that minister's labors. Presbyteries, therefore, which do not wish to burden the Church and the ministry with superfluous men, having no real title to be ordained, should always look sharply at the promise of support made by a people. Except through the Presbytery, the minister cannot receive the call; and if put by them into his hand approvingly, it is signified, of course, that they find it in order, and such as it is proper should be given him. But can a *call to starve* ever be orderly and proper, such as a church may give and a Presbytery approve? Many are the complaints that the ministry are not duly supported. The fault lies in part at the door of Presbytery. Let the body refuse to sanction every call which does not pledge a just and adequate *title* to the pastorate, which does not furnish fair and full evidence

that the labors of the called man are truly in demand by that congregation.

But if the point of the minister's support enters essentially into the question of a *titulus* to be ordained, so likewise does the other point, of the people's having no man obtruded upon them without their own free choice and preference. And the necessity of free choice by the people is not simply that their taste and predilections may have due consideration; it draws deeper far than this. Our whole grand representative system stands or falls with this necessity. Unless the people choose the man, (we speak, of course, only of the settled church state,) he will not be *their representative*, and cannot sit in the church courts. Ordained ministers are and must be as truly representatives of the people as ruling elders. These latter are "properly," that is, *distinctively, simply, solely*, "representatives;" but ministers are not *simply* representatives, but that and something more. We must have in all our assemblies which rule, both the classes of rulers; and if the representative or *ruling* authority of the ministry is denied, our system is absolutely subverted and destroyed. Now, in the settled church state, no man can become a representative of the people, except by his being called to rule over them in the pastorate.

V. But what necessity is there at all for this ordination with the imposition of hands? For, may not any man and every man who belongs to Jesus, stand up and speak for him? Of course he may, and he must. But is there not a manifest and most wide difference between official and unofficial speaking for Jesus? The Lord himself has appointed that there shall be a class of men set free from worldly cares and avocations, and devoted to this very work. These are his ambassadors, carrying the key of doctrine and also the key of discipline, and opening and shutting therewith the kingdom of heaven. It is for these men to preach authoritatively, and to be ordained and set apart to that office; whilst at the same time every Christian ought to speak for his Master and the souls of men, as he finds opportunity. Yet let him not obtrude himself as having official authority, when he has had no call of God and his Church.

But what is to be thought and said of the modern lay evangelists, preaching now in London and in Berlin and in various cities of America? Are they to be held to be ministers of the gospel, or mere unauthorised private Christians? Do they speak for Jesus officially or unofficially?

It is a safe principle that the Church must acknowledge all whom God acknowledges, and honor every one as God honors him. Now, what does the lay evangelist referred to claim for his mission and work? Does he regard himself as only a *layman*, talking for Jesus without any special commission and authority given him by his Lord? Well, then, we will so receive and acknowledge him. But does he claim to be sent of the Lord, though not *of men* or *by men*, with extraordinary authority, commissioned to preach the Word, administer the sacraments, and rule like an apostle in and over the Church? Well, then, we must inquire, Does he show the signs of any such extraordinary commission? If so, we will reverently acknowledge him to be what he claims. If the Holy Ghost manifestly acknowledges, accompanies, and employs his preaching, we will not dare to set ourselves against him. The Lord has always raised up, and will raise up, extraordinary agents of his own, according to the necessities of the Church. This is the clear doctrine of Calvin and of Holy Writ. God is our Sovereign Head, and is not to be tied to any class of agencies as though he were dependent on them. But our right and our duty is to try all these claimants by the Word. The Spirit cannot be with any who positively contradict the Word. To the law, then, and to the testimony. If they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them. We must not believe every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world.

It would seem to follow, that the Lord may, without any dishonor to his own ordinances, so long established and so generally employed by him, see fit to send forth new agencies at his sovereign pleasure. There never should be any comparison drawn by any between the ordinary and the extraordinary commissioners of the Almighty. For, in the first place, both are the Lord's

instruments, and all the glory and honor are his. But, in the second place, no mortal man is competent to make such a comparison. Suppose the eminently successful men who are now shaking Great Britain with their gospel trumpet's sound, should be blessed to convert ten thousand souls; it would be wondrous and glorious success. But who can say that it would be a greater or as great a work as a few ordinary ministers and elders led our Church in doing, when, in 1837, the tide of New School heresy was rolled back, and the blessed doctrines of grace got a fresh testimony to their truth and their preciousness? If theology be corrupted, if the Church be debauched, may not the evil be greater through its wide and lasting influences than though ten thousand souls were lost? May not, therefore, the honest, faithful, unknown men who keep the Church from being thus fatally injured, or restore her, with God's blessing, when so damaged—may not these obscure servants of the Lord honor him more, and better serve his people, than these eminently successful preachers, whom all the world is wondering after? The truth simply is, that the ordinary and the extraordinary are not comparable—they are different things, and for different purposes, and in different spheres, and we have no common measure which can be applied to both.

VI. But what significance or value is there in the imposition of hands? Just the same, it has been well said, as belongs to the lifting of the hands in public prayer. We practise it, not for any inherent efficacy in it, but because the apostles practised it. So long as no one contravenes the right of a presbytery, as distinguished from a prelatie bishop, to employ it; or the right of a ruling elder, as distinguished from a teaching elder, to take part in it; or the right of elders and deacons to be ordained, as well as preachers, with this simple scriptural rite—so long we could have no particular zeal regarding it. But it is because great and important questions of church government turn on this simple matter, that it assumes such grave consequence, and excites such profound interest.

VII. And who, then, are to lay on hands in the ordination of all church officers? Our Book, speaking of the first office in the

Church, both for dignity and usefulness, says it is *the Presbytery*. Well, the Presbytery consists of the two classes of presbyters. In every ordination of a minister, both classes deliberated, and both acted together throughout all the precedent steps. Why not, then, both act together in this last step, which constitutes nothing else than a simple and beautifully significant rite descending to us from those who founded the Church? To deny their right to take part here is popish, for it makes a new sacrament of that which is none.

VIII. But ought there to be allowed any such thing as the demission of church office? Well, can those who admit to church office, claim infallibility? The Session which ordains a new deacon or elder, the Presbytery which ordains a new bishop or presbyter, does it pretend that it cannot err as to the title of the candidate? Two other parties have coöperated with the Presbytery in bringing this result to pass—the church which called, and the candidate who was called. Both these expressed a judgment as well as the Presbytery; and the concurrence of these three elements was understood as evincing the truth of God's call to the man. But is either the individual church or the individual man incapable of mistake? Now, if all these three parties are fallible, and if, in fact, mistakes have often been, and no doubt constantly are, made by all three in this matter of ordination to church office, ought there not to be some mode provided in our Book for rectifying such a mistake, without the necessity of imposing an undeserved censure on any party? All acted conscientiously and in the fear of God. Why not provide, with all proper safeguards, that where no disciplinable offence has taken place, there may be a simple, honest, definite acknowledgment of the error, publicly made and put on record?

ARTICLE VI.

THE PROPOSED PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL.

It is not quite correct to say, as was lately affirmed in a well-known journal, that the word "international" was introduced into our language on occasion of the Exhibition in 1851. Before that time it had an obscure corner in the English vocabulary; but it is a significant fact that the Exhibition brought it out, and gave it the prominent place which it continues to occupy. In the older dictionaries it does not occur. It is the representative of a modern idea, and may be described genealogically as one of the daughters of the steamboat, the railway, and the telegraph. It represents the feeling that seeks a fellowship wider than that of individual countries or languages; that recognises a kinship in all the world; and wherever it finds the elements of brotherhood, seeks to bind them together in a world-wide confederation.

It is partly, no doubt, in connexion with this international *Zeit-geist*, though essentially from a deeper root, that a strong and wide-spread desire has arisen, or rather has been revived, for a closer fellowship between the various branches of the Presbyterian Church. The shrinking from isolation, the desire for fellowship, the pleasure of finding congenial elements at the other side of the world, and the sense of benefit likely to accrue from more frequent and regular intercourse, which are characteristic of the age, have no doubt had a large share in giving form and freshness to this desire. At the same time, it may be doubted whether the project would be likely to come to more than a passing expression of feeling, if it had no deeper root than this. It is right to recognise the spirit and appliances of the age as giv-

NOTE.—We are not of those who have been anxious for our Church to be represented in this proposed Council, because unable to resist the apprehension that it must tend to interference with questions it ought not to touch, and also to the assumption of some authority over the churches represented. Yet we are very happy to let our readers enjoy the pleasure and profit of Dr. Blaikie's statement of the advantages anticipated.
EDS. S. P. REVIEW.

ing facilities, unknown before, for realising a large scheme of fellowship. But if something of the kind were not involved in the very nature of Presbytery—and indeed of the Christian Church; if it were not the proper outcome of principles which stop short in our existing arrangements before they have reached their ultimate application; if it were not the natural crown of an edifice which has never yet been brought to completion—we should not regard the project as very valuable, or likely to lead to great results. Unquestionably the most important light in which to view the proposal of a Presbyterian Council, is as the missing link for bringing together the hitherto *disjecta membra* of the family. Presbyterianism has never presented to the world that aspect of unity *as a whole*, which its several branches very remarkably exhibit. Take any well-organised section of the Presbyterian Church, and you find its unity quite remarkable. The whole hangs together through a gradation of church courts, rising from the congregational kirk-session to the all-regulating General Assembly. There is nothing here of the aspect of the Independent system, perhaps we may say too little; for in Scripture there is perhaps more recognition of local independence, within certain limits, than is usual among us. But while we have been most careful to banish Independency from our individual Presbyterian organisations, we have left it in full swing in so far as these churches are related to one another. It has not got so much as a foothold in the separate members, but as if to compensate for this, it is allowed to reign supreme over the whole. Most of the sections of the Presbyterian Church are quite independent of each other. Presbyterian principles are carried to their utmost reach in the interior; they are abandoned in the region beyond. They are applied with scrupulous care to adjust all local interests; they remain in abeyance when wider interests and obligations are concerned. But surely the principles that are applicable to individual sections are in some degree applicable to the body as a whole. If it was the design of the Head of the Church, that within a definite territory or a particular church the members should have a close relation to each other, it could not have been his intention that the several organisations, spread over the

world, should be quite apart. Here, then, is the great deficiency of Presbyterianism. It has wanted the Ecumenical bond. It presents the aspect of mere independent fragments. It has not even the appearance of visible or formal unity; and the want is all the more striking because it has so much both of substantial unity as a whole, and of visible unity in the separate parts.

Undoubtedly the Church of Rome presents by far the most complete and striking aspect of visible and formal unity which Christendom contains. We do not, of course, advert to the quality of that unity, except to say, that not resting on the basis of Scripture, it is rather the antithesis than the ideal of the unity of the New Testament. But something may surely be learned from the study even of this antithesis. No other Church spread over many lands has yet solved the problem of unity. Take the Protestant Episcopal Church, for example. So far as its several branches existing in different countries are concerned, they are as independent of one another as the various sections of the Presbyterian. To feel this somewhat acutely has been the special experience of the Church of England. The Pan-Anglican Synod was an attempt to bring together, but in an informal way, various members of the Episcopal family, so like to one another, that it seemed very strange that they could not be formally organised into one. The Association for Promoting the Union of Christendom labors to fuse into one churches which have no real unity, and are so unlike to one another that even if a cord could be found to tie them together, the result would only be a clumsy conglomerate. In the conflict between the Anglican party and Rome, the want of a visible centre of unity has always been a weak point with the former. After all, the Romanist asks, what are churches unconnected with Rome but a bundle of independent fragments? He points proudly to the Eternal City and the Chair of St. Peter, round which, like the sun, the whole Papal system revolves. To many a hesitating Anglican this has proved the decisive appeal. "Surely," he has reasoned, "this must be the One Church; other churches move in confusion hither and thither; here only do I find a head ruling alike over *urbi et orbi*;

one whose dominion is from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth.”

What view, it is natural to ask, did the Presbyterian Reformers take of this subject? It was certainly not their idea that the several churches, existing in different countries, should be wholly unconnected with one another. The Ecumenical Council was recognised as a constitutional and important body, which should serve as the visible centre of unity for the Reformed churches. The subject of a general union was much in Calvin's thoughts; and what he aimed at, but found it too difficult to accomplish, was a union which should embrace all the Reformed churches. Bullinger and Beza fully shared his views. In 1561, Beza, at a conference at St. Germain, urged in the name of the Reformed, the necessity of a general council, in which not the pope but the Scripture should decide the questions discussed. Calvin's views may be gathered from some of his letters to Cranmer :

“One of the greatest events of the time,” he wrote, “is, that the churches are so widely separated from each other, that there is not even a temporal or human intercourse carried on between them; we may well therefore be silent as to a holy communion of the members of Christ, which is in every body's mouth, but no sign of which exists in the heart. This is partly the fault of the princes. The body of Christ is torn asunder, because the members are separated. So far as I am concerned, If I can be of any use, I will readily pass over ten seas to effect the object in view. If the welfare of England alone were concerned, I should regard it as a sufficient reason to act thus. But at present, when our purpose is to unite the sentiments of all good and learned men, and so, according to the rule of Scripture, to bring the separated churches into one, *neither labor nor trouble of any kind ought to be spared.*”*

It is possible that Calvin aimed at too much—aimed at a closer union than it is reasonable to expect between churches in different countries; but it is evident that something much less than this would have been hailed with pleasure. He laments that there was not even “temporal or human intercourse” between the churches; if members of them had even been in the way of seeing each other in the flesh, exchanging views with one an-

* Henry's *Life of Calvin*, Vol. II., p. 126.

other, and entering into one another's difficulties and labors, he would have welcomed that as a step in the right direction.

We need not dwell on the untoward events which interfered with the realisation of Calvin's scheme, and turned it more and more into a devout imagination. In fact, in the course of time, it seems to have dropt into oblivion. There never has been a thoroughly Ecumenical Council of the Protestant Church, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian. The Synod of Dort was primarily a Dutch Synod, but assumed a broader character, in consequence of other countries and churches having been invited to send deputies. The Westminster Assembly did not profess to throw its arms wider than the three kingdoms. No ecclesiastical gathering has taken place to which all Protestant churches and countries have been invited to send representatives, or at which an endeavor has been made to embrace in one wide survey the interests of the whole, or to present, in one great act of devotion, the united prayers of Protestant Christendom. The nearest approach to such a gathering has been furnished by the meetings of the Evangelical Alliance; but these have avowedly been meetings not of church representatives, but of individuals associated only in a private capacity.

Yet indirectly the Evangelical Alliance has had a considerable influence in giving shape to the proposed Presbyterian Council or Confederation of 1876, which promises now at length to take a step, but only a little step, in the direction that was so earnestly contemplated by Calvin. It was at the time of the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in the United States in 1873, that the first steps were taken towards actually bringing together a general council of the Presbyterian Churches. Before that time, the subject had been repeatedly discussed on both sides of the Atlantic. It is astonishing how many persons claim to be the father of the scheme. The truth is, it took possession simultaneously of several minds, and utterance was given to it at sundry times, and in diverse manners, unknown perhaps to persons at a distance. We think, however, that the credit of being the chief mover must be given to President McCosh of Princeton. In the United States, the subject had been spoken of

at a great meeting held in 1872, at Philadelphia, to celebrate the ter-centenary of the Scottish Reformation, and in the following May, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church appointed a Committee to promote the object. In the same year, the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland passed resolutions to the like effect; that Assembly having had the honor to move a full year before any of the Assemblies in Scotland. On the 6th October, 1873, a meeting was held at New York, under the auspices of the General Assembly's Committee. It was attended by about a hundred and fifty persons, representing the various Presbyterian churches in the United States and Canada, in England, Scotland, Wales, and Australia; in Italy and Germany, and (virtually) in France. The Committee formed at this meeting was authorised to communicate with the Presbyterian churches throughout the world; and it is in consequence of the efforts thus made, that the scheme has reached the degree of maturity which it has attained.

In one important respect the scheme now proposed differs widely from what would have entered into Calvin's idea of an Ecumenical Council. No one proposes, by this movement, to constitute a court that shall possess authoritative control over the churches of whose representatives it is to consist. For such a scheme as this it is evident that we are utterly unripe, and any endeavor to constitute it would be sure to wreck the whole undertaking. The idea of such a confederation is, of course, not excluded; but the council proposed to be held now will possess only moral influence, and not attempt to realise the full desideratum of the Presbyterian churches in the matter of unity. It will not be a General Assembly for all the churches, in the sense in which the courts so designated are the supreme tribunals for the churches individually. It will not carry out the gradation of church courts a step beyond the point to which that principle is carried out now. Whether it may work towards such a result, is a question which we are not competent to answer. In theory it is true that a supreme tribunal, which should be literally a General Assembly in the fullest sense, is the apex of the Presbyterian system. But whether we are nearer to such a consummation than Calvin was, and whether a successful unauthoritative council would help to

realise the more formal and regular Assembly, are questions which we do not need to answer, because such a thing is not at all the object of this movement.

Let us now notice briefly the principal churches with which communication has been held, or is in the course of being held, on the subject of the council. The total number of organisations is forty-eight, and from nearly all favorable answers have been returned to the proposal :

I. GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Church of Scotland. | 6. United Original Seceders. |
| 2. Free Church of Scotland. | 7. Presbyterian Church of Ireland. |
| 3. United Presbyterian Church. | 8. Reformed Presbyterian Church in Ireland. |
| 4. Reformed Presbyterian Church. | 9. Presbyterian Church in England. |
| 5. Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland. | 10. Welsh Calvinistic Church. |

II. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Presbyterian Church in United States of America. | 5. General Synod of Reformed Presbyterian Church. |
| 2. United Presbyterian Church of North America. | 6. Synod of Reformed Presbyterian Church. |
| 3. Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church of United States. | 7. Associate Reformed Church —(South). |
| 4. Reformed Church in America, (Dutch Reformed.) | 8. Presbyterian Church in United States (South). |

III. BRITISH COLONIES.

Canada.

1. Canada Presbyterian Church.
2. Presbyterian Church in Canada, in connexion with the Church of Scotland.
3. Presbyterian Church in Lower Provinces.
4. Presbyterian Church in connexion with the Church of Scotland.*

Australia.

1. Presbyterian Church of Victoria.
2. Presbyterian Church of New South Wales.
3. Presbyterian Church of Queensland.

4. Presbyterian Church of South Australia.
5. Presbyterian Church of Tasmania.

New Zealand.

1. Presbyterian Church of New Zealand.
2. Presbyterian Church of Otago.

New Hebrides.

1. Synod of the New Hebrides Mission.

Africa.

1. Dutch Reformed Church.
2. Presbyteries of Kaffraria and Natal.

* These four churches were united June 15th, 1875.

IV. THE EUROPEAN CONTINENT.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Reformed Church of France. | 9. Free Church of Canton de Vaud. |
| 2. Union of Evangelical Churches of France. | 10. National Church of Neuchatel. |
| 3. Evangelical Church of Lyons. | 11. Evangelical Independ't Church of Neuchatel. |
| 4. Belgian Reformed Church. | 12. Waldensian Church. |
| 5. Evangelical Missionary Church of Belgium. | 13. Reformed Church of Hungary. |
| 6. National Church of Geneva. | 14. Reformed Church of Bohemia. |
| 7. Evangelical Church of Geneva. | 15. Reformed Church of Holland. |
| 8. National Church of Canton de Vaud. | 16. Secession Church of Holland. |

It is probable that this long list of forty-eight Churches embraces a constituency of some 20,000 congregations. We must remember to include in our reckoning the Presbyterian missionaries in various other parts of the world, whether to Jews or Gentiles, and any scattered pastors ministering here and there to congregations of Presbyterians not included in the foregoing list. It is also a fact of great interest, that a strong desire to join such a council has been expressed by members of an important Church which, in name at least, is not Presbyterian—the United Church of Prussia. At the meeting at New York in 1873, Professor Dörner and other Germans affirmed that, while they could not commit their Church to their opinion, they themselves hailed with delight the proposal of a Presbyterian Conference as what they had been long yearning after, feeling as they did, that, on the Continent especially, they had been almost completely severed from the fellowship of their brethren in England and America. This was equivalent to a formal claim on the part of these members of the United Church of Prussia to be considered Presbyterians; and the other continental deputies present concurred with much warmth. It might be an event full of important results, not only to Germany, but the world, if the Prussian Church were to be brought into such contact with the Presbyterian Churches, as to become more like them in doctrine and in spirit.

The benefits of the proposed Congress, as set forth in a brief address that emanated from the American brethren, may be arranged in three classes, according as they pertain to testimony,

fellowship, or work. In regard to *testimony*, the Congress would be a witness to the world of the substantial unity of the Presbyterian Churches; of the adaptation of the Presbyterian system to every form of civil government, and to all the varying conditions of the Church; of its ability to preserve order, without arrogance or tyranny; and also of its true proportions and wide extent—not being, as is often thought, a mere fragment accidentally displaced, as it were, from the great Episcopal system—a planetoid, which has been driven by a convulsion out of the true Christian orbit, but an extensive and orderly system, claiming, not unworthily, to represent the Church of the first century and a-half. In regard to *fellowship*, it would enable those not inclined to organic union to manifest their love to their brethren of other organisations, without compromising their distinctive principles; it would tend greatly to strengthen weak and struggling churches, by bringing to their support the influence of a large and powerful body; while, better still, by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, to be earnestly prayed for as the chief distinction and glory of the meeting, there might proceed new impulses of spiritual life, bringing every member into closer fellowship with his Divine Master, into deeper love of the brethren for the Master's sake, and into more entire consecration of all his powers to the Master's work. In regard to *work*, the Council would give to the various churches an opportunity of knowing more of each other's methods, and so getting useful hints for their own work in the future; it would also allow a combined effort to be made against infidelity, popery, and other forces that are everywhere opposing evangelical agencies; and it would facilitate an understanding as to mission operations, the amicable allocation of foreign fields, or of continental or other stations where evangelical work is to be done. In more fully expanding the objects of the Council, in a more recent document, we find that our American friends have given occasion to an apprehension that the functions of the Evangelical Alliance may be interfered with. We do not think there is any real cause for such an apprehension; certainly no such interference is designed; nor

will it be difficult for both these bodies to find ample and suitable occupation, each on its respective line.

Similar views as to the purposes and benefits of the Congress have been expressed on this side of the Atlantic. In a paper published by the present writer in November, 1871, seven benefits were specified: 1st. The sense of connexion with a large ecclesiastical brotherhood or family; 2d. A fuller communion by the churches in each others' gifts and graces; 3d. A larger experience of ways and methods that are most blessed in the various fields which have to be cultivated; 4th. An adjustment of the relations of freedom and order; 5th. Practical arrangements for the division of mission and other work; 6. Opportunities for united prayer; and 7th. Christian friendship and fellowship on a larger scale.

Such views probably lie, in most cases, at the foundation of the strong desire which has been so widely expressed for the accomplishment of this scheme. In its general features it has obtained the cordial approval of the Supreme Courts of the leading Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, Ireland, and England. Committees were appointed last year to coöperate with similar committees of other churches, and considerable progress has been made in maturing such arrangements as are needful for the realisation of the scheme. After local preliminary meetings in Edinburgh and New York, a general preliminary meeting has been summoned to be held in London on 21st July, 1875, at which the constitution of the proposed body will be considered, and the place and time of the first meeting of the Council definitely fixed.

To those who look with attention into the functions and operations of the proposed body, it becomes very clear, the more they study the matter, that it must sustain a definite relation to the churches of whose members it is to be composed. At first, perhaps, the idea was, that it would be composed of such Presbyterian ministers and elders as might be attracted together to the place of meeting, without much regard to any formal delegation by the churches from which they came. But it soon became apparent that such a random constitution or bond of union would

be far too loose. If the meeting was to be in any sense Ecumenical, if it was to possess in any degree the right to express the views of the Presbyterian churches, if it was even to escape the reproach of professing to be much more than it really was, it must consist of men appointed to attend it by their various churches. These must have a commission emanating in some way from the supreme court of their church. The supreme court may either appoint them directly, or it may give authority to a committee to do so; but it is quite essential that the members be delegated. This does not imply that the church, in appointing them, will be committed either to what they say or to what they do. When a church appoints commissioners to visit other churches, she is not committed to their proceedings. It will be an annoying thing to her, no doubt, if they misrepresent her; but she will have no responsibility. It is an annoying thing to a church if conspicuous members misrepresent her on any occasion, or in any capacity; but the usual organs of remonstrance and repudiation are open, and through them dissatisfied members may remove any misconception of their views. Any church that should appoint delegates to attend the general council would be entitled to require a report of their proceedings; and if it should be found that they had not truly represented her, the proper disclaimer could easily be given. But for the sake of the great object in view, it is to be hoped that the several supreme courts will not find any difficulty in appointing delegates. The truth is, it will be much better for the churches to appoint them, defining their functions, and requiring an account to be given of their stewardship, than to leave them, as it were, to appoint themselves. A church is far less likely to be misrepresented by a select number of delegates, formally commissioned by her, than by individual members congregated, accidentally as it were, and lying under no special obligation to have regard to her views. If the idea of this Presbyterian Council be a good one, it deserves to be carried out under the best and most orderly provisions which the churches encouraging it can devise. We cannot therefore entertain any serious apprehension that the churches which have already signified their approval, will shrink from giving their

commission to a sufficient number of delegates to attend the meetings.

This may be done the more freely, that in appointing the delegates it may be stipulated that the Council will have no ecclesiastical authority, but will be a mere consultative or deliberative body, its influence being derived wholly from its moral weight. We have the precise parallel of such a body in our university councils in Scotland, which are empowered by statute to consult upon all matters relating to the well-being of the university. As such, the councils are as truly and essentially a part of the university as the administrative or legislative part, but they have no actual power of any kind, except the moral power of their deliberations and conclusions.

While the constituted members of the Council ought thus to be limited to persons duly delegated from their several churches, it may be found convenient to give a certain standing to other persons, on occasion of particular meetings. At whatever place the Council may at any time meet, a much larger number of ministers and elders connected with that place are likely to be present than the proportion which would naturally be members. Without their receiving any power to vote, they might be invited, under due regulations, to sit with the members, and aid in their deliberations and devotions. Provision would thus be made for taking advantage of the local interest to which such meetings commonly give rise, in much the same way as at the meetings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, or the Social Science Association. The Council itself must not be an unwieldy body, but the greater the interest that can be excited in its proceedings the better. If the privilege of associates should be found to be abused, or should tend to complicate or needlessly retard the procedure, not being an essential feature of the Council, it could afterwards be cut off.

A very important question relates to the manner in which the business of the Council shall be introduced. On the one hand, it would not be desirable to restrict unduly the freedom of members to suggest and introduce topics for discussion; but on the other, it would tend to confusion if the Council were bound to

take up any matter that might be brought forward, and had not the liberty of selection and arrangement. It is evident that for this purpose considerable latitude would have to be given to a provisional committee. To such a committee, necessarily appointed at first in a somewhat irregular way, the choice of topics would have to be assigned. If the constituent churches would suggest topics for the consideration of the Council, that undoubtedly would be their best mode of introduction. Even in that case, however, a committee would have to classify and arrange; and in order to save the time of the Council, it would probably be found necessary to intrust the committee with the duty of requesting one or more persons, known to be conversant with special subjects, to introduce them to the Council.

The name of the proposed body is a point of some interest. In the rough form which the proposal first assumed, a considerable variety of names was given to it. It has been called a General Presbyterian Council; a Confederation of Presbyterians; a Pan-Presbyterian Council; an Ecumenical Presbyterian Council; a Presbyterian Congress; a Presbyterian Conference; and, doubtless, on the other side of the Atlantic, a Presbyterian Convention. For the most part, the title adopted is that of "General Presbyterian Council." It may be observed, however, that the meeting held in December, 1874, in New York, deviated slightly from the previous nomenclature. It proposes to constitute a confederation of the Presbyterian churches, from which confederation shall spring from time to time the Presbyterian Council. That is to say, the various churches approving of the scheme are to be regarded as confederate, so far as that scheme is concerned. They are to come under agreement to appoint delegates to the Council, and in this way advance the scheme. It does not appear that according to the views of our American brethren, they are to be regarded as confederate for any other purpose. It may be a question, therefore, whether it is necessary to introduce the word Confederacy at all. It is liable to be regarded as meaning more than in this case it would mean, and if so, it might be found better to fall back on the name first used by our American brethren—General Presbyterian Council.

Nothing has yet been said on the conditions of membership. In so far as the question has been considered, there is entire harmony of view on both sides of the Atlantic—that adherence to an approved and recognised symbol should be the condition on which churches might send delegates to the Council. In the case of nearly all the English-speaking churches, the Westminster Confession obviously furnishes the requisite standard. Nor would there arise any practical difficulty in the case of two English-speaking Presbyterian churches which do not use that symbol—the Reformed, or Dutch Reformed, as they used to be called in America, and the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists. The standards of these bodies are in close accord with the Westminster Confession. The chief difficulty would be in the case of some continental churches which, while formally adhering to sound Confessions, in some instances virtually abandon them. It might require to be certified, in the case of delegates commissioned by such churches, that they were really in sympathy with their symbols. No invitation could be given to churches that openly, and even ostentatiously, repudiate the views of these standards—such as Unitarians in Britain, or Cumberland Presbyterians in America.

Another question for the preliminary meeting in July will be the place and the time of the first general council. As to time, the general voice seems to indicate 1876; as to place, there may be more variety of opinion. Edinburgh naturally presents itself as the cradle of English-speaking Presbyterianism. Another and deeper genealogy would point to Geneva. London would have a claim as the great centre of public opinion. New York or Philadelphia would represent the claims of the New World. In favor of a transatlantic meeting-place, much weight is due to the extraordinary interest so sure to be taken by the American people, evinced as it was in quite an overwhelming manner at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in 1873, and likely to be equalled should a great Presbyterian gathering be held there. For overflowing liberality and hospitality, and for the enthusiastic coöperation in some matters of all classes, there is no people like the American. Geneva, we fear, is out of the

question ; its language being foreign to the great mass of the members, while the population would be but slightly in sympathy with the movement, and there would be no adequate representation of its proceedings in the press. London affords the great advantage of a daily press whose voice reaches to the ends of the earth, and so far as its Presbyterian congregations are concerned, no body of men could be more hearty or hospitable. The drawback to London would be the smallness of its Presbyterian population. Coming back to Edinburgh, it has undoubtedly the prestige of having been for three centuries the Presbyterian Zion, "whither the tribes go up;" it has been known so long as an ecclesiastical capital, that it would be strange were it passed over. It possesses a Hall, too, which, for church conferences, has neither superior nor equal. The drawback to Edinburgh is, that it is in a manner surfeited with ecclesiastical meetings. We do not see in it indications of such lively and pervading interest in the subject as would be likely to facilitate the very laborious and manifold arrangements that would be necessary. While New York or Philadelphia would respond to the proposal with a ringing shout of welcome, Edinburgh would reply with comparative tameness. Not but that Edinburgh would ultimately rouse herself to do her duty well; in the long run she would be sure to acquit herself as she always does when large public bodies assemble within her gates; but there probably would not be at first that lively manifestation of interest which would create expectation and serve to ensure success. Glasgow, we believe, would show more spontaneous warmth, and in many respects would be an excellent place of meeting. But on British ground, Edinburgh, we apprehend, would have the preference. We see no reason, however, why other towns, especially London, Glasgow, and Belfast, should not have public meetings in connexion with the Council, which some of the more eminent strangers might be asked to attend. On future occasions, too, all might have their turn.

In any state of things, but especially in the present, it would be inexcusable for any body of Christian office-bearers to come together without trying to warm and quicken each other's hearts,

by conferring and praying over the great things that God has been doing in the midst of them. One of the earliest days of the Council should be given wholly to the subject of spiritual life, and the whole proceedings should be baptized with the spirit which a conference on this topic might be expected to awaken. We are quite sure that the prominence of this feature in the proposed meetings would have more effect than anything else in drawing members from distant parts of the globe. The interest that has been awakened everywhere in the spiritual work of the last eighteen months is unprecedented. In continental countries the desire for information about it is very remarkable. A friend has just told us, that a few weeks ago he went one Sunday evening to a leading church in a continental capital, along with a young person who had got good at Mr. Moody's Edinburgh meetings, and greatly to their surprise, the sermon contained an account of Mr. Moody's work in that very city. Our colonial ministers, our missionaries, and our ministers in places out of the way, would all be greatly attracted by meetings, which, besides giving information respecting past blessing, would afford good hope of a renewal of the shower. A very hopeful feeling prevails that in due time the spirit of revival will spread to the most distant places. Even missionaries in heathen India hope to see the day when it shall be asked, "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?" Presbyterian organisation saturated with the revival spirit—the body and backbone of the most compact form of church structure united to the utmost intensity and fervor—would surely contain seeds of highest promise. One thing, indeed, would need to be carefully guarded against—the idea that either numbers, or organisation, or human ability of any kind, could furnish the real force out of which vital results arise. Life only can beget life. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Certainly there would be an utter failure in any attempt to convey right impressions of the recent revival, if it were not made as plain as day, that distrust of human ability, with entire and very confident reliance on the promised power and grace of God, lie at the foundation of all revival blessing.

Surely it would not be out of keeping if the whole business of such a council were to be pervaded by the spirit kindled from revival scenes. If we value our Presbyterian organisation beyond any other, it is because we believe it to be the best adapted for the great work of the Christian Church, the ingathering and the edification of souls. It is always desirable to keep up a close connexion between means and end. In our ecclesiastical assemblies, the wide gap allowed to arise between them, in great discussions in which the spiritual ends of the Church are so liable to be lost sight of, is often a cause of evil. The Council might, in perfect consistency with this spirit, discuss the widest range of topics. All that relates to doctrine, discipline, and worship; to the aspects and operations of unbelief in the various countries; to the relation of Christianity to other interests, such as those of education, science, art, and literature; to the training of students, the efficiency of the pulpit, and the pastoral methods of the ministry; to the reclaiming of the lapsed classes, the protection of the Sabbath, the circulation of the Bible, the extension of a missionary spirit at home and abroad; to the development of the Christian family, and the instruction of the young; to the turning to account of the gifts of the laity; to the suppression of intemperance; or to the remedying of other evils felt by all, or the attainment of other ends desired by all, might be quite as well, nay better, discussed, under the impulse derived from the recent awakening. The whole proceedings would have a fragrant and animating character; a delightful atmosphere would prevail; keen disputes would be avoided; and men would go home thanking God for having brought them together, and praying that again and again he would meet in like manner with his people.

This, too, would be the conclusive answer to any objections that might be taken to the scheme on the ground of its being limited to one class of churches, or on the supposition of its aim being to sound the Presbyterian trumpet, and glorify the Presbyterian name. Speaking for ourselves, we can say with the greatest emphasis, that with regard to any scheme of which the end and purpose was to glorify any portion of the Church, we not only would not do anything to advance it, but, on the contrary, would

do everything to prevent it. Of all trumpets, the denominational trumpet seems to us to give out the most unmusical sound. The only case in which it seems right and fitting for a church to exalt herself, is when she has been exposed to disparagement in such a way that her character is injured and her usefulness impaired. St. Paul had sometimes to vindicate his reputation in such circumstances, but he did it with a strong apology for speaking as a man, or even as a fool. It is because the influence of the Presbyterian Church, which we believe in the main to be wholesome and scriptural, has been so systematically disparaged, that we should like to see it manifesting itself in its true strength and importance. God forbid that in any other way self-assertion should be the object of the Council. The less it seemed to aim at this, the more real influence would it have. The members ought to come together with their hearts full of interests infinitely higher than their own; humbled at the thought that far on in the nineteenth century Christ's name is unknown to by far the greater part of the world, and often sadly slighted where it is known; and moved by the most intense desire to be instrumental in doing whatever can be done for the extension of his kingdom.

As to the objection that it would be a pity to limit the meetings to the members of one section of Christian churches, especially when our recent Christian "conventions" have been so free to all, the answer is, that for such meetings, on the widest scale, the Evangelical Alliance already affords the opportunity, and that we very cordially wish them God-speed. But, as has been already said, these are meetings of individuals, and what we desire is a council of churches. As Presbyterians, we have no influence with any but Presbyterian churches. We see an obvious incompleteness in the present relations of these churches to each other. That incompleteness, we believe, must be displeasing to our Head. We are not able to remedy it, but we seem to be able to take one step towards remedying it. It may sound well to speak slightingly of churches, and to recognise only individual Christianity. But we believe that this is not in accordance with our Lord's mind. The Church is his institution, and however imperfectly it may realise his design, it is not for that reason to be

slighted. Efforts are to be made to get that design realised more perfectly. This is our aim in the present matter. We believe it may be prosecuted under the blessing of Christ.

As we have been writing this paper, the thought has often occurred to us, If Calvin were alive, what would he think of this scheme? We can believe that his first feeling would be one of disappointment. "What," he would say, "this does not propose to include the Protestant churches generally, but only the Presbyterian. My desire was to include them all in a common bond." Very true, we should have to reply, but the Church of England has changed since the days of Cranmer. "And then," he would continue, "I should have desired something like organic unity; my idea of an Ecumenical Council would have been that of a council having authority, whereas you only propose one carrying moral weight." True, again, we reply, but we do not see our way to more. "Well, in that case," the venerable voice would probably continue, "go on, and God be with you; in my day I should have been glad of even 'temporal or human intercourse' between the churches; and if you attain to that, you may do good service to the great cause of the gospel."

ARTICLE VII.

WILLIAM CARSTARES.

To most to whom the names of the saints and fathers of the Scottish Church are familiar, and whose copies of the *Scots Worthies* and *Cloud of Witnesses* have been well and lovingly thumbed, the name of the man which heads this paper will probably be unknown; yet he was a father of the Scottish Church, if ever any one was, and is worthier of a place in her Hagiology than many who are there. The visitor to Edinburgh, who is curious about Revolution-history matters, will neither see nor hear anything to recall him as a man who filled a foremost place

among his contemporaries, and powerfully influenced the destinies of his country. In that sacred place of burial where he was laid, the famous Greyfriars' churchyard, whose air is full of imperishable historic associations, you will seek well nigh in vain for his name. His monument, indeed, is there, next to Henderson's,* but is weather-worn and hardly distinguishable. Yet he was as wise, and true, and brave a son of the Church of Scotland as her great leader in her conflict with Charles and Laud; and although unknown in her hagiologies, he has been called, with much historic fitness, her "second Founder."†

But although this proud title may be one open to question, and may even be an undeserved one, yet this much is perfectly certain, that William Carstares was no common man, and was one of our greatest Churchmen; and it is just possible that for a hundred and fifty years we have all been forgetting the name of one of Scotland's genuine worthies. Ah, those forgotten worthies! We enter into their labors, we delight ourselves beside the still waters and green pastures won by their patience, their hope, and their bravery, and do them, too often, no homage in our hearts—sometimes not even knowing, or, what is worse and altogether inexcusable, not even caring about their names. What though the better sort of them were men who cared for none of our praise? The loyal servants of duty, who could not render her enough of sturdy service, and sought only the smile of their own conscience, and found that enough to cheer them in the breach, in the desert, and in the prison, let us none the less know them by name and cherish their memories. They have lived for us, have influenced our destinies, have made us their debtors. They, of all men, should not be forgotten. Happily for their good name, and for us and our children, they are not likely to be. It is one of the best fruits of the historical spirit of our time, to which the archives and charter-chests of our chief public and private libraries are now open, that justice is likely to be meted out alike to all who have figured, or are supposed to have figured,

* Stanley, *Lectures on the Church of Scotland*, says, "The grave is unmarked by any monument." (P. 122.)

† Ibid, p. 121.

in the past. There will be, one may be sure, some significant reversals of popular verdicts. It will stand hard, for instance, with many of the old favorites of party. No matter. Others, whose names have been in few mouths, or who fell on "evil days," but whose ideas have since borne fruit, or whose work still stands firm, will come conspicuously to the front; and this will be as it should. We shall find that, after all, History is but another name for Justice, whose eternal maxim is those sacred and irreversible words, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Will William Carstares bear this judgment? This question may be answered satisfactorily by every one who cares to do it. The facts of his life are many, characteristic, and well authenticated. His *State Papers*, edited by McCormick, is not a scarce book. Macaulay, Burton, Cunningham, Grub, and Stanley, have each paid him their tribute. These have been just supplemented by a careful and excellently written historical biography from the pen of Mr. Story, of Roseneath, in which Carstares and his time are clearly, although at too great length, set before us.* In circumstances so favorable for forming a just and definite opinion on one of our greatest Churchmen, and in the belief that there is very much need for this, we propose to put before our readers in the following pages the chief facts of Carstares's "career," that they may be able for themselves to see what was his "character." In the course of this they ought to see what was the actual worth of the man, and discover the reasons why he never was canonised.

His life, like the lives of many in his troubled time, was full of strange, often stirring, incidents, most of which are characteristic of the man or of his times, and is divided into three distinct periods.

The first period embraces the years when he was a political conspirator; the second period, when he was King William's favorite chaplain and confidential secretary on Scotch affairs; the third period, when he was Principal of the University of Edinburgh, and leader of the Church of Scotland.

* *William Carstares: A Character and Career of the Revolutionary Epoch, 1649-1715.* London: McMillan & Co. 1874.

He first saw the light on the 11th of February, 1649, at Cathcart, a sunny, agricultural parish, a little south of Glasgow, of which his father, John Carstares, "a man of no small mark among the Scottish Churchmen of the days of the Commonwealth and persecution," was the minister. His father was one whose life we cannot closely scan without getting a glimpse into the inner spirit of those times: what was best in them and most heroic, he had a large share of, and was not wanting in their intolerances. Every inch a Covenanter, a thorough upholder of Christ's crown and covenant, he was one of the ministers who thronged the Scottish camp at Dunbar, provokingly profuse of advice, which ended in headlong disaster, and was one of those who railed at the great Oliver to his face, in the Cathedral of Glasgow, whither he had now been removed. We are all familiar with Knox's fearless, or as they may happen to be called, his fierce and insolent, reprimands; both Painting and Poetry have made them their own. Yet what a striking, and in its way suggestive, picture is it to see those stern, uncompromising Presbyters denouncing the not less stern but more reasonable Puritan, who had come to deliver them from their bondage of delusion!

This "extreme contentiousness of spirit," as Mr. Story remarks, was in nowise incompatible with "profound personal piety." Of course it was not. The stern realism of those days made it not only possible, but inevitable. We smile complacently, or we have our scoff, at the solemn importance put upon trifles by the Covenanters, and we frequently call them "enthusiasts" and "fanatics." That is easy to do. But we must not pretend to any proper historical understanding of them and their work, if we do this. Any one can cavil and find fault, and so pretend to a monopoly of wisdom: the very rare thing is the judicial, historical spirit, which at once understands and fairly measures out praise and blame. No men have suffered more from a want of this spirit than the Covenanters, especially as they are seen during those years when they were rent into sections, and were, on the one hand, at the mercy of a Court which cajoled them into wretched acquiescence, or, on the other, at the mercy of men whose names have become everlastingly odious for their delight

in human suffering. Who has estimated them fairly? Who has entered into the spirit of *The Scots Worthies* and *The Cloud of Witnesses*? Sir Walter, as a genuine Jacobite, held them up to derision in his *Old Mortality*. Buckle did the same, in a more conclusive way, in his *History of Civilisation in England*. Dean Stanley, as we might expect, cannot see their nobleness. John Hill Burton, learned Scotsman though he be, is too prosy and passionless. Nor, indeed, does Mr. Story show an impartial appreciation of them. He is kindest to the Trimmers, and is content with the commonplace explanation of the devotion unto death of those who continued in arms till the Revolution. Then there are Napier's *Memoirs of Montrose and Claverhouse*, and Aytoun's *Lays*, to crown the edifice. If the biographer of John Knox and Andrew Melville had but given us their history!* *It is still to be written.*

A characteristic trait of this piety of Carstares was his fervor in prayer, in which he excelled most of his contemporaries. In the age of Samuel Rutherford, "the true saint of the covenant," † it was not easy to do this. Wodrow puts the man vividly before us.

"When he first entered on his Sabbath's work, he ordinarily prayed one hour, for he took in all the public things in that prayer. His band would have been all wet, as if it had been douked with tears, before he was done with his first prayer. . . . He was doing duty at the sacrament for a brother minister at Calder. He served the first table in a strange rapture, and he called some ministers there to the next, but he was in such a frame that none of them would come to take the work off his hand. He continued at the work with the greatest enlargement and melting upon himself and all present, and served fourteen or sixteen tables."

After reading this we do not wonder his colleague should have said of him, that "such was the eminence of the grace of God in him, and so manifest was the presence of God with him, that

*Does the reader know his *Review of Tales of my Landlord?* (*Works*, Vol. IV., 1862.) If not, he has a pleasure in store. Dodd's *Fifty Years' Struggle of the Scottish Covenanters*, (Edmonston and Douglas, 1860,) is excellent in its way, but has all the faults of a series of popular lectures.

† Stanley, p. 87. The whole sketch, 87-92, is characteristically good.

I never did open my mouth where he was, but with the greatest reluctance." This other illustration is equally, perhaps even more, striking. When the dissipated and reckless Earl of Rothes, the chancellor, lay dying, he sent for Carstares that *he might hear him pray*. So touching and beautiful were the prayers, that almost all who were present were moved to tears.*

It was characteristic of intense natures like this, in the earlier years of the Covenant, and more or less so till after the Revolution, to take up with unconditional political views as the only tenable ones; and we naturally therefore, find Carstares a prominent man among the Protesters or extreme Covenanters. The burning questions of that time are mostly extinct volcanos now; but they have left very memorable marks in the history and character of our country, which even in passing we must give heed to. It was this party, we may remind our readers, which was so remarkable for its tenacity of purpose and its "fanaticism," and which prolonged the deadly struggle with the Stuarts till the flight of James II. *It was this party which gave to the Middle period of Scottish history its special character, and its special significance and glory.* They had no idea of compromise, or of the profound meaning of the Greek proverb, that half a loaf is better than no loaf. They had to learn this. The realism just spoken of gave to every article of their political creed a meaning which compelled them to hold by it as a sacred hold. It was to them an indivisible embodiment of the truth which alone could save Scotland; and every modification of it was a fatal lowering of their standard of right and duty, which they dared not consent to. As was to be expected, this party has been maligned, misunderstood, and misrepresented. Who will say, however, that milder men and measures would have succeeded? Did the milder men succeed in anything, unless in saving themselves and getting into "pleasant places"? Mr. Story, for instance, to take the latest example, gives proof enough of the outrageous and gratuitous tyranny of the times, yet he has only hard words for the party which it could not humble and crush. They not only remained

* Story: Steven's *History of the Scottish Church*, Rotterdam, p. 57; and *Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, March, 1827.

unconquered, but with all their faults, which were many, it is perfectly certain they did more for the religious life of Scotland than their weaker expediency-loving brethren, the Resolutioners,* and were, as Mr. Story himself tells us, the only men in the land who were deserving of the name of patriots. "This body," he says, "ever growing in steadfastness, and as oppression and misgovernment increased, becoming more distinctly the ark of refuge for the shattered liberties of Scotland, and the rallying point for all the disaffected, kept alive through years of persecution a political and religious enthusiasm of the keenest, though not of the purest, type, which won its triumph in 1688."† Of this oppression and misgovernment, the elder Carstares had his full share, having been imprisoned, forced to flee "justice" and live in hiding, and forfeited both in person and estate. The triumph he never saw, as he died in Edinburgh early in 1686 : but some of his latest words showed what his presentiments were. Some one asked him as he was nearing his end, what he thought now of the times and the state of the nation : "Notwithstanding all the successes and prevailings of these men against the people and work of God," he said, "I am persuaded *tandem bona causa triumphabit.*"

In the midst of influences natural to circumstances like these, under the shadow of the ancient cathedral church of Glasgow, young Carstares passed his boyhood, and had his first memories and stirrings of mind. We know nothing from himself of these years, and little about the steps by which he was led to adopt the career he afterwards pursued ; but we do not need, for we can easily see from what we know of his father's house, how he could become what he was. It must have been the scene of many meetings and partings. He must there have seen many notable men in stern and in social mood, and heard many serious as well as racy conversations : for doubtless the accomplished and gentle

* Cunningham, *Church History of Scotland*, Vol. II., pp. 172, 173.

† See the close of McCrie's *Review of Tales of my Landlord*; Dodds, pp. 300-305 ; Buckle, Vol. III., pp. 137-150, for some eloquent and powerful advocacy of this party. And generally they have the best of it as compared with the Resolutioners.

Durham, the young and mystical Gray, quaint, witty Zachary Boyd, and the portly, business minded Bailie,* with others of lesser note, were among his father's familiar guests, which would make his house, in a time of intense and prolonged excitement, quite a place of education for a quick but quietly observing boy. These influences would only be intensified and confirmed in their action after the Restoration, when Episcopacy was restored, Argyll and the leaders of the "fanatics" beheaded, the Covenant burnt by the common hangman, and when four hundred ministers were driven from their parishes in the winter of 1662, because they would not abjure their rights to freedom of conscience at the bidding of Middleton, a soldier of fortune, and his Drunken Parliament. Sitting as a lad of fourteen over his lessons in the still household, no longer brightened by his father's presence, what must he have felt when his mother, whom he most tenderly loved, and whose saintly influence was an abiding spell.† read him these words secretly brought to her from his father: "Charge Will to make earnest of seeking God, and to be diligent at his books;" or when, some time after, he was a sharer of his father's perils in the wilds of the North of Ireland or the Mull of Cantyre, whither he had fled from the tender mercies of the traitor archbishop? These were experiences likely enough to influence powerfully a man's early years, and sufficient to shape and determine his maturer ones, as we find them.‡

And they were continued through his manhood. He became a student of the University of Edinburgh in 1663, and took his degree in 1667; but side by side of his humane studies during these four years, occupying and heating his mind, no doubt, to their hindrance, were the religious and political questions of his day with which the western shires were ablaze. Young natures like his—susceptible, eager, and looking out for opinions and rules of action—walking the quiet Edinburgh streets and quieter college courts, would certainly feel more interest in the human

*Story, p. 12; *Scots Worthies*, for lives of Durham, Gray, and Bailie.

† See his own words, Story, pp. 130, 132.

‡ Mr. Burton thinks they would all tend the other way, *History of Scotland*, chap. lxxx., note at end.

than the humane; and with the Pentland Rising as the chief event of the previous winter, in which his father and his kinsfolk, the Mures of Caldwell, had a share, would have new occasion, and would find stronger reasons than they already had, for coming to definite conclusions on morals and government.

"He saw his country writhing under the merciless dragonnades and exactions of fierce soldiers, such as Turner and Dalzell. He saw the prisons full of hapless victims, only released from the dungeon to be crushed in the boots, or marched to the gallows, or shipped to the plantations to be sold as slaves. He saw the ministers of the National Church driven from their homes and churches, celebrating the rites of their religion in secrecy and fear among the broken and scattered remnants of their flocks. He saw the places of the ancient pastors filled by those whom even one of their own order could but describe as worthless men of little learning, less piety, and no discretion. He saw his own father skulking from covert to covert like a felon, under a feigned name, unable, unless at peril of his life, to look on the face of wife or child, even in their days of sickness, sorrow, and death."*

He saw, in short, the most wicked and detestable government in modern history.†

This state of things was one which well might stir the wrath even to *saeva indignatio*, of a young man of his training and memories, and of his active, determined, and capable turn. And it was the natural soil of plottings and conspiracies. Could he look on his brethren's burdens and wrongs, and not meditate on the way to escape from them, or to checkmate and right them? Tyrannicide is an ugly subject; but who that has felt the mountings of the spirit of liberty, or conceived the agony of despair felt at iniquities flaunted openly by their doers who are above the law, and from whose power no man's house is safe, has not also felt that it cannot be always a crime? Conspiring and taking up arms against your "lawful" sovereign, which is the next thing to tyrannicide, has received the sanction of modern history, and been illustrated in many memorable examples. But those suffer-

*Story, pp. 22, 23.

† See Hallam (whom everybody naturally defers to as an authority) on this period; *History of England*, chap. xvii. Lingard's account is characteristically brief and oblivious as regards the persecuted, and bland as regards the persecutor.

ers and their forefathers were among the first to educate Western Europe into these political truths. Would young Carstares not be read in Buchanan's *De Jure Regni* and Rutherford's *Lex Rex?* and, as one acquainted with their doctrines, be intensely influenced by the things he saw around him? Whether or not, the spectacle wrought upon him so, that when he took his degree, his friends thought it prudent he should stay no longer in Scotland. He was ready to rush into the fray; but he was too young to do the just cause any good, or to hope to escape the snares of the enemy. Presbyterian loyalty under such a government was impossible. If divinity must needs be further studied, it must be studied abroad. Accordingly, John Carstares sent his son, in his twentieth year, over to Holland to finish his theological education at the University of Utrecht. Little did either of them think of the "education" which awaited the young student there, and of the historical consequences of the step.

On his way thither he passed through London, and spent some time there in the house of a particular friend of his father's, who kept up a correspondence with Holland, seeing, among other things, how the light-hearted and wanton Charles ruled, and how the Duke of York stood in public favor. Here he took his first step in his public career. With a letter of introduction in his pocket from his father's friend to the Prince of Orange's physician, he left his native shores to carve out a name for himself in the cause and as a confessor of religious and political liberty. This letter laid the future foundation of his fortunes in life.*

The old but elegant episcopal city of Utrecht to which he went—the "cradle of liberty," as the Netherlanders had loved to call it since the signing of the famous Articles of 1579—was a most pleasant place to live in. It was a garrison town for Scotch and English regiments in the seventeenth century; but while, like Leyden and Rotterdam, and other considerable Dutch towns, it had a large British colony mostly composed of students and traders, with the usual accompaniments of a coffee-house and a church, its most interesting and noticeable class was the refugees

* McCormick, pp. 4, 5.

from the tyranny of the Stuarts. Thesewere numerous. Exiled from home and the scenes they most loved, they had much here to solace themselves with. Surrounded by trim gardens and orchards, and embowered in groves of beeches and lime trees, with busy canals fringed with poplars and crossed by innumerable bridges, with its stately brick tower of St. Martin's and its magnificent cathedral, its shady Mall and open walks beyond the gates, this seat of the once famous hard-fighting Frisian bishops was then, as it now is, one of the cheerfulest and most imposing towns in the provinces.*

This, of all places, was the one where the young Scot would have his early tendencies developed and directed. It was a "centre" of disaffection and conspiracy. Sauntering along its shady Mall, and over their cups in the coffee-room, many projects for the revolutionising of England and Scotland had been, were now being, and would yet be mooted by nobles and lairds who, unlike the Lords of the Congregation a hundred years before, had hardly anything to win by a change but freedom of conscience. Into the midst of these exiles and malcontents Carstares's letter of introduction took him. It had brought him under the instant notice of Grand Pensionary Fagel, and that shrewd and skilful minister saw qualities in him which made him well worth enlisting in his royal master's service. Fagel accordingly presented him to William, who was also impressed by his discriminating knowledge of parties and affairs in North Britain, and pleased with his easy manner and address. The times were not yet ripe for a revolution, but if a revolution were to be successfully accomplished, the men who must do it would need to be tried as well as devoted men; and William was content just now to know where these could be found. It was enough to him that Carstares seemed to be a man admirably fitted for important secret service; and it was enough for Carstares to have the honor and the opportunity of pledging himself to William, and with his life in his hand daring to do everything which would hasten a better day,

* Steven, pp. 337, 266, 1; Story, p. 25; Motley's *Life and Death of John of Barneveldt*, Vol. II., p. 227; Mackay's *Memoir of Sir James Dalrymple*, pp. 186-190; Calamy's *Life of Howe*, p. 146.

and fulfil the dying hope of his father and all who like him had died in faith. Meanwhile each had to wait till the one could serve the other in the good cause.

Sixteen long years he had to wait with the other weary watchers for the dawn! Think of that, good reader! It is worth meditating upon by you and me, who reap a hundred-fold of the fruits of the waiting, and patience, and unconquerable resolve of those men. It meant, on the one hand, the most wanton and irresponsible use of means which were intended for the well-being of the Commonwealth, and the pains and penalties of the stoniest-hearted of inquisitors. It meant, on the other, a fixed determination to oppose in every possible way, and to overthrow, if possible, this state of things, and unquestionable tact, wariness, and insight. He who would make his hand felt in these circumstances, could only be a man of clear insight, sure discrimination, and wise, swift decision. A pioneer in the jungle of tyranny, where unseen dangers lurked on every side, he could only spy out the land and make his ground sure behind him, or cut a path through it to the clear light of freedom beyond, by mixing conscientiousness and craftiness in wise proportions. His special function, to change the figure, would be always that of the silent, steady sapper, on the springing of whose mine the fate of the hour mostly depended.

Not a very "noble" calling, say some of our readers, thinking with a slight respectable shudder of Italian Carbonari or French Communists; yet a very necessary one, it will be allowed, for which all the nobler qualities are wanted, and in which they may have abundant scope. Carstares, at any rate, had no misgivings on the matter, nor had the most upright and distinguished statesmen and patriots of the period, the two Argyles, Bailie of Jerviswood, Lord Russell, and Algernon Sidney. It is easy for us to be squeamish; and we can afford to conjure up scruples. The iron has not entered our souls. There are times when honest men who love truth and freedom, and who prefer realities to superstitions, cannot but be plotters. Where open warfare with an intolerable evil is impossible, recourse must be had to secret craft; and the citadel which cannot be stormed, must be approached through trench and

mine. This was such a time. Let us only use our historical imagination to conceive its real character and the actual condition of the nation, and we shall see that the misgovernment was such as made resistance the duty of the subject, and passive obedience the proof and badge of cowards and slaves. We are, therefore, not to honor those only who perished in the conflict and by a mere accident became martyrs, but those not less who braved all things, and were ready to suffer all things, and whose good work remains, but who were not counted victims of mark, were not what Beaton called "high game," or who were more expert at concealing their hand, and lived to see the reward of their prolonged and heroic endurance. Fame dependent upon accident! It is a shame it so often is; a disgrace it has so long been so, owing to prejudice and ignorance.

We could not easily get a better illustration of the necessity for the application of this principle in our historical judgments than the case of Carstares during those years. We find everything in it which marks the man of devoted, high purpose, and of that rare metal which enables a man to carry this out in the teeth of every opposition. We find him, as in the Shaftesbury or Great Whig Plot, in which he was very deeply involved, a farther seeing man than most of his superiors, whose restlessness and ignorance of men and circumstances he had to check and direct as best he could.* Wherever he is, and whatever he may engage himself with for a time, his one abiding thought and aim is always the same. He has a hand in the chief plots, is deep in the secrets, and is one of the most active correspondents of the time. Sir George Mackenzie correctly described him as "the chaplain of the conspiracy." Until he leads the religious exercises of William's troops on the beach at Torbay, he slackens no effort, nor fails in sagacity and dauntlessness, in endeavoring to bring about the only constitutional remedy, that is, a revolution, for the miseries of the reign of the English Tiberius.

These traits of his character we distinctly realise on reading his famous examination and torture before the Privy Council in

* McCormick, pp. 10-17. Story, chap. iv.

Edinburgh. He was brought before it for his connexion with the Great Plot. It is a revolting scene, but a true, vivid picture, in which persecuted and persecutors appear as history knows them. Let us look at it as told by Mr. Story.

“ A little before noon he was taken out of the irons and brought down to that long, low-browed chamber in the Parliament House, where the Privy Council held its sittings and tortured its victims. . . . The design of the Council was partly to satisfy the English Government, by proceeding against one of the most suspected of the Scotch accomplices in the recent conspiracy, but chiefly to extort from Carstares the secrets, which it was believed he possessed, relative to the plans of Argyle and the other malcontents abroad.

“ It must have been with no ordinary anxiety that he took his place at the bar, for though prepared to disclaim all share in any plot against the king's life or the established monarchy, and to palliate his concurrence in the designs of Russell and Argyle, on the plea that they only aimed at the redress of existing grievances, he did not know whether or not any discovery had been made of his own private correspondence with the most trusted agents of the Prince of Orange. He had kept up this correspondence with Fagel and with Bentinck until the very time of his arrest in England. What the secrets of it were he would never, even after the Revolution, reveal; but Fagel spoke of them to Burnet *as affairs of the greatest importance, the betrayal of which would have secured his free pardon, and laid the king and government under lasting obligation to Carstares*. Of these secrets, however, the Scotch inquisitors were ignorant; and the question to which they addressed themselves was Carstares's engagement in and knowledge of the recent plot.

“ After considerable parley about the outrageous illegality of the mode of questioning proposed by the Council, which Carstares firmly refused to comply with, the torture began. One of the bailies of Edinburgh and the executioner had been ordered to conduct the operation; and the king's smith was also in attendance with a new pair of thumbkins of improved construction. This little engine had been known in Muscovy, and brought home as a useful contribution to the resources of the executive, by General Dalzell. It is not unlike a miniature pair of stocks in steel, with a strong central screw. The thumbs are inserted in two apertures, and the upper bar is screwed down till the bones are crushed! Carstares's thumbs were put in and screwed down till the sweat of his agony poured over his brow and down his cheeks. The Duke of Hamilton, who was entirely opposed to the torturing system, rose and left the Council-room, followed by the Duke of Queensberry, who exclaimed to the Chancellor, ‘ I see he will rather die than confess.’ Perth ordered the executioner to give another turn, which was given with such violence that Carstares

broke silence, and cried out, 'The bones are squeezed to pieces.' 'If you continue obstinate,' roared the Chancellor, 'I hope to see every bone of your body squeezed to pieces!' Again and again he was asked, would he answer the queries of the Council; and assured that if he did not, he should be tortured day by day while he had life. General Dalzell at last in a rage left his seat at the table, and coming close to the prisoner, vowed that he would take him and roast him alive the next day, if he would not comply. Carstares did not waver for a moment. A sterner test must be applied, and the order was given for the boot. While his thumbs were still held fast in the thumbkins the boot was brought forward, and an attempt made to fit it on. The hangman, however, was so inexpert that he could not adjust the boot and the wedge. He had to take it off after a good deal of bungling, and applying himself anew to the thumbkins, turned the screw again and again, until Carstares appeared to be going to swoon. The torture had now lasted 'near an hour and a-half.' The executioner was ordered to remove the thumbkins, but found them so driven home that he could not, and the king's smith had to be sent for before the broken and mangled thumbs could be released. He was then sent back to the Tolbooth."*

That is a cameo from history of some rareness!

It was not his first experience of the Privy Council. In 1679 he left his prison in Edinburgh Castle after four and a-half years' confinement on account of his treasonable activities. At that time he learned where his enemies were weak and where he was strong. He had heard that he would find favor if he would but tell names, which "I hope," he writes, "through grace never to do. I bless the Lord my imprisonment hath put the thoughts of giving them satisfaction in this matter of names further from me than ever." Happily he was able to keep his brave resolve; in this fiery trial, "through grace," he bore himself with admirable prudence and conspicuous stoutness of heart.

It was his last experience, however. Bearing in his thumbs

* Story, chap. v. After the Revolution, the thumbkins were presented by the Privy Council to Carstares (whose family still has them). King William expressed a wish to see them and to try them on. They were accordingly fastened on the royal thumbs, and Carstares gave the screw a courtier-like turn. "Harder," said the king, and another was given. "Again," and Carstares turned the screw pretty sharply. "Stop, doctor, stop," cried William, "another turn would make me confess anything."

the marks of the tyranny which was crushing the life and thought out of his country, he lost no time in once more leaving it. Since he had left Holland, two years before, he had lain in four different prisons—in the Gatehouse, the Tolbooth, the castles of Edinburgh and of Stirling. And this was only part of the price his love of liberty was costing him. The heaviest price, for the moment, was that his aged father had turned against him. Although he had himself, in his prime, striven against this same tyranny, he had now grown weary and moody, and thought exceedingly ill of his son's political leanings and complications. They were unbecoming a minister of the gospel; he would bring disgrace upon them all—and so he would not even see him! The father was not unwilling to eat the crumbs which fell from the tyrant's table, and, in hope of better things, to accept the Indulgence. The son had other hopes; a fairer vision filled his eye. Meanwhile, like many a pioneer in the way of liberty, of truth, and of knowledge, he had to go on his way alone, trusting in God and in his own brave heart. Singularly self-gathered, shrewd, very patient, buoyant, and with a clear, steady glow of enthusiasm under all, which no pains and penalties had dulled or damped, he turned his eyes, with the braver and bolder spirits of that suffering time, to Holland, the only spot in Europe whence help was possible. "There a great company of exiles lamented their country's wrongs, and waited for the day of deliverance. There a young and sagacious prince, the head of a free commonwealth, a Protestant and Presbyterian, was maintaining the rights of his people and the cause of religious liberty against all the might of France, and in spite of the hostility of England. If help was to be found anywhere, it must surely be found in Holland." This was in 1685.

In three years more the day of deliverance came, and England and Scotland were again free to their own children, and ruled according to the spirit of their common laws. These were three years of profound anxiety to William, and of ceaseless effort to William's party. Carstares comes into notice as one of this party. We find him carrying on an important correspondence with Sir James Stuart, who expressed the mind of James II., and whose

letters did much to pave the way for the Revolution. This correspondence extended through the whole of 1687, and was regularly communicated to William. Carstares now lived in Leyden, the chief attraction of which was its nearness to the Hague and the court of the Prince of Orange. The great crisis, now fast ripening, depended very much for its success on accurate information on the state of public opinion, and on the characters of the public men of the two countries. The expeditions of Argyle and Monmouth had failed because of their untimely birth. William would not fail in his enterprise from a like reason, nor would he stir a foot until he had carefully sounded every part of his perilous way. *To do this was the special function of Carstares.* The Prince had not forgotten his past services. None knew his worth better, or felt his need more. He had not forgotten the secrets which Carstares had kept buried in his bosom, despite torture, imprisonment, and even banishment; secrets which could not have been discovered without probably changing the verdict of history on some aspects of William's policy. He was accordingly admitted to the Prince's most confidential counsels, and in concert with Bentinck and Fagel and Burnet, discussed throughout that winter the momentous questions of the hour. At the same time he was made one of the Prince's chaplains, and, in addition, was appointed to the second charge of the Scots Church in Leyden, a charge which William founded entirely on his account.

But this was the beginning of the end. The streaks of the long-looked for dawn were gladdening the distant horizon. The hour for striking the great blow in defence of the Protestant religion and the liberties of England was at hand, and, as William would have more need than ever of men like his newly-appointed chaplain, he ordered him to join his retinue. What mingled feelings must have agitated him as he sailed out of Helvoetsluys, in company with the most distinguished of the refugees, in the frigate which bore the Prince's flag, with its new and happily chosen device! What thankfulness and gratification for the past! what hopes and fears for the future! These feelings, which were not evanescent nor suppressed amid the bustle and excitement on

board, found a fit opportunity for public expression on reaching Torbay. Nothing could be more appropriate, he thought, than for the army to engage in a solemn religious service as its first act on English ground. Did the thought of young Cleland at Drumclog, or of Cromwell at Marston Moor, blend with his feelings at the moment? Anyhow, his suggestion met with the cordial approval of William. Accordingly, when the troops had all landed, they were drawn up on parade, and Carstares at their head conducted divine service, after which, as they stood along the beach, they joined in singing the 118th Psalm before they encamped. A master-stroke of genius or tact, which made a profound impression both on soldiers and spectators.

In six weeks after, James II. was a fugitive, his cause lost, and the country free. Carstares no longer needed to play the conspirator. More congenial, but, as it turned out, not less anxious work lay before him in this, the middle period of his career, in which all his strength and wisdom were fully tasked and finely displayed.

One of the first official acts of William in regard to Scotch affairs, was to appoint Carstares to be chaplain to their Majesties for Scotland, intimating at the same time that he required his constant attendance upon his person, and assigning him apartments in his own palace when in England, and expenses for camp equipage when in the field. This was simply the official sanction of his place in the king's counsels. As a clergyman of the Church of Scotland, he could hold no higher post in connexion with the Court; but every one knew that on all Scotch affairs he was William's confidential adviser and secretary, and had more of his confidence and more influence with him than any other person. It was well for Scotland and the Revolution that William had such a man to advise with. When we look closely into the state of parties and opinion which existed then, and consider the measures which alone could meet the public wants, and the measures which became law, we shall clearly see this. Scotland was remote; if measured by the hour, it was as far from London then as St. Petersburg is now. Its factions were embittered with a bitterness hardly known in England, and such as had

not been known in Holland since the days of John of Barneveld. Its political life was utterly demoralised. It had, moreover, a peculiar trouble almost native to itself. At a time when continental statesmen, accepting the principles of Cardinal Richelieu, were trying to divorce things sacred from things secular, the chief men in Scotland were almost theocratic in opinion, and unable therefore to imagine that it might be right to separate matters of faith from matters of government. That familiar knowledge of the questions which were inevitable in such circumstances, and of the persons on whom their settlement must chiefly depend, which he himself could not have, nor indeed cared to acquire, William had ready to hand in Carstares. Him he knew, and could implicitly trust. And such had been their relations in the past, such the devotion of the one and the confidence of the other, that it was highly probable that whatever political crisis might arise in connexion with the settling of the government of Scotland, the sagacity and personal knowledge of the subject would be the guide and stay of the sovereign.

The first thing to be settled was whether Scotland should be Presbyterian or Episcopalian. A good deal could be said in favor of the Episcopal Church. William himself was a Presbyterian; but the form of religious worship was nothing to him. Hence, although a Presbyterian among his countrymen, because they would not have bishops to rule over them, he was an Episcopalian in England, because her people would. On one point, and on one point only, was he most earnest and most resolute, and that was, that religious toleration should be granted to all his subjects! With these views, it is needless to say that he was certain to meet with insurmountable difficulties in dealing with the religious questions of his new kingdoms. Neither presbyter nor bishop could see eye to eye with him on this point. It was natural for him, as a Netherlander, to think in this way; but the thing, however beautiful in Milton's or Jeremy Taylor's prose, was quite unknown in the common practice of England and Scotland.

These differences of opinions meet us on the very threshold of William's reign. The one breathes through the famous *Claim of*

Right, which was prepared by a select committee, and adopted by the Convention of Estates. One of the declarations in it is, that Prelacy and the superiority of any office in the Church above presbyters is, and has been, a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and therefore ought to be abolished. The other we see on the occasion of William taking the Coronation Oath, and see it clashing with that other. The last clause makes the king swear that "he shall root out all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God, that shall be convicted by the true kirk of God of the foresaid crimes." When the Earl of Argyle, who read the oath, came to this clause, William paused and said, "I will not lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor." With the new turn of affairs had come a new epoch, and a king who would quickly bend his subjects to his mind and the demands of the time! It was a good omen for the future that such sentiments had been spoken from the throne; but how far these would influence and determine that future would very much depend on those who surrounded it, and mediated between the Crown and the Church.

William Carstares was raised up and qualified by all his previous life for this all-important work. If mediation between the Crown and the Church was the one thing needing to be done for Scotland, he was fitted as no other to do it. He knew what religious persecution and its deplorable consequences were; and he had seen the blessings and tasted the sweets of toleration in his second home, Holland. He at least did not need the powerful arguments which John Locke had just penned from Utrecht in his famous *Letters*, to convince him that freedom of conscience was each man's inalienable right, and religious persecution a wickedness and a blunder. Moreover, his experiences had made it impossible for him to believe that bishops were vessels of special divine grace. He had found and seen more Christian love in a land where there were none, than he had found or seen at the hands of Archbishop Sharp and his consecrated companions in cruelty. The form of church government was not the essential thing. What mattered it, if the Church herself was fair as the moon and clear as the sun with the graces of her divine Lord?

Was not the best and the one only convincing proof of her divine origin the fact that in her midst dwelt a visible, unworldly, sin-conquering, loving spirit?

These were novel views, and in fact were quite "modern." Carstares had long parted from the narrow spirit of his fathers, which he did not doubt had been natural and justifiable in their circumstances; and had no sympathy with the querulous, fantastical, hair-splitting tendencies which still prevailed among his countrymen. Did they not discern the signs of the times? If they would hold by the past, they must, if wise, at least prepare for, and if possible anticipate, the future. The old views in the new order would not do. The thoughts of men had been widened by recent events; and it would be simply recognising this to see to it with all speed and good feeling, that the walls of their common Jerusalem were rebuilt on broader foundations than the last, with ampler courts and opener gates. But it was because he held these views that he was able to influence successfully the ecclesiastical affairs of his country. He was the first Scottish Churchman who brought down theoretical church questions from the clouds, and put them on the ground of practical convenience. And he did this for what seemed to him the best of reasons. No one knew better the value and meaning of the sufferings of the past forty years; but these did not blind him to his duty and to the duty of the Church in their altered circumstances. The Covenants had served their day and generation nobly, and had handed down a priceless possession, with many immortal memories; but it was clear as day to him that they were no longer needed. They had become things of the past, and must now be left behind with its other memorials; and if the Church would be equal to her opportunity, they must have no distinct, narrowing influence on the Revolution settlement. It was emphatically a time for forbearance, patience, and large-mindedness. The jars, divisions, and mystical shibboleths which had distracted and deluded the Church must be given up. The heroic virtues must give place to the prudential ones; and precisely in proportion as these were forthcoming, could she hope that her broken walls would be restored and her gates made beautiful. Toleration and

comprehension were the two ideas of William's ecclesiastical policy; and Carstares believed that, in a modified form, they were quite practicable even in Scotland.

If we turn now to the ecclesiastical history of the period, we shall find the name of Carstares on every page of it, endeavoring to carry out these principles. How he did this; how he formed and guided the policy of the king in the reëstablishment of Presbyterianism in 1689 and 1690; how he labored to heal, restore, and rebuild; how far he succeeded; how far and why he failed, as on the question of patronage; how he was understood and regarded by his contemporaries—these are told us by Mr. Story in his best style, and with a fulness and judiciousness which leave nothing to be desired.* This portion of our national story is little known. It was not an heroic age; and certainly we are under very strong temptations to pass it over. The details, indeed, as is well said by the above-named writer, can now hardly be the object of very keen human sympathy. The mutual jealousies of Presbyterians and Episcopalians—the harshness of the one, the stiffness of the other—occupy the foreground so noisily and obtrusively, and cross each other in such involved movement, that one is apt to watch them rather with a sense of wearied confusion than of hearty interest. The scene is ennobled by none of the heroic lights and shadows of Knox's conflict with the ancient Church. Its tameness is not stirred by any of the rough but hardy independence of Andrew Melville's wrestlings with King James. It lacks alike the wild fire of the early covenant and the rich lustre of the varied learning and sound churchmanship which give weight to the counsels and dignity to the contests of Henderson and Bailie.† For all that, the work which then fell to be done was as needful as any done in earlier times, and called for no less earnestness and skill, and for fully more devotion, as being work done often silently and out of sight, amid a hundred-fold meaner annoyances, and sustained by no loud encouragements of popular applause. The best of this work

* How singularly bitter he is, though, towards the Scotch Episcopalists! It is suggestive to compare his and Stanley's remarks on them.

† Story, p. 201.

was done by Carstares, either directly or indirectly. He was the first great preacher of the new National Covenant. He is the one figure of the period cast in heroic mould; and the one and only touch of romance it has is an incident of which he was the hero.

This incident brings out so clearly all that is here claimed for him, that no estimate of his character would be complete without it. It happened in 1694, and happened thus: The Crown and the Church had been pulling opposite ways for some time, and William, in consequence, had assumed the high hand. The King believed that the Church was dealing too harshly with the Episcopal incumbents; the Church believed that the King was absurdly well affected towards them. To make matters worse, the Church grew mulish, and the Assembly of 1692 had to be summarily dissolved after a month's sederunt. This summary dissolution kindled much resentment; and in the following year this feeling rose to the highest pitch, in consequence of a fresh offence done it. "An Act for settling the quiet and peace of the Church," as it was soothingly called, had been passed in Parliament, which required the Church to admit the incumbents on certain conditions, and also demanded the calling of a General Assembly. The Church was in a ferment, and loudly exclaimed about Episcopalian craft and royal Erastianism. The King was out of hearing, however, although at the best rather indifferent about Scottish Church affairs. He had been listening to Tarbat, whose personal leanings were towards Episcopacy, and to the Master of Stair, to whom churches, parties, and principles were only so many pieces on the political chess-board, to be moved hither or thither, or swept aside, as best suited his purpose. Having made up his mind in ignorance of the actual state of feeling at the moment, he called an Assembly, and sent down orders to Lord Carmichael, who was the Commissioner, that the ministers must acknowledge his authority before they took their seats; and that if they refused to do so, the Assembly was to be dissolved. This brings us to the incident itself, as told by M'Cormick, Carstares's first biographer and grand-nephew.*

* M'Cormick, pp. 58-61.

“ After Lord Carmichael’s arriving in Edinburgh and communicating his orders to some of the clergy in town, he found them obstinate in their resolutions not to comply. They assured him that their sentiments upon the subject were the same with those of all their brethren in the country; and that if this measure were persisted in, it would spread a flame over the country which it would not be in the power of such as had given his Majesty these counsels to extinguish.

“ The Commissioner saw that all his attempts to bring them to better temper would be vain and fruitless. At the same time he was sensible that the dissolution of the Assembly would not only prove fatal to the Church of Scotland, to which he was a real friend, but also to his Majesty’s interest in that kingdom. From a sincere regard to both, therefore, he undertook to lay the matter, as it stood, fairly before the king; and for that purpose sent off a flying packet, which he expected to return from London with the king’s final determination the night before the Assembly was appointed to meet. At the same time the clergy sent up a memorial to Mr. Carstares (who happened to be away from court on leave of absence), urging him to use his good offices in this critical conjuncture, for the preservation of that Church which he had so active a hand in establishing.

“ The flying packet arrived at Kensington in the forenoon of that day upon which Mr. Carstares returned. But before his arrival his Majesty, by the advice of Lord Stair and Lord Tarbat, who represented the obstinacy of the clergy as an act of rebellion against his government, had renewed his instructions to the Commissioner, and sent them off by the same packet.

“ When Mr. Carstares came to Kensington and received his letters, he immediately inquired what was the nature of the dispatches his Majesty had sent off for Scotland; and upon learning the contents, he went directly, and in his Majesty’s name, required the messenger who was just setting off, to deliver them up to him. It was now late at night, and as he knew no time was to be lost, he ran to his Majesty’s apartment; and being informed by the lord in waiting that he was gone to bed, he told him it was a matter of the last importance which had brought him at that unseasonable hour, and that he must see the king.

“ Upon entering the chamber he found his Majesty fast asleep, upon which, turning aside the curtain, and falling down upon his knees, he gently awaked him. The king, astonished to see him at so late an hour, and in this posture by his bedside, asked him, ‘What was the matter?’ He answered, ‘he had come to ask his life.’ ‘And is it possible,’ said the king, ‘that you have been guilty of a crime that deserves death?’ He acknowledged he had, and then produced the dispatches he had brought back from the messenger. ‘And have you,’ says the king, with a severe frown, ‘have you indeed presumed to countermand my orders?’

Mr. Carstares then begged leave only to be heard a few words, and he was ready to submit to any punishment his Majesty should think proper to inflict.

“The king heard him with great attention, and when he had done, gave him the dispatches to read, and desired him to throw them in the fire; after which he bade him draw up the instructions to the Commissioner in what terms he pleased, and he would sign them. Mr. Carstares immediately wrote to the Commissioner, signifying that it was his Majesty’s pleasure to dispense with putting the oaths to the ministers; and when the king had signed it, he immediately dispatched the messenger, who, by being detained so many hours longer than he intended, did not arrive in Edinburgh till the morning of the day fixed for the sitting of the Assembly.

“By this time both the Commissioner and the clergy were in the utmost perplexity; he was obliged to dissolve the Assembly; they were determined to assert their own authority, independent of the civil magistrate. To their inexpressible joy they were relieved by the return of the packet countermanding the dissolution of the Assembly.”

Was it a mistake to call this man the “second Founder” of the Church of Scotland? It is beyond controversy that he was “the person who persuaded King William to settle Presbytery in Scotland;”* and it is equally so that “that midnight interview decided that for evil or for good Scotland in future was to be emphatically Presbyterian.”† Where is the difference between the two statements? No matter how closely we look into the ecclesiastical events of this period, we shall as distinctly mark the influence of his clear, decisive, charitable spirit, which was willing to be all things to all men in the true apostolic meaning, as we mark the terrible unbending scorn and rude humorous zeal of Knox in the Reformation period.

After reading of this “famous instance of his power, unique in the history of Princes and Churches,”‡ we see the point and appropriateness of the nickname of “Cardinal,” by which he was usually known at court. This was in allusion to the saying of Isabella of Spain’s great minister, Cardinal Ximenes, that he could play at foot-ball with the heads of the Castilian courtiers. And indeed it is a most remarkable and even impressive spectacle

* Dalrymple, quoted by Story, p. 165.

† Story, p. 244. And all the writers on this period. ‡ Stanley, p. 117.

to see this plain Presbyterian minister holding the threads of the King's Scottish policy in his own hands, drawing up minute after minute for consideration in the royal closet, and being the final referee in most appointments to office. The great mass of his correspondence preserved by his first biographer proves how completely communication between Scotland and William lay under Carstares's control. Every question touching the government of the northern kingdom seems to have been laid before him, and every measure ruled, more or less, by his advice. Rarely in any age, and not at all in that age, has so much power been used so modestly and beneficently. No one spot tarnishes his good name. Neither insolence, selfishness, nor pride had any place in him or in his ways. The principles which guided him in these matters are expressed in one of his characteristic replies to a needy noble who had been begging a place for a needier friend, and were these: "The good of my country, the satisfaction of friends, and the contenting of honest men in general."

None knew better than William himself that these were his principles. Amongst a multitude who sought their own advantage, and were ready to serve him or betray him for the highest bribe, William knew he could always find in this one man an unselfish fidelity, a patriotism as incorruptible as Knox's, or Melville's, or Marvell's, and counsel which was neither warped by personal ends, nor inflamed by political or ecclesiastical ambition. And he honored him accordingly.

"One morning," says the gossiping Wodrow, "when the king was in the closet, some Scotsmen fell a speaking to the king anent Mr. Carstares, and they told him it was the mind of his best friends he should be removed from about him; and the English bishops were taking umbrage that he should have so much of his ear. The king gave them no answer. Within a while the king came forth to the chamber of presence, and the onwaiters, nobility, and others, made a lane for him to go through them. At the entry of the lane Mr. Carstares stood. The king bowed to all as he came through them; when he came near to Mr. Carstares, he put out his hand to him, and said in the hearing of all, 'Honest William Carstares, how is all with thee this morning?' This was answer enough to his accusers."

More decisive still—nothing could be more so—of his profound regard for his chaplain and counsellor, was a gift to him on his

deathbed of a gold ring, containing a lock of his hair ; and these words concerning him, so like those others : “ I have known him long, and I knew him thoroughly, and I know him to be a truly honest man.”

After the death of William, Carstares, of course, ceased to have any place in royal counsels, or any direct management in Scottish affairs. It was not to be supposed, however, that a man of his rare experience and wisdom, especially at such a period, would be allowed to rust in retirement, or that he himself, so long an honored soldier in the cause of liberty and progress, and still in the prime of life, should desire to go into obscurity. Ere long an honorable position presented itself ; in the year after the death of his great patron, he was elected Principal of the University of Edinburgh. A new career of national usefulness awaited him here.

If there were any who demurred to his appointment on the score of unfitness, he speedily gave them cause to think well of him ; for so uncommon were his Latin orations, which he delivered at the opening of each session, that they made his most fastidious hearers fancy themselves transported to the Forum of ancient Rome. Shortly after he was appointed, in addition to this office, to Greyfriars' church. It was while here that a story was told of him which puts his manner and influence as a Churchman so vividly before us that room must be found for it. About the time of the Union a national fast had been appointed, which the violent opposers of that scheme amongst the clergy would not observe. Mr. Carstares had given his advice against the appointment ; but, as a zealous friend of the Union, he observed the fast. His colleague, who was equally zealous in his opposition to that measure, not only refused to observe it, but next Sunday took occasion in the forenoon sermon to throw out some bitter reflections upon the Union in general, and upon certain contrivers and promoters of it in particular, who, he alleged, were traitors to their country, and to the Church of Scotland, and had too great influence over their deluded brethren.

“ As this violent attack was directly pointed at Mr. Carstares, it fixed the eyes of the congregation upon him, whilst with great composure he began to turn over the leaves of his Bible. His colleague's discourse

being considered by the people as a formal challenge to Mr. Carstares to vindicate his conduct, a great crowd, from all corners of the city, were assembled to hear him in the afternoon, when he gave out for the subject these words of the psalmist, 'Let the righteous smite me, it will not break my bones.' From which he took occasion, with great calmness of temper, to vindicate his colleague from any suspicion of being deficient in regard and affection for him; that though he differed from him in his sentiments on some points, yet he was sure both of them had the same end in view; and that, as he knew the uprightness of his colleague's intentions, and the goodness of his heart, he was determined to consider any admonitions or rebukes directed to himself from that place as the strongest expressions of his love."*

It was this eminently Christian temper, combined with his sagacity and general breadth of view, enabling him to forecast and provide for the changes of the future, which shone out conspicuously during the third and last period of his life, and which leaves the impression upon our minds of his being one of the noblest Christian patriots, and, without doubt, "one of the most illustrious benefactors of the Scottish Church and nation."†

When Carstares transferred his residence from London to Edinburgh, clouds were darkening the political sky, and already had been heard some mutterings of the coming storm. That imbroglio was beginning which was to end in the Union; and Jacobite strategems, Episcopal pretensions, Presbyterian jealousies, national prejudices, personal dishonesties, and political corruptions, had already begun to show themselves. The presence of this calm and judicious churchman, bringing his wide experience of courts, councils, and camps to this narrow and fiery centre of Scotch life and action at Edinburgh, must have been a felt blessing to the few wise and honest patriots who were taking their share in forwarding the good of their country; while to his fellow-churchmen his name was a tower of strength. All had a vague, unnerving dread of mischief and misfortune about to happen. The people generally thought the Union an abject surrender of their national independence; a feeling which found its rhetorical expression in Belhaven's famous speech. The Church was afraid of the consequences that would happen to Presbyte-

* M'Cormick, p. 73.

† Stanley, p. 116.

rianism. The Cameronians were prepared for the worst. This one thing only was clear to all, to friends and foes alike, that nearly everything as regarded its success or failure was in the hands of the clergy.* At this crisis Carstares was elected Moderator of the General Assembly. Its meeting was satisfactory. Those who had watched for the halting of the Church were disappointed; Carstares, in his calm, impressive way, being able to say in his closing address:

“Many who wish not well to our interest have these days past come hither to spy out our liberty, and to catch at something that might be matter for their drollery; but they have seen the beauty of our harmony, the calmness with which our debates have been managed, the order that hath been in our proceedings, and the civil authority of the magistrates and the spiritual power of the Church kindly embracing each other. They saw it: they marvelled. They were troubled, and hasted away.”

Four times in eleven years he was elected Moderator, an honor borne by no other name in the Scottish Church. Each time when he was raised to the office, either a crisis was imminent or dangers were feared. His high character, his skill in ruling debate, his words weighted with an experience possessed by no other member of that Court, his unquestioned knowledge of men and parties, all drew his fellow churchmen to him on these occasions as to their natural leader; and on each occasion he acquitted himself to the satisfaction “of honest men in general.” In 1705, he induced them to support the Union, as the true policy of the Church, no less than of the country. In 1708, the year after it had become law, he allayed their imaginary fears and their real irritation. In 1711, he presided when the Greenshields case was in every one’s mind; and in 1715, when the flames of Jacobite rebellion were kindling in the north, he was again in the Moderator’s chair.

Could we get a stronger proof of the place Carstares held in the eyes of his country? And what his influence must have been we can easily imagine, when we remember that the General Assembly was yet unbroken in its power, could still launch its

* Story, p. 275. Cunningham, Vol. II., pp. 334–5. M’Cormick, p. 75.

excommunications with effect, and was to the body of Presbyterians the voice of authority. This influence, as before, was consistently used on the side of righteousness and Presbyterian liberty. Peace, but not peace at any price; toleration, but not toleration for party ends; comprehension, but not comprehension in an obviously absurd sense, were what he argued for, advised, and achieved.* At a time when the old leaven of national intolerance and prejudice were stirred to their depths, and trifles seemed things of vital importance, this man's greatness was seen in repressing momentary considerations, and rising to general principles. How different would have been the issue, poor enough as that may seem to have been, had the Church been led by a man of narrower, noisier views, or who cared more for his party than for the commonweal! How easy to have plunged Church and State into chaos! Well might Queen Anne thank him personally for his services, and her chief statesmen feel assured that nothing would go wrong when his hand was on the helm. Well might the Elector, who was watching the course of events, and waiting hopefully at Hanover, speak of the Presbyterians of Scotland as his "best friends," and encourage their leader by his approving words.

But now with these, the main outlines of Carstares's career before us, let us turn aside for a little, and notice his manner of life and private character. These, happily, we have had described to us by more than one who knew him long and intimately. Whatever may be thought of his public actions, and however they may be interpreted, these indications of the spirit which was in the man will, at any rate, help us to understand them better.

First of all, no one will have any difficulty, we think, in picturing the appearance of the man. From all we know of him already, we imagine him to have had a face which would attract us. His portrait confirms us in our fancy. Much keenness,

* On these points see Story, (chap. xviii.,) whose view of Carstares's action in regard to the Toleration and the Patronage Acts is, we think, the true one; also, Cunningham, (Vol. II., p. 355,) who is not correct, in our opinion, in his estimate of the Toleration Act, although excellent, as usual, on the Patronage Act.

force, quiet honest look, strong social instincts, and a general cheerfulness are evident in it, the qualities which are everywhere seen in his life. How touching are these two incidents, very illustrative at the same time of the man!

“When he was imprisoned in the castle at Edinburgh, a little boy of twelve years old, son of Erskine of Cambo, governor of the castle, in the course of his rambles through the court, came to the grate of Carstares’s apartment. As he always loved to amuse himself with children, he went to the grate and began a conversation. The boy was delighted, and every day came to the prison-grate—told him stories, brought him provisions, took his letters to the post, was unhappy if Carstares had no errand to send and no favor to ask. When Carstares was released, they parted with tears on both sides. One of the first favors that Carstares asked of King William was that he would bestow the office of Lord Lyon on his young friend, to whom he owed so much; and he obtained it, with the additional compliment that it should be hereditary in the family. So in fact it continued, till it was unfortunately forfeited by the engagement of Erskine’s eldest son in the rebellion of 1745.

“Another story illustrates the freshness and simplicity of his pastoral character, amongst the absorbing public affairs which occupied him. His sister, the wife of a Fifeshire clergyman, had become a widow. Carstares had just arrived in Edinburgh from London, to transact business with King William’s ministers. She came over to Edinburgh, and went to his lodgings. They were crowded with the nobility and officers of State; and she was told she could not see him. ‘Just whisper,’ said she to the servant, ‘that I desire to know when it would be convenient for him to see me.’ He returned for answer, ‘*Immediately,*’ left the company, came to her, and most affectionately embraced her. On her attempting to apologise, ‘Make yourself easy,’ he said; ‘these gentlemen are come hither, not on my account, but their own. They will wait with patience till I return. You know I never pray long.’ And so, after a short fervent prayer, suited to her circumstances, he fixed the time for seeing her more at leisure, and returned in tears to the company.”*

As a minister, we read “that he was equally diligent and prudent, and applied himself with the greatest cheerfulness to the lowest and most toilsome offices thereof. He had an admirable gift, both of prayer and preaching; chose always to insist on the most weighty and important subjects of religion; and delivered his sermons so gravely and distinctly, and with such an acceptable pathos, as never failed to fix the attention of his hearers,

* M’Cormick. Stanley.

and greatly to promote their edification. His sermons were of that sort as he understood by the meanest capacities, and admired by the best judges." But what more need we than the sermon preached in reply to his colleague, to prove his power in that way? There are several other illustrations, however, of this, told us by the younger Calamy.

As a leader in the Church Courts, "his manner of speaking was calm, sententious, and decisive. Such was the respect for his character, that one sentence from him would often extinguish in a moment the most violent flame in the house. This authority which he had acquired he knew well how to maintain. In matters of lesser account he seldom spoke at all; in business of consequence he spoke only at the close of the debate, and it was a rare instance in which any ventured to speak after him."

As to his character generally, contemporary history is at one, and describes it thus:

"As his piety was unfeigned, so his charity was unbounded; more so, indeed, than his circumstances could well afford; for, whilst he had one farthing remaining in his pocket, he could not turn aside from any necessitous object that claimed his assistance. This was so well known to the poor that, whenever he went abroad, he was perpetually harassed by them, and was at last obliged to submit to a regulation, proposed to him by one of his friends who knew his foible; which was, to put only so much money in his pocket as he could conveniently spare for the purposes of ordinary charity.

"Amidst that publicity of business in which he was perpetually engaged, it is remarkable that he found abundance of leisure for the duties of hospitality. His house was a place of resort to all the youth of the best families and the most promising hopes, who were generally recommended to his attention during their course at the university; and he failed not to improve the opportunities which his station afforded him, of instilling into their minds, along with an ardor for study, the best regulations for their future conduct. Many of them, who have since acted their part in the most conspicuous stations, have not scrupled to own that it was to him they were indebted for the best maxims both in public and private life. . . .

"The clergy of all denominations were welcome to his family; particularly such of the Episcopal clergy as were deprived of their livings at the Revolution. He always treated them with peculiar tenderness and humanity. He often relieved their families when in distress, and took care to dispense his charities in such a manner as he knew would be

least burdensome to them. Some of them, who were his yearly pensioners, never knew from what channel their relief flowed, till they found by his death that the source of it was dried up."

This good and great man, whose heart so often warmed to suffering, which his hand was prompt to relieve, and whose clear and calm mind and persuasive voice had so long led the councils of his Church, was struck down with apoplexy. on 28th December, 1715, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. A little while before his death, those who watched beside him heard him say, "I have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

When his body was laid in the dust, in the venerable graveyard of his own church of Greyfriars, two men were observed to turn aside from the rest of the company, and bursting into tears, bewail their mutual loss. Upon inquiry, it was found that they were two Episcopal nonjurors, whose families for a considerable time had been supported by his benefactions.*

Surely as beautiful and strong a character as the Scottish Church has had!

"A courtier, he never used the royal favor for his private ends. A churchman, he never sought to separate the interests of his order from the interests of the nation. A statesman of rare sagacity and knowledge of state-craft, yet forbidden to enter in person the arena of public politics, he stood by without jealousy, ill-will, or intrigue, content if, through his private influence, he could impart to the policy of others a character that should be just, tolerant, and liberal. His principles and his action were free from all harshness and violence of extremes. A Presbyterian, bred in an age of prelatie persecution and sacerdotal arrogance, he was indulgent to differences of religious opinion, government, and ritual. A liberal, in days when political parties gave no quarter in their embittered strife, his liberalism was calm with the wisdom of experience, pure from all passion of the mob, large in its scope, constructive and conservative even in the midst of reform and revolution.

"That the 'Revolution Settlement,' in Church and State, was firmly established in Scotland; that the Union was peaceably effected; that the Church, instead of splitting into a number of hostile and fanatical sects, gradually accommodated itself to that relation with the State which at once guaranteed its constitutional freedom, and equipped it most efficiently for its sacred work—was mainly owing to Carstairs. Men who wield the sword and die in battle, and men who, with flaming

*M'Cormick.

zeal and quenchless energy, lead stormy factions in days of popular excitement, stamp their names in deeper impress upon the common memory than those who do the more quiet, thoughtful, and laborious work of controlling the impatient and inexperienced, and guiding the general intelligence and action. But when the havoc of the more hasty and passionate work has swept past, the result of the more quiet and orderly abides, although the names of the workers may be forgotten. For one Scotsman who has heard the name of Carstares, thousands are familiar with that of Dundee, though the actual life's work of the one is woven into the very frame-work of our national being and political constitution, and that of the other has been long since cast into the limbo of unremembered vanities. The verdict of History ought to redress the injustices of popular opinion and ignorant caprice, and raise the statues of real heroes to their pedestals. To it the memory of Carstares appeals; and we believe it will accord him, as he deserves, a place among the best and highest in the long and splendid roll of those Scotchmen who have deserved well of the republic."*

History will do this in her own calm, certain way. The more the mists of the past clear off from the fields of conflict and controversy, and men are judged by their influence and work, the clearer will the unassuming figure of William Carstares appear as the chief one in the Revolution era. He left no memorials behind him but his life; and history impartially surveying that, will rank him among our greatest, and place him beside Knox, Melville, Henderson, and Chalmers.

* Story, pp, 367-8. And see Stanley, whose estimate of him is as high.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Christian Ethics, or The True Moral Manhood and Life of Duty. A Text Book for Schools and Colleges. By. D. S. GREGORY, D. D., Professor of Moral Science, Logic, and Mathematics in the University of Wooster. Philadelphia: Eldridge & Brother, 17 North Seventh Street. 1875. Pp. 346, 12mo.

This work consists of Part I. and Part II., the former presenting THEORETICAL ETHICS—the theory of the Life of Duty; the latter presenting PRACTICAL ETHICS—duties in the Life of Duty. Under the FIRST HEAD it treats, 1. Of the Nature of the Moral Agent; 2. Of the Nature of Virtue or the Dutiful in Conduct; 3. The Philosophy of the Life of Duty. Under the SECOND HEAD it treats, 1. Of Individual Ethics—duties towards self, viz., self-conservation, self-culture, self-conduct; 2. Of Social Ethics—duties towards mankind, viz., General Ethics, or duties towards men in general, Economical Ethics, or duties in the household, Civil Ethics, or duties in the State; 3. Of Theistic Ethics—duties towards God, viz., supreme devotion of the intellect, of the heart, of the will to God.

It will be observed that the book takes a wide range of discussion. In lieu of any examination of it considered as a whole, we propose to notice its attitude upon sundry questions of the day, which may serve much better to convey to the reader's mind a just and satisfactory idea of its character and merits.

1. In treating of Civil Ethics, or Duties in the State, it is made plain that the work is *American*. It discusses the duties of the State towards its citizens and of the citizens towards the State, but it does not touch on the rights and duties of kings and the correlative ones of subjects. This hardly becomes a work claiming to be scientific. Indeed the author broadly declares that "sovereignty resides in the State itself," and "not in any king

or in any other ruler whatsoever." "The *divine right* of kings has therefore no basis on which to rest." (P. 295.) This smacks of Red Republicanism.

The author is altogether definite and positive in his views of the state's right to regulate popular education. It may "appoint the teachers, determine the text books, and control the internal regulations of each and every school, . . . provide for its support by taxation, and compel attendance." It is "the right and duty of the State to combine with this education such moral and religious instruction as will tend to bring men up to the proper moral elevation." (Pp. 299, 300.) These notions have very wide sweep.

He is also perfectly clear that the State must be religious and must acknowledge Christianity in its constitution and organic law, and in its institutions. (P. 306.) The opinion of Judge Story is quoted in favor of this view. (P. 307.)

On the subject of the citizen's duty to the State, the author admits distinctly that "open resistance," leading to civil war, "may become a most solemn duty to the oppressed citizens of any State." (P. 310.)

2. On the subject of truthfulness the author teaches that *it is never right to lie*. And he says the only open question is, What constitutes a lie? He refers in his answer to the three forms of falsehood which Aquinas has pointed out: 1st, Where a man departs from the truth to injure some one, which form of it all must condemn; 2ndly, Where a lie is told to benefit some one—here, he says, it may be doubted whether in any circumstances true, general, permanent good can be gained by falsehood; 3rdly, Where the object is neither to do good nor ill to any one, but for the purpose of amusement. Under this head he brings in (from Paley) parables, fables, novels, jests, ludicrous embellishments of a story, compliments in the subscriptions of a letter, a prisoner's plea "not guilty," an advocate's assertion of the justice of his client's case. The parables, etc., do not deceive, and therefore are not falsehoods; the compliments may deceive, and therefore ought always to be in strict accordance with the truth; the plea "not guilty" means only that the accused is willing to stand his trial, and

is proper; but the doctrine of Lord Brougham that an advocate is to know no one but his client, and must clear him if possible, *per fas et nefas*, is pronounced to be "simply diabolical morality." The author says "the notoriously impious and wicked" are not to be defended. (P. 250.) These notions are oblivious of the essential imperfection of human justice, and of the necessity there is to limit the power of rulers to take life. It is fundamental to any system of free government that ten guilty men escape rather than one innocent man be condemned, and that the life of the subject or citizen is not to be sacrificed without giving him every possible means and opportunity of vindicating himself from the charge.

As to cases where there is no claim to be told the truth, this author says the military commander is not bound to reveal his stratagems to the enemy, nor the traveller to tell the robber where he shall find his purse. But the question is whether the enemy or the robber may be *deceived* by falsehood spoken or acted? Dr. Hodge, from whom the author constantly borrows, goes further than he has done, and approves of the general actually misleading his adversary, and we think most persons would agree with him, and yet that is a clear case of deceiving. Again, Dr. Hodge says (Syst. Theol. III., 441): "Few men would be so scrupulous as to refuse to keep a light in a room when robbery was apprehended, with the purpose of producing the impression that the members of the household were on the alert." And he takes the ground broadly that "intention to deceive therefore is an element in the idea of falsehood. But even this is not always culpable." "It is generally admitted that in criminal falsehood there must be not only the enunciation or signification [that is by action if not in words] of what is false and an intention to deceive [thereby] but also a violation of some obligation." Now the general's "adversary has no right to suppose that his apparent intention is his real purpose." And "Elisha was under no obligation to aid the Syrians in securing his person and taking his life, and they had no right to assume that he would thus assist them. And therefore he did no wrong in misleading them." Dr. Hodge goes still further, and main-

tains that "the general obligation to speak the truth" may be "merged or lost for the time being in a higher obligation." He illustrates thus: a robber demands your purse, and it is said to be right to deny that you have anything of value about you. But "the obligation to speak the truth is a very solemn one, and where the choice is left a man to tell a lie or lose his money, he had better let his money go. On the other hand, if a mother sees a murderer in pursuit of her child, she has a perfect right to mislead him by any means in her power, because the general obligation to speak the truth is merged or lost for the time being in the higher obligation. This principle is not invalidated by its possible or actual abuse. It has been abused. Jesuits taught that the obligation to promote the good of the Church absorbed or superseded every other obligation. And therefore in their system, not only falsehood and mental reservation, but perjury, robbery, and assassination became lawful if committed with the design of promoting the interests of the Church. Notwithstanding this liability to abuse, the principle that a higher obligation absolves from a lower stands firm. . . . The Jesuits erred in assuming that the promotion of the interests of the Church (in their sense especially of the word Church) was a higher duty than obedience to the moral law. They erred also in assuming that the interests of the Church could be promoted by the commission of crime; and their principle was in direct violation of the scriptural rule that it is wrong to do evil that good may come." Dr. Hodge goes on to say "the question now under consideration is not whether it is ever right to do wrong, which is a solecism; nor is the question whether it is ever right to lie, but rather, What constitutes a lie? It is not simply an *enunciatio falsi* . . . but there must be an intention to deceive when we are expected and bound to speak the truth. That is there are circumstances in which a man is not bound to speak the truth, and therefore there are cases in which speaking or intimating what is not true is not a lie." (*Ibid.*, pp. 442, 3.)

These broad statements of Dr. Hodge the author seems not prepared exactly to adopt. His remark is: "It is more than doubtful if it is not better to adhere strictly to the principles

already laid down, as applicable to the second form of falsehood." To us Dr. Hodge's doctrine appears to be altogether untenable as well as exceedingly dangerous. The Jesuits said falsehood and other crimes are lawful for the good of the Church. Dr. Hodge says they erred in assuming that to promote the good of the Church was a higher duty than obedience to the moral law. Does he not err as much in assuming that for a mother to save her child's life is a higher obligation than to obey the same moral law? Dr. Hodge says a man must let his money go rather than tell a lie to save it, and why not the mother let her child's life go rather than tell a lie? Is it not wrong for her to do evil that good may come? But, says Dr. Hodge, it is no evil, it is no lie to speak what is not true, in any case where we are not expected and bound to speak the truth. Expected by whom? By the other party. But does not God expect and bind us to speak the truth always, and could not he save the mother's child without her lie if it was best?

Dr. Thornwell more consistently says "the right of another to know the truth is not the ground of my obligation when I speak at all to speak the truth. It is the ground in many cases of my obligation to speak—that may be freely confessed; but if independently of this ground, I choose upon any other considerations to open my lips, the law of sincerity must apply to my discourse. The absence of the right in question on the part of my neighbor can operate no further than to justify me in being silent; it exempts me from all obligation to signify at all. But it by no means imparts to me a right to speak falsely. . . . How much nobler and safer is the doctrine of the Scriptures and of the unsophisticated language of man's moral constitution that truth is obligatory on its own account, and that he who undertakes to signify to another, no matter in what form and no matter what may be the right in the case to know the truth, is bound to signify according to the convictions of his own mind!" "To those therefore who would ask, Why am I bound to speak the truth? I would briefly answer, Because it is the law of our nature; it is a fundamental datum of conscience, a command of God impressed upon the moral structure of the soul." (Works, Vol. II., pp. 540-542, 528.)

And yet Dr. Thornwell allows of "partial or evasive information (which, however, must always be correct as far as it goes,) in which the design is not deception but concealment." (P. 532.) But he condemns whenever we "deceive in order to conceal. We do not *cover* but *misrepresent* our mind, which can never be lawful, however important the ends it is intended to accomplish; and when these ends are incapable of being answered in any other way, we should take it as a clear intimation from Providence that we are required to abandon them." (P. 533.) Of course, then, Dr. Thornwell would not sanction a general's building watch-fires and keeping up other appearances designed to mislead his enemy, whilst he saved his little army from total destruction through these feints by marching them away in the night.

We confess that we find a *puzzle* in some of these questions about lying. Why may there not be puzzles in moral science as in other sciences? Generally as to truth-telling the path of duty is plain enough, but cases may be supposed which we are not able satisfactorily to solve. We have looked in vain for a solution of such in this new text book of morals as we have in every other. Evidently he was *gravelled* with Dr. Hodge's sophistical reasonings, and gave the question up.

On the subject of *extorted promises*, our author is as loose as it is possible to be. "An extorted promise is not binding. Where the consent is not voluntary, of course there is no obligation to fulfil the promise." (P. 252.)

Let us put alongside of this lax morality what Dr. Thornwell says: "As to extorted promises, the only point to be settled is the subjective condition of the agent. Did he voluntarily signify, and did he know the import of the signs he employed? If he was in such a state of agitation and alarm that he could not command the use of his faculties—if, in other words, he was deprived for the time of the essential elements of moral agency—he could be no more responsible for his acts than an idiot or a lunatic. But if he *knew* what he was doing, no violence of fear, no external pressure, can exempt him from responsibility. The act was voluntary, though not chosen for itself. The man was in circum-

stances which led him to prefer it as the least of two evils. He therefore, in a moral sense, deliberately promised, and the obligation is the same as in all other cases. The true security against being drawn into an engagement which we are subsequently reluctant to perform, is that firm reliance upon the providence of God which enables us to look upon danger with contempt or to regard nothing as a danger which does not shake our claim upon the divine protection. . . . The preservation of integrity should be superior to all other considerations, and it is a miserable confession of weakness that the love of life or limb has been stronger than the love of virtue. . . . Those circumstances in which cowardice yields and puts in the plea of extortion, constitute the occasions on which the Christian hero may illustrate the magnanimity of his principles." (Vol. II., pp. 552, 3.)

3. On the subject of slavery, of course we could not expect, after what we have already seen, that this writer could present anything original, discriminating, or profound. Hear him on what the Scriptures teach respecting slavery: "The so-called scriptural argument for slavery has as its foundation the fact that the divine system of the Scriptures found slavery existing in the world, and did not directly prohibit it by positive command. It, however, set at work the principle of brotherly love, and prescribed regulations, which, when permitted to work, must always speedily destroy slavery." Now (1.) the Scriptures not only did not prohibit slavery, but they treat it as a lawful and proper relation of man to man, and regulate by express commands the duties which grow out of it on both sides. (2.) If the principle of brotherly love is to make the master emancipate his slave, so would it require the rich man to share his estate with his poor neighbors. (3.) The regulations of the Scripture never have speedily destroyed slavery. What does Babington testify in his Hulsean Lecture "on the influence of Christianity in promoting the abolition of slavery in Europe?" He says, "Christianity had been constantly producing such an effect upon society, that, when a *thousand years* had passed away, strict personal slavery had in most parts of Europe *begun* to disappear. Adam Smith, Hallam, and Macau-

lay all speak of the abolition of slavery in Europe as having been very silently and imperceptibly effected; and Guizot, Muratori, Millais, Sismondi, and the pictorial historian of England, allow Christianity very little share in effecting this abolition. And what was it which brought about emancipation in this country? Certainly it was not Christianity; for as a matter of fact it was resorted to as a war measure, while as to the influences operating for thirty years on the public conscience against the institution, they were not derived from Christian, but humanitarian doctrine. The abolitionists always reasoned from a morality better than the Bible's, which of course necessarily constitutes infidelity. The Bible teaches that we are all brethren; but Esau and Jacob were literal brothers, and yet God said "the elder shall serve the younger." The subjection by God of one man and one nation to another is supposed throughout the Bible as an ordinary and constantly recurring fact. The tenth commandment, graven with the finger of God upon marble, gives to us a divine solemn recognition of rights of property—"Thou shalt not covet any thing that is thy neighbor's." But the same divine commandment sanctions the right of property in a human being—"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's." Does Almighty God then count slaves as human cattle? Is the slave a mere thing? Far from it. He is an immortal man, but has a human master by divine appointment, and that master has a right of property in him—has a right to his services which no other man can innocently covet.

Our author speaks of "man's natural right to liberty." Now, it is not true that all men simply as men have a natural right to an equal amount of property or an equal share of personal liberty. There are rights belonging to man as such which cannot be wrested from him without the destruction of his intellectual and moral constitution—without them he could not be a man. But there are other rights which accrue in the progress of society, appertaining not to man *as such*, but to man in particular providential circumstances and relations. These rights are as natural as others, because society and civilisation, which develop them

are natural, but they cannot be separated from the circumstances and relations which determine them, and hence men in other circumstances and other relations can lay no claim to them. The foundation of all right is in the nature God has given to man. Rights can no where exist except amongst those who are susceptible of moral obligation. All those rights, therefore, which belong to men as such, should be conceded to them. None should anywhere be deprived of them. But the rights belonging to particular conditions—those which result from the circumstances and relations in which men are placed—must obviously admit of as great variety as those circumstances and relations themselves.

Apologetic Lectures on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity, delivered in Leipsic in the winter of 1864. By CHR. ERNST LUTHARDT, Doctor and Professor of Theology. Translated from the Seventh German edition by SOPHIE TAYLOR. Third edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

The apologetics of Christianity vary as its enemies in the different ages of the world change their front in the conflict. Sometimes it has been attacked by the advocates of paganism, and quite as often by the schools of philosophy. From Athenagoras, Quadratus, Tatian, and Justin Martyr of the second century, down to the present day, it has not lacked defenders. The later objections have come from the field of science, where, in one department, the old materialistic doctrines of Epicurus, a little modified are revived anew, so that the lines of Juvenal are again significant—

“Sunt qui in Fortunæ jam casibus omnia ponant,
Et nullo credant mundum rectore moveri,
Natura volvente vices et lucis et anni:
Atque ideo intrepidi quæcunque altaria tangunt.”

Satir. xiii., vs. 86-89.

The department of Christian apologetics rightfully occupies a prominent position, to which a distinct chair is assigned in many European schools, and in some of the theological institutions in this country. The present lectures were based upon the author's prelections on theological morality (Theol. Moral) in the Univer-

sity of Leipsic, and were first delivered in a popular form to an evening audience in the beginning of 1864, and appeared in print in the spring of the same year. They were very favorably received from the first, and have passed through seven editions, enlarged and gradually improved, of the seventh of which this is a translation, appearing in 1870. In 1872 they had been translated into seven languages. With the translation into the Modern Greek by Dr. Marianthus, Teacher of Theology in the Theological School in Jerusalem, and printed at the press of the Holy Sepulchre, the author expresses himself as especially pleased, and says that the list of subscribers attached to it contains pretty nearly the whole hierachy of the Greek Church.

These lectures were followed by a second series on *The Saving Truths of Christianity*, and a third on *The Moral Truths of Christianity*. They were published in English by T. T. Clark of Edinburgh, in 1873.

The first series, of which we have chiefly spoken, treats of "The antagonistic views of the world in their historical development," "The Contradictions of Existence," "The Personal God," "The Creation of the World," "Man," "Religion," "Revelation," "The History of Revelation," "Heathenism and Judaism," "Christianity in History," and "The Person of Jesus Christ."

In the course of these lectures Pantheism, Naturalism, Rationalism, Materialism, Atheism, the conflict between Natural Science and Religion, the supposed oppositions of Astronomy and Geology to revelation, the Transmutation Theory of Darwin, the Unity of the Human Race, are discussed in a popular form, and often in a style graceful, polished, and eloquent.

The translation does credit to the original and those who have not leisure and taste for the protracted and often intricate discussions of scientific men, may find here what will be acceptable to them, the judgment of one who is competent to decide, and who presents an answer to their theories so far as they militate against the statements and doctrines of the inspired Scriptures.

An Expositor's Note Book: or Brief Essays on obscure or mis-read Scriptures By SAMUEL COX, author of "The Private

Letters of St. Paul and St. John," "The Quest of the Chief Good," and "The Resurrection." Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 710 Arch Street. Pp. 452, 12mo.

The author of this book is an English minister residing at Nottingham, though it is issued by American publishers. In his preface he informs us that he has had a more quiet and sequestered lot than falls to most teachers and servants of the Word, and that for twenty years his time has been spent mainly in studying and expounding the Scriptures. In the course of these studies, he has lit now and then on passages, mostly obscure or hard to interpret, on which he has written brief expository essays for magazines designed for the Christian public in general. Most of these are sincere attempts to deal with difficulties or obscurities, or to show the worth and suggestiveness of passages which are commonly overlooked. Such is the account he gives of his volume. In most of these attempts he has successfully unfolded the meaning of the passages which are his themes, suggesting many happy applications of the language and doctrine, which would not occur to the ordinary reader, and in a pleasing and attractive style. In Chap.—IX., for example, on 1 Chron. xii. 33, "Fifty thousand who could keep rank; they were not of double heart," which is the substance of a sermon to a military company in Nottingham, he throws light upon what to almost every one has seemed a barren list of names unworthy of attention, by showing that they were five muster-rolls of the army of David, which reached at last a splendid military organisation of three hundred thousand men, by which he won his throne and accomplished his extended conquests; and that if they had such of the War of the Roses between the houses of Lancaster and York, in which war the great bulk of the ancient nobility of England perished, they would be of exceeding interest to the English nation; as the muster rolls of our Revolutionary war would also be to us. Some characteristic words of praise too were accorded to each of these bands in the sacred record. And "all these men of war that could keep rank, came with a perfect heart to Hebron, to make David king over all Israel." He shews to these men of war whom *he* addressed, that this, like all Scripture, "is profitable

for men," and was especially instructive to them. In his sixth chapter on "KING BRAMBLE," founded on Jotham's parable, Judges ix. 8-15, there is an allusion to our own country. "The bramble should never be permitted to usurp the place of the olive or the vine, and the vine and the olive should not shrink from the duties which their very sweetness and fatness impose upon them. When men of noble character, and great parts, and refined culture withdraw from public life—as for instance we are told they do in America—and leave the administration of public affairs to the ignorant and greedy and unscrupulous; or when, as often happens in England, men who are worthless as brambles, simply because they have a long purse or a long pedigree (and brambles are at least as old as the curse), are thrust into seats of honor and responsibility—then we may predict, with Jotham, that a fire will break forth from them in which much that we love will be consumed. If Gideon will not rule and Abimelech will, or if we are base enough to prefer a base Abimelech before a noble Gideon, we may be very sure that evil will come of it, and not good; we shall not gather grapes of briers, nor figs of thistles; we may confidently look for thorns and flames in lieu of wine and honey." Sadly true is all this in these days of degeneracy in which we live; in this decay of public virtue, so grievous to the heart of every true patriot and every true Christian! Some portions of this book are more striking than others. Some interpretations and translations of Scripture terms are hardly tenable, yet we have read the volume with interest. Of spirited writing and neat sarcasm, Chapter XXIII., "Accidents not Judgments," founded on Luke xiii. 1-5, may be taken as a specimen.

God's Rule for Christian Giving. A Practical Essay on the Science of Christian Economy. BY WILLIAM SPEER, Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Education. Philadelphia Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1334 Chestnut Street. Pp. 272, 12mo.

The ordinance as to Christian stewardship in property, was written (says the author,) by Paul in one sentence of thirteen,

which our common translation renders in twenty-two words, as follows :

“UPON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK LET EVERY ONE OF YOU LAY BY HIM IN STORE AS GOD HATH PROSPERED HIM.”

This formula, it is justly observed, like the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, and the last command of Christ, is wonderfully concise. But the most consummate financier in modern ages, can add nothing to and take nothing from this brief rule. It contains every important principle necessary to the accomplishment of the great end in view. It enforces (1.) A weekly religious duty ; (2.) of universal obligation ; (3.) by acts of personal consecration and donation ; (4.) according to some definite, and, with the blessing of God, enlarging proportion of the income. The author maintains that this brevity and simplicity, and yet comprehensiveness, is an evidence of the divine origin, wisdom, and authority of the rule.

On the subject of *tithes*, the author maintains that their appointment did not belong to the ceremonial law which was abrogated at the coming of Christ. It prevailed certainly five hundred years before the law, in Abraham's day. He shows that our Lord on two occasions expressly considered the measure in which money is to be contributed for religious purposes. In Luke xi. 43, he said, “Give alms of such things as ye have,” or as the margin there reads *as ye have*, that is, *as ye are able*. This is the idea of the Divine Rule through Paul. “Give according as God hath prospered.” Again in Matthew xxiii. 23, he said, *Tithes ought to be paid*. The Jews paid two tithes : one for the Levites and charity, the other for festival and family rejoicings and matters connected with the three great annual feasts at Jerusalem. These payments were entirely voluntary, but this financial system reached every family and every individual. It combined the interest and coöperation of the whole people. It adapted the measure of contribution to the means of each one. It sought something from each one, but made the amount to be given proportionable to wealth or income, illustrating still the New Testament rule, “according as God hath prospered.” We have but to compare this, says the author, with any contemporaneous

or later system of taxation; we have but to contrast the happy condition of the Hebrew common people with that of the wretched, vicious, savage condition of the poor in Rome or in any ancient nation, and we must be satisfied that this is God's plan, a plan originating in infinite wisdom and infinite goodness.

But (he adds) neither the Old nor the New Testament would be fairly represented, did we not hold up its provision for special vows and gifts as expressions of gratitude for extraordinary or peculiar mercies from God, or as the seal of covenants of greater devotion to him. This is a subject with which Christians of this day, and especially in this part of the world, have not made themselves acquainted, and the duties of which they have not practised.

This Essay possesses great value and will bear careful study. We are inclined to think the author's treatment of his subject too *extending*. He rakes in too many things not directly and necessarily connected with his theme. We must also criticise some slight degree of the *finical*, as when he speaks of our comprehending "the final mission of the sewing machine," (Note p. 58,) or puts into his title page, "the Science of Christian Economy." This is a kind of element, however, to be now generally expected in books or other writings by our Northern brethren. We have also to remark that the very name given to the essay appears indicative of some disposition to strain at effect. Why say God's rule for Christian giving? The Creator's name need not here be spoken—*The* rule for Christian giving, is of course God's rule. And if any one of the divine titles must be here named specifically, some other, it appears to us, had been more appropriate than the one selected.

Johannis Buxtorfii Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum, et Rabbinicum. Denuo editum et Annotatis auctum a Dr. Ph. B. FISCHER, Theologo Hebræo et Dr. Ph. Hermanno Gelbe, Theologo Christiano. Fasciculus I., pp. 40. Londini: Asher & Co.; Lipsiæ: impensis Mauriti Schæfer. Philadelphia, E. Schæfer & Koradi.

Every student of the languages of the Semitic stock is acquainted with the labors and the merits of the two Buxtorfs,

father and son. The work whose title is above given is the result of thirty years labor of John Buxtorf, the elder, and was published by his son in 1639. It is the most important of all the works of that distinguished scholar, and indeed of all the works of its class, and to this day is justly held indispensable to those who would acquire a knowledge of the later Hebrew, the Rabbinic, and Chaldee. The book has become rare and costly. In consequence of the newly awakened and lively interest felt in Talmudic science, the present publisher has undertaken to bring out a new edition of Buxtorf, with such emendations as the present state of science has rendered necessary. For the satisfaction of the admirers of Buxtorf, the original text of his work will be reprinted with some few alterations in the abbreviations, while the additions and emendations will be added below in a laborious and well digested Commentary. Words which he has omitted will be inserted, and those he has not sufficiently explained will be elucidated, especially those of Persic or Arabic origin. The correctness and clearness of the impression will also be the objects of especial attention.

In order to facilitate the acquisition of the work, it will be published in 25 Parts, each of five sheets, at 1s. 6d. each Part.

Schæfer & Koradi, S. W. corner of Fourth and Wood Streets, Philadelphia, are the American Publishers.

Assyrian Discoveries: An Account of Explorations and Discoveries on the Site of Nineveh during 1873 and 1874. By GEORGE SMITH, of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum, author of "Assurbanipal," etc. With illustrations. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1875. Pp. 461, 8vo.

The preface to this highly interesting work recounts the fact that the London *Daily Telegraph*—a newspaper in the hands of enterprising proprietors—started the first expedition to the site of Nineveh. These explorations were afterwards continued by the Trustees of the British Museum, and in both cases Mr. Smith, the writer of the book before us, was the explorer. The description of the country in its present condition is very enter-

taining; and the author's account of the treacherous tribes now inhabiting the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates, awakens the desire to reclaim those ancient lands, and give them in custody of a worthier race.

The translations of the various inscriptions unearthed by this latest explorer are very remarkable. The accurate description of the Deluge, corresponding with the Scripture narrative, has been commented upon by all the prominent English journals. The antiquity of these monuments cannot be doubted; and it is perhaps a defect in the present book that Mr. Smith's method of deciphering the cuneiform characters is not more elaborately recounted. The meaning of these curious characters was, however, discovered by Sir Henry Rawlinson, whose first publications upon this topic are nearly twenty-five years old. The value of the works of Rawlinson in fixing the chronology of historic events for the Assyrian inscriptions cannot be overrated; and the revelations of the Old Testament concerning the wars of Israel in the days of Hezekiah are wonderfully corroborated by these Assyrian investigations.

The Christian scholar will of course be met by the ready suggestion that the Scripture accounts are but the repetition of ancient fables, preserved in the mounds of the Eastern valleys. But these recent discoveries, including inscriptions that reach backward in their historic revelations to the days of Nimrod, show the distinct diversity in the two accounts, and the high improbability that one should have been copied from the other. Mr. Smith's book is a valuable addition to the works of Rawlinson, Layard, and other explorers of the present century.

The Odd Trump: A Novel. New York: E. J. Hale & Son, Publishers. Murray Street. 1875.

It is not often that we are called on to give judgment on the merits of a novel. In this case the author is said to be a Southron and a Presbyterian. Devoted to more serious studies, we are yet not insensible to the value of a good novel. The busiest age of human history, this nineteenth century nevertheless demands entertainment and instruction by novels. The busiest

race on the globe, this American people must have and will read them, and it is well therefore to have good ones furnished. It has been said, however, that in these degenerate days no novel can be popular unless there be woven into its texture some form of assault upon pure morals or sound theology. Hints and innuendoes perhaps contain the attack on morals, whilst the doctrines of revelation are assailed through sneers at "effete theories" and through a flippant profanation of things held sacred by the wise and virtuous. Our author claims to have produced a novel free from either indelicate or irreligious sentiment. We consider that the claim is made good except in one particular, namely, that very free use is made of the name of a personage mankind have no reason to laugh at or to laugh about. The disposition manifested by so elevated a writer to point the wit and fun of the parties he describes with references to a fallen seraph, our direful foe, is avagary none the less strange because so common.

The *Louisville Courier-Journal* says "this novel bids fair, from the freshness and audacity of its plot, from the gracefulness and vigor of its style, and from its variety and charm of incident, to be the most popular novel of the year." We heartily second this favorable judgment in all its particulars, and, to confirm the calculation as to popularity, are able to state that it is within our knowledge that the first edition is exhausted and a second one about to be issued. The anonymous author calls this his "initial" volume. We welcome the rising star, and are all the more gratified at the success of this new unknown because evidently belonging to our section of the land.

The scene of the story is laid in England. There are two heroes, one English and the other American, both noble and well sustained characters. The heroine is modest and well behaved, as well as beautiful, but beyond this there is little in her to attract. Mabel Grahame neither says nor does anything worthy of her place in the story. The best sustained characters are side ones: an eccentric old banker, a desperate English radical, and an American freedman—a very good specimen of the old fashioned Virginia negro. Some of the passages at arms between these last two personages are exceedingly racy, and well illustrate the

issues of the day. The showing up of radicalism by a *quondam* negro slave, who is at the same time and always was a real gentleman, is entertaining in the highest degree.

What impresses us most in this book is the wealth of invention it displays. The resources of a writer whose exuberant genius creates so easily and sustains so well, cannot be exhausted. Our appetite is well whetted for the next feast to be set before us.

Home Sketches in France, and Other Papers. By the late Mrs. HENRY M. FIELD. With some notices of her Life and Character. New York: George P. Putnam's Sons. 1875. Pp. 256, 12mo.

Mrs. Field was born in Paris. Early left an orphan, she fell to the care of her grandfather, the Baron Felix Desportes, who placed her at a celebrated boarding school of Paris, where she received a thorough education. Grown a woman, she went to England and became governess in the family of Sir Thomas Hislop, for the education of his only child, now the Countess of Minto. Returning to France, she entered the family of the Duke de Praslin, a nobleman of the highest rank, whose daughters she instructed for seven or eight years, till 1847. Some time after she left the Duke's, he killed the Duchess, his wife, in a fit of passion or insanity, and committed suicide. This event threw a gloom over her life, and caused her to come to this country, where, after teaching a short time in New York city, she was married to the Rev. Dr. Field, then pastor of a church in West Springfield, Mass., and subsequently and at present one of the editors and proprietors of the *New York Evangelist*.

For twenty years this French lady has been one of the most distinguished women of New York—eminent for wit, high intellect, large reading, the finest conversational powers, open hospitality, and for her accomplishments as an artist. Brought up a Roman Catholic, she became a Protestant and a Presbyterian, and both in her life and death illustrated the power of divine grace.

Her last request to her husband was: "When I am gone, let me rest in peace. Do not publish anything to attract the atten-

tion of the world. The world is nothing to me. I am going to God. Let me live only in your heart as a sweet memory, and in the hearts of those that love me." "Forbidden thus to write a history," Dr. Field has gathered "a few tributes by others to her worth, and lays them on her grave." They have "all appeared elsewhere," and he only "collects them for the convenience of her friends." The volume so formed is "not for the world," but for those who loved her. The dedication of the little book is very touching :

"To the sacred memory
of
The Beloved Dead,
These scattered leaves
Fallen from her hand,
Are gathered with a sad heart,
To lay them as a withered wreath,
Upon her grave."

The sketches from Mrs. Field's hand describe "Paris, Grave and Gay;" "Religion in France;" "Father Hyacinthe at Notre Dame;" "French Protestantism;" "Home Life in France;" "Education in France;" "The House of Orleans:" "The old French Noblesse," etc.

All About Jesus. By ALEXANDER DICKSON. "How great is his beauty." Zech. ix. 17. Second Edition. New York. Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1875. Pp. 404, 12mo.

Who Alexander Dickson is, we do not know, except as he reveals himself in these pages, a most dear friend and brother of ours, though personally all unknown. He dates the preface of his book, "Lansingburgh, N. Y., Christmas day, 1874." And he dedicates his book thus :

"To
My Wife,
Whom I love
'Even as Christ also loved the Church,'
This book is dedicated,
'Until the day break and the shadows flee away,'
When we shall go both of us together,
To see
'The King in His beauty.'"

The publisher of this book occupies a special leaf with a tablet, enclosing these words :

"May the Master make this book as sweet to others as it has been to me."
ROBERT CARTER."

The reader, after all these statements, is prepared to find in this volume the very marrow and fatness of the gospel, provided his own heart is prepared to enjoy such a feast. We should be happy to be assured that a taste for such reading is on the increase amongst the members of the Christian Churches in this country.

Sports that Kill. By T. DEWITT TALMAGE, author of "Crumbs Swept Up;" "Abominations of Modern Society;" "First Series of Sermons;" "Second Series of Sermons;" "Old Wells Dug Out;" "Around the Tea Table," etc. Phonographically reported and revised. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1875. Pp. 241, 12mo.

Several of these sermons are shots fired against the American theatre as it is—the author, we are very happy to notice, spelling this and similar words in the old English, and not in the New England way. The remainder of the discourses are levelled against drunkenness, obscene literature, the unclean life, and the extravagance of modern society. One of them enumerates and encourages a variety of sports which do not kill, but are useful and necessary.

That these sermons are *sensational*, is a matter of course. But we cannot charge them with any extravagance, and we have not observed any tinge of false sentiment or unsound doctrine creeping in. They are in the highest degree eloquent and entertaining. Nobody that takes up the little volume will be apt to lay it down till finished. We should be thankful and happy to see the book in the hands of every young man and woman of the whole land.

And yet we cannot admit that this is a sort of preaching we should be glad to have very general or very constant. Christ is occasionally brought to view—very occasionally. But these are not gospel themes. Preaching down the theatre, or drunkenness, or obscene books and papers, or modern (and we might better say *American*) extravagance of living, does not save the soul.

Nothing but the gospel is the power of God and the wisdom of God to the salvation of men.

Here is one specimen of the preacher's directness :

"If a man has been industrious and economical, and has not a farthing to leave his children as he goes away from them, he has a right to put them in the hands of the Father of the fatherless, and know they will be cared for: but if you, with every comfort in life, are lavish and improvident, and then depart this life, leaving your children to be hurled into pauperism, you deserve to have your bones sold to the medical museum for anatomical specimens, the proceeds to furnish your children bread. I know the subject cuts close. I expected that some of you, in high dudgeon, would get up and go out. You stand it pretty well. Some of you are making a great swosh in life, and after a while will die, leaving your families beggars, and you will expect us ministers of the gospel to come and stand by your coffin and lie about your excellences; but we will not do it. If you send for me, I will tell you what my text will be: 'He that provideth not for his own, and especially for those of his own household, is worse than an infidel.'" (Pp. 208-9.)

The reader would perhaps like another :

"This wicked extravagance shows itself no more forcibly than on the funeral day. No one else seems willing to speak of it, so I shall speak of it. There has been many a man who has died solvent, but has been insolvent before he got under the ground. . . . A man dies in our neighboring city of New York. He has lived a fictitious life, moved amid splendor, and dies, leaving his family not a dollar; but they, poor things! must keep up the same magnificence,—and so they resolve upon a great funeral. The obsequies shall be splendid. I give you no imaginary case. I give you the funeral of a man in up-town, New York, the facts authenticated, and in my pocket. The undertaker was not to blame—he only sold them what they asked for. The only blame was for those who bought when they knew they could not pay.

Casket, covered with Lyons velvet, silver mouldings,	\$850
Heavy plated handles,	60
Solid silver plate, engraved in Roman letters,	75
Ten linen scarfs,	150
Floral decorations,	225
Music and quartette choir at the house,	40
Twenty carriages, walking to the cemetery,	140
Then fifteen other important expenditures, amounting to	336

All the expenditures added up, being \$1,876
for getting one poor mortal to his last home!" (Pp. 212-13.)

The American Evangelists, D. L. Moody and Ira D. Sankey, in Great Britain and Ireland. By JOHN HALL, D. D., New York, and GEORGE H. STUART, Philadelphia. New York: Dodd & Mead, Publishers, 762 Broadway. Pp. 455, 12mo.

The main considerations which give the work of these evangelists a clear right to our confidence, are, (as the authors of this

book have said,) that they *hold forth substantial truth*, and that the *Spirit blesses*, as is evident from the results. If we look at the number of persons hopefully converted from sin to a godly life; at the churches revived and comforted, and the ministers stimulated and roused to preach more simply, earnestly, and effectively; and at the impression favorable to these evangelists, which every where appears amongst the good and wise who come to know them, we cannot doubt that they are men raised up and made use of by the Lord for his own work and glory. With many of us, the very fact that Dr. John Hall, of New York, is the author, in part, of this volume, will suffice to satisfy every lingering doubt as to the character of these evangelists and of their work. In addition to this, they have had the cordial approval of the University and Theological Professors in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen; in Trinity College, Dublin, and in Belfast; of more than one bishop of the Irish Church, and of the most trusted ministers of all evangelical denominations in England, Scotland, and Ireland—such as Dr. Blaikie and the late Mr. Arnot, of Edinburgh; Dr. Kirkpatrick, of Dublin; Rev. R. W. Dale, of Birmingham; Dr. Lowe, of Liverpool; Spurgeon, of London; Drs. Rainy, Cairns, Bonar, Charles Brown, Wallace, and Professor Charteris. Besides these individual testimonies, the United Presbyterian Synod and the General Assemblies of the Free Church and of the Established Church of Scotland, publicly endorsed this movement and its chief leaders.

This book is simply a compilation from the reports of many eye witnesses writing on the other side of the Atlantic. These reports usually contained much descriptive eulogy of Messrs. Moody and Sankey. Very judiciously this has all been left out. And further, while the methods of operation are detailed, the compilers have abstained from all expressions of opinion respecting them, whether favorable or unfavorable. The reader is left to form his own judgment on these matters, it being the sole aim of the editors to give a clear, colorless, and continuous view of the facts. The order followed is very simple: "Who are these men? How did they come to the front in America? How did

they enter Great Britain? What has been their progress? What did they teach? What are the results?" Besides answering these questions, several of Mr. Moody's addresses, as condensed in various journals, are given, to speak for him and his colleague. These occupy some sixty pages of the book.

One striking and important feature of Mr. Moody's operations is emphasized—he always seeks and secures the coöperation of pastors. He declined to go to Sheffield until substantial unity was secured in an invitation from the evangelical ministers of the town. And he will not hold meetings at the usual hours of divine service, unless, in the judgment of the local ministers, it is deemed desirable. He has always set himself against all weakening of the hands of the stated ministry, on whom depends the systematic and permanent instruction of the people. This was the wise policy always of Mr. Nettleton, of blessed memory.

The Rev. J. B. Lowe, D. D., of St. Jude's [Established Church,] Liverpool, said: "If I were to select one word by which to express my impression of the work of Mr. Moody and Mr. Sankey in this town, I should speak of its *genuineness*. The men themselves are *genuine*. They are not artificial, with anything of the character of an actor; they are true men, their heart in the Lord's work, and their eye single. Some persons are disappointed when they first hear Mr. Moody, and say he does not come up to the expectations they had entertained respecting him. Herein he differs from an artificial *got-up* man, who would put his best foot foremost, and come prepared to make a great impression, and to take every one by storm. But Mr. Moody aims not to produce a mere effect, but to instil vital truths of saving power into the minds of his audience; and the impression made by him grows stronger and stronger as he proceeds. His manifest sincerity and earnestness are prominent features. . . . One is struck with the great simplicity of Mr. Moody's speech, and the total absence of carnal excitement in his manner and utterance. Earnestness there is, indeed, and zeal and eloquence, (though not oratory,) but it is moral and spiritual, not carnal or sensational." (Pp. 350-2.)

The Rev. R. W. Dale, of Birmingham, successor to John An-

gell James, says: "Some people have said it is easy to get crowds of women to 'hysterical' religious services. But although the morning and afternoon services were largely attended by women, I believe that the majority of the evening congregation always consisted of men, and of men of all kinds—rough lads of seventeen or eighteen, working men, clerks, tradesmen, and manufacturers." (Pp. 353-4.)

This minister describes his pleasure on first hearing Mr. Moody, who was "simple, direct, kindly, and hopeful. with a touch of humor and a touch of pathos," yet nothing remarkable. The next time he heard him, "there was a certain warmth and brightness, which made the service very pleasant." The next morning, at the prayer-meeting, the address was more "incisive," and at the evening service he "began to see that the stranger had a faculty for making the elementary truths of the gospel intensely clear and vivid. But it still seemed most remarkable that he should have done so much; and on Tuesday I told Mr. Moody that the work was most plainly of God, for I could see no real relation between him and what he had done. He laughed cheerily, and said he should be very sorry if it were otherwise." (Pp. 357-8.)

Evidence is afforded in this volume that the interest in religion has not declined after the departure of the evangelists from a given place.

Since the last date to which this book brings down the history of this greatest religious movement of the age, these humble men have been laboring with wonderful success in London. Their campaigning three months in that great city is drawing to an end. About the second week in July they expect to return to this country. They have shaken Great Britain. Not London and the other *great* cities only, but from all parts of the kingdom, there come tidings of great gatherings of people to hear the gospel preached; intense activity on the part of professing Christians to speak the Word, and wonderful willingness to hear on the part of unconverted people. What hath God wrought! May He work the same blessed work in all this land, and throughout the whole world, and so his kingdom come!

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVI.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXV.

ARTICLE I.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ST. LOUIS.

Our Church was very fully represented at the last Assembly. If we have counted rightly, 133 commissioners were present; every Presbytery was represented, at least in part, excepting only Sao Paulo, our Missionary Presbytery in Brazil; and not counting that Presbytery, every commissioner was present, excepting three ruling elders. The body is now almost or quite large enough. An overgrown Assembly is no blessing to any Church.

Without designing any invidious comparisons, the marked ability of the late Assembly may also be referred to. This certainly is a very great blessing to any Church—to have its highest court filled with men of wisdom and learning and the grace of God; men competent to handle the grave questions which concern the whole Church; “men that have understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do.”

It was a wise arrangement, as the late Assembly found by experience, to give the afternoons of the first four or five days to the standing committees. Time is not lost, but saved by it. Reports considered thoroughly in committee are apt to be quickly and favorably disposed of by the body at large.

Last year the Northern Assembly met at St. Louis, with its half a thousand commissioners. When our Assembly at Columbus resolved to meet this year in the same city, the Philadelphia

Presbyterian declared that it was a great venture for our "little craft" to follow their immense ship into those waters. God helping us, we have experienced no damage, but great advantage.

THE MODERATOR'S SERMON.

The Moderator's opening sermon was of rare excellence. The subject discussed is of the most fundamental importance always, but has special claims to our attention in these slack times. Dr. GIRARDEAU holds with Dr. Duff, that there is a fatal law of degeneracy always operating amongst fallen men, even in the very Church itself, and ever demanding constant intervention by the Almighty to save mankind from immediate and final and irretrievable ruin; and moreover, that at the present time our own Church gives some signs of being in the downward sweep of that fatal law. The strength of Presbyterianism is in its firm and fast hold of the Word, as setting before us the whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for his glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, unto which nothing is at any time to be added. The design of the discourse was to set forth the Word as that only and perfect rule to which, as Calvin expresses it, the Church is *astricted*. We deem the discussion so able and so important, that we here place a summary of it before our readers, laboring the while under only one apprehension, viz., lest the brevity of the statement may do injustice to the argument.

The text was Matt. xxviii. 20: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The preacher found here a great principle, laying on the heart of the Church two supreme obligations: (1) to evangelise all nations; (2) to inculcate and maintain all the truth which the great Prophet has taught. There are obviously two aspects of this second charge—*positively*, the Church is to teach all Christ has commanded; *negatively*, she is prohibited from teaching anything which he has not commanded. Here, then, is that principle tinged with the blood your Puritan, Covenanting, and Huguenot forefathers, that whatever is not either explicitly or else implicitly commanded in the Scriptures, is prohibited to the Church. She can utter no new doctrine, make no new laws, ordain no new forms of government, invent no new modes of worship.

The question to be discussed is, whether the Church has any discretionary power. The Word and the Spirit are our Supreme Judge in religion: And has the Church any discretion, or is she to be conformed in everything and at all times to the written word.?

This question is to be answered by means of an antecedent one: What is the nature of the Church? It is a supernatural institute, to which God has given a supernatural rule of faith and practice, complete and supreme. Her whole duty, then, manifestly, is obedience to this rule; neither in the sphere of doctrine, nor of government, nor of worship, can she add anything of her own. This conclusion is obvious; and yet the history of the Church presents continual contradictions of it. The explanation of this strange fact introduces us to the theory of discretionary power. This is the secret of the Church's constant tendency to degeneracy, by departing from the Word, her sufficient and divine rule. This theory makes the Church the Lord's confidential agent, from whom he expects counsel and the amendment of his ordinances, not obedience to the same. Her freedom is not to be fettered nor her energies crippled by the constant demand for a divine warrant. She is not to be tied to the letter of Scripture, for the Lord hath made her free. Wherever Scripture is silent, there she may speak; and she is at liberty to ordain whatever to her mind is not contrary to the general scope and spirit of the word.

1. The first point discussed is the operation of this theory of discretionary power on the sphere of doctrine. Under its influence the claim is made for what is called, in high-sounding phrase, *the development of doctrine*.

Now there is no question as to a divine development of doctrine in successive dispensations by the hands of patriarchs, prophets, and apostles; but the canon of Scripture having been closed, has the Church any power to continue the development?

Again, there is no question as to the subjective development of doctrine in the minds and to the knowledge of men—a development, as Dr. Rainy expresses it, not *of* Scripture, nor *from* Scripture, but *up* to Scripture, as the ultimate standard.

But the question is as to an expansion and enlargement of the doctrinal system by substantive accretions. Here lies the very core of the theory before us.

As Rome defends this theory, it is conceded that the alleged development does not proceed by its own law, but is managed and regulated by the Church. She is the real creator of the new doctrines. But if the Church be thus inspired, let us have her credentials for it. Let the Pope once raise the dead.

The Rationalist also defends this objective development of doctrine; reason being with him, instead of the Church, for an ultimate developing authority. And reason may abridge as well as enlarge the doctrines. With this opponent our issue respects mainly the inspiration of the word. If the Bible be indeed inspired, it may not be subjected to the fallible judgments of the human mind.

Now, against all assertions of the development of doctrine in the sense of positive additions to the Scripture, we accept its own testimony, that it is perfect and complete. To talk of developing a complete rule is absurd; to say that Scripture is not complete is wicked.

But what of that development by *inferences* which our Confession sanctions? That involves no additions to the doctrine. That is the explicit evolution of what is implicitly contained in the word, and is really a part of the original enunciation. Here is no discretionary power lodged with the Church; for the inferences she may draw are such as logic necessitates. Let the Church confine herself to the deduction of *good and necessary consequences*, and she will never develop the doctrines and commandments of men.

And here we meet a specious and dangerous form of this theory, which claims that the creeds and confessions in which the Church has logically arranged the doctrines of the Scripture shall not bind the conscience nor shackle thought. Creeds are just collections of the dogmas of men. To forbid the development of doctrine beyond their limits, is a tyranny of the intellect. The free, progressive, advanced thought of the age must not be strapped down by old dogmas gone to sleep with the conflicts

which gave them birth. The demand of the times is for untrammelled development. The young, vigorous, exultant intellect of this era will be satisfied with nothing less. If the Church will cling to antiquated ideas, she will be left behind by the grand army of progress, in its onward and triumphant march. This is eloquent. All it needs to make it effective, is truth. The simple question is, Do Church creeds reproduce faithfully the Scripture doctrine? If they do not, the development required is to expunge the faulty dogmas and insert better ones. If they do, thus uttering Christ's word, these creeds have Christ's authority. And the cry, Down with creeds! then, means, Down with the Bible! These are not Christian views, but the children of Rationalism, brought to the font of the Church, and baptized under the attractive names of Broad Church, Liberal Christianity, and Progressive Thought.

And in the name of reason we would ask, why should confessions of faith be rejected because they are old! What is there in age to invalidate truth? She is as old as God, and as immortal as he. Is not the Bible old? Has age made it worthless? Is it not now, as it ever has been, the impregnable tower into which the righteous runneth when pressed by the legions of the pit? Has age made it decrepid? Is it not now taking wings like the Apocalyptic Angel, to fly in mid-heaven and blow the trump of jubilee to the slaves of sin and death? Is not nature old? And are her laws inoperative because they began to work from the foundation of the world? Are her ordinances worn out because they are old? Shine not the heavenly host with the same lustre with which they beamed upon the plains of Uz, when Job sang of the bands of Orion and the sweet influences of the Pleiades? And are the grand facts and doctrines of redemption effete because they date back to the Promise, which, springing like a bow from the abyss of the fall, has spanned the arch of time? Is the panoply of God of no further service, because for ages the darts of the devil have been driven in a fiery storm against it? And is the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, now useless and to be discarded, because in the conflicts of centuries it has run against the armor of error and the mail

of hell? No: the difficulty with these confessions—the battle-torn standards of the Church—is not that they are antiquated; it is that they are as young and vigorous as ever. The light of immortal youth, which rests upon the divine Word, kindles upon them. Their crime is, that they too faithfully represent God's authority—that they restrain the license of speculation, call the students of truth into the school of Christ, and bind his yoke upon their necks.

2. The second point of discussion relates to the sphere of government. To suppose that Scripture gives no constitution for the supernatural kingdom of Christ on the earth, is to impeach his divine wisdom. But it is said no definite form is given, only the essential principles; that is, government in the general, but no form in particular. Now we can understand the proposition that Christ has given no government at all; we can perceive in the abstract the logical distinction between the generic notion of government and the different species which may be contained under it; but it passes our ability to comprehend how, in the concrete, an organised society can be under government in the general, but under no particular form of government. It is like thinking away all the distinctive marks which characterise a thing, and then attempting to form a notion of the thing itself. If Christ has in his Word ordained any government at all for his Church, it must be one capable of being realised in a definite form. Has he done this? Well, the essential elements of a government are laws, officers, courts; and each of these is revealed in the New Testament. There are a particular sort of officers, courts peculiarly composed, and a specific principle distinguishing the mode of administering this government from every other, viz., the principle of government by representative assemblies, which discriminates this polity from Prelacy on the one hand, and Independency on the other. Now the extent to which the Church has discretionary power in the sphere of government is in ordering the circumstances of time, place, and decorum—circumstances, all of them, common to human actions and societies. She can make no laws, create no offices, institute no

modes of government. Her power and duty are alike summed up in absolute conformity to the written word.

3. The same line of argument applies to the Church's power in the matter of public worship; for that belongs to the Church, and all that is predicable of it is not predicable of the family or the social circle.

But there is no divine institution in respect to which natural wisdom and natural taste are so apt to arrogate discretion as this. It involves the æsthetic element in our nature; the imagination and the sensibilities, as well as the reason, plead for a share in the control of this matter. A cultivated carnality begs, clamors, storms for some license here. But let it never be forgotten that will-worship, under every dispensation of religion, has been the special object of divine denunciation and wrath.

There are certain well known modes of worship revealed by Christ in his word. The Church has no discretionary power to introduce any others. Such is the clear doctrine of our Standards, and of the best and truest Reformers.

But our Confession admits the right of the Church to order some circumstances concerning the worship of God. What is the nature of these? As Dr. Thornwell has well said: They are the concomitants of an action without which it cannot be done at all, or not with decency and decorum. Public worship requires public assemblies, and these require some time and place of meeting, and some costume and posture. These are the circumstances which the Church may regulate; circumstances attending an action, not appendages to an action. The Church may not appoint appendages. These do not belong to the substance of the action, nor yet surround it so that it cannot be performed without them. A liturgy is a circumstance of this sort. Such is the doctrine of one who was a master of the Presbyterian system; such was the doctrine of Calvin and Owen, of Cunningham and Breckinridge; such the doctrine of the Reformed Church of France, of the Puritans of England; such the doctrine to which, by the grace of God, the practice of the Free Church of Scotland and of the Presbyterian Church in

Ireland, in an age of growing laxity, still continues to be conformed.

There are three criteria by which the kind of circumstances falling under the discretionary power of the Church may be determined: *first*, they are not qualities or modes of the act of worship; *secondly*, they are common to the acts of all societies; and *thirdly*, they are conditions necessary to the performance of the acts of worship. Take, now, a liturgy which is an appendage to one of the acts of public worship, viz., *prayer*, and bring it to the test of these criteria. It cannot abide the first, because it is a mode of the act of prayer itself. It cannot abide the second, because it is not common to all human actions and societies. It cannot abide the third, because a liturgy is not a condition necessary to the act of prayer itself. The other strict and proper act of worship is the singing of praise. Let it be observed, it is not *praise*, but the *singing of praise*. This distinction is precisely drawn by the New Testament and by our Standards. Now, let us submit instrumental music, which has been made an appendage to the singing of praise, to the test of the three criteria. *First*, this is a mode in which the act of the singing of praise is performed. *Secondly*, this is not a circumstance common to all human societies. *Thirdly*, this is not something without which the singing of praise cannot be performed. This line of argument ought to be conclusive with all Presbyterians against ranking instrumental music in public worship with the circumstances falling under the Church's discretion. And therefore to justify it, one must prove that it is of the commanded things which the apostles taught the Church.

What has been said on this last point is not the dictate of a captious or arrogant spirit, but the offspring of a solemn conviction of the duty of the Church, and her danger in departing from the word.

This admirable discourse was closed with an earnest presentation of the idea that the Church is not only the divinely commissioned publisher, but likewise the divinely commanded conservator of the truth. Conservation and aggression are twin duties of the Church. To maintain is as important as to propagate the

truth. In her onward march, the Church must not neglect her base line. We are not without our perils. The law of degeneracy is written on all the past, and we may not fondly dream that our Church will be found outside its scope. In the best Churches of Protestantism, we behold a growing latitudinarianism. Defections and struggles are before us. Perilous times are coming. Seducers are waxing worse, deceiving and being deceived. We may not doubt that as the hopes of the Church sank into the grave of Jesus just before the ascending glories of the Apostolic Reformation, and as they again descended into the sepulchre just before the resurrection light of the Protestant Reformation, so they will again decline into the gloom of a wide-spread apostasy and a mighty tribulation, just before the Morning Star of the Millennial Reformation shall beam amidst the rifted clouds of an ecclesiastical night. Protestantism itself will need to be reformed.

What, then, is the course which our own beloved Church is called by the Head to pursue? What, fathers and brethren, what? What, youthful students and thinkers, into whose hands, under God, the destinies of this Church—her type of faith, thought, and action, of doctrine, polity, and worship, are to be intrusted when the actors in her early organisation shall have mouldered into dust? What, ye ruling elders, responsible and honored guardians of each little flock, as it rests in its own particular fold? What is the great, paramount vocation of this Church? While yet in the body of her mother, she struggled, as conscious even then of a separate individuality, against the Esau of discretionary power; and the first breath of her independent historic existence was expended in protest against error and testimony for truth. Conformity to the Word was the reason of her separate being; let conformity to the Word be the law of its development—conformity to the Word, close, implicit, undeviating in doctrine, government, and worship. The opportunity furnished us is inexpressibly grand. Freed from the conflict of antagonistic ideas, almost a unit ourselves, we have the moulding and fashioning of a Church in our hands. What will we do with her? Let us rise to the greatness of the occasion. Let us endeavor, by grace, to make this Church as perfect a specimen of scriptural truth, order,

and worship as the imperfections of the present state will permit. Let us take her by the hand and lead her to the Word alone. Let us pass the Reformers, let us pass the Fathers, uncovering our heads to them in token of our profound appreciation of their labors for truth, and heartily receiving from them all they speak in accordance with the Word; but let us pass on and pause not, until with our sacred charge we reach the Oracles of God, and with her bow at the Master's feet, and listen to the Master's voice. Let obedience to the Word of Christ in all things be the law of her life; so that when the day of review shall come, and section after section of the universal Church shall halt for judgment before the great Inspector himself, although, no doubt, there will be much of unfaithfulness of life that will draw upon his forgiveness, his eye may detect no departure from his Word in her principles, her order, and her worship. He cannot discredit his own commands; and that Church will receive his chief encomiums which has been most closely conformed to his WORD. Let us strive for that glory.

ELECTION OF THE MODERATOR.

Drs. LEFEVRE and HOGE were nominated, but at the earnest request of the former his name was withdrawn and Dr. HOGE was chosen by acclamation. He discharged the duties of his high office in an eminently satisfactory way. Very felicitous were his responses to the salutations borne to our Church from corresponding bodies, and very edifying his manner of conducting the daily religious services. The devotional element is said to have been very prevalent, and the "singing of praise" with the voices of the whole body, led by the commanding voice of Mr. Penick of North Carolina, to have been "grandly impressive."

REPORT ON FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Excepting the heavy debt with which the year closed, never did the work of the Committee wear a brighter aspect;—a larger number of missionaries, more efficient schools, more diffusion of the truth printed, preaching in more languages and with greater power, new churches organised, and converts at almost every station and at some in considerable numbers.

We have six missionary stations in the Indian country, one in Mexico, two in Colombia, two in Brazil, one in Italy, two in Greece, and two in China—in all sixteen, with twenty-seven ordained missionaries (of whom eight are natives) and twenty-seven assistant missionaries, together with sixteen native helpers—in all a body of seventy laborers. In the schools are upwards of four hundred pupils.

The receipts for the year were as follows :

From churches and individuals,	\$31,711 41
“ Women’s Missionary Associations,	4,455 33
“ Sabbath-schools,	6,067 55
Balance from last year,	2,056 48
	\$44,290 77

The expenditures amount to \$58,913.95, so that the debt amounts to \$14,623.18. It does not belong, however, to the last year alone, but to the last two years, for it includes the payment of several heavy drafts for outlays of preceding year, which (as was anticipated by the last Report) reached the Treasurer shortly after the close of the year just ended. This is always liable to occur, and the more liable as the work expands. It had not appeared to the last Assembly, or to the Committee, unreasonable to expect that the receipts of the last year would amount to \$60,000, less than 60 cents per member. Till late in the year, it was confidently hoped this amount would be realised. When it became certain that it would not, it was too late to retrench without incalculable damage to the work. It is to be observed, however, that there has been no material falling off in the receipts. Those named in the first line actually exceeded the previous year’s by more than \$1,000, while those of the third line fell short nearly the same amount. But the Women’s Associations more than doubled their previous year’s contributions.

Only about one-half of our churches give any thing to Foreign Missions, although there is an increase of seven in the number of contributing churches. Three hundred of the contributing churches do not give as much as \$10 each, less than 10 cents for each of their members.

To pay the debt, meet the expenses of the next missionary year, and send out a few more laborers, who are much needed, will require at least \$80,000. This will not be 75 cents for each of our members.

REPORT ON SUSTENTATION, ETC., ETC.

Fifty-six of our sixty-four Presbyteries coöperate with the Executive Committee. Three of the remainder are on ground cared for by the Foreign Missions Committee, so that but five of our home Presbyteries are not in active sympathy with the Assembly's Committee. None of these are known to be opposed to the principles or methods of Sustentation.

The Southern Aid Society of New York gave to our work the past year \$2,240. This friendly society being on the point of dissolution, we are not to expect any further aid from it.

Collections have been received from 855 churches for Sustentation, from 415 for Evangelistic work, and from 556 for the Invalid Fund. This is a small gain on the preceding year. Yet, not one-half of our churches contribute to Sustentation, not one-fourth to Evangelistic work, and not one-third to the Invalid Fund. Thus we have an immense reserve force in our Presbyteries, as yet unutilised.

The receipts for the year (not including the gift of the Southern Aid Society) have been \$21,186.65. Last year they amounted to \$25,249.06, but that included a considerable legacy. The regular contributions of the churches this year have exceeded those of the last year by \$2,651.07, and leaving out the contributions from Missouri, there is a net gain of \$2,158.27 from the churches represented in the last annual report.

The payments to Presbyteries from this fund have been \$15,751.24, besides the amount received from the Southern Aid Society.

The receipts for the Evangelistic work have been about the same as last year; for the Invalid Fund a little less; for the Colored Evangelistic work, very small, and chiefly from outside of our own Church.

The investments for the Relief Fund amount now to \$16,000. Forty-seven of our sixty-one home Presbyteries have asked

and received aid from *the Sustentation Fund*. One hundred and fifty-three ministers, representing perhaps four hundred churches, have been aided and assistance given in the erection of twelve church buildings.

The aim of the Committee is to develop pastoral support and awaken interest in the Sustentation Fund, as the agency by which really poor churches are helped to a supply of the ministry of the word. Three Presbyteries report each one church receiving aid last year, which can this year do without help. Seven Presbyteries report a decrease in the average of pastoral support; eleven an increase of the average. Five Presbyterial Committees report that no efficient means are used to bring the duty of enlarged pastoral support to the attention of their congregations. In seventeen Presbyteries the proper grouping of churches so as to form accessible and self-sustaining pastoral charges has not been satisfactorily adjusted.

That the work has made progress is evinced from these facts, to wit: (1) Nine additional Presbyteries coöperate; (2) pastoral support has obtained some increase; (3) the number of collections is increasing; (4) the sum of receipts this year is increased by 16 per cent., yet the pastors of many feeble churches are living without adequate support. And this fund ought to be largely increased in order for it to meet the legitimate demands upon it. Much depends on the Committees into whose hands Presbyteries place this interest of our Church, and especially much on the chairman of the Presbyterial Committee.

On *the Evangelistic work*, reports have come from fifty-three Presbyteries; thirty-six of these coöperate with the Assembly's scheme by enjoining collections in all their churches. In the reporting Presbyteries, thirty-five evangelists have been employed for their whole time during the year past, and three for one-half their time. Some few Presbyteries have two or more evangelists. In many Presbyteries the work is done by details of pastors and supplies sent to distant points either singly or by couples. Some of our Presbyteries having territory well covered with churches do not feel the need of evangelistic labor.

The Committee have sought to stimulate this kind of efforts,

especially in the newer regions, and to this end have made large appropriations to the Southwest. Of course the selection of the evangelist and the direction of his labors rests with the Presbyteries. The only condition required by the Committee is, that the work shall be conducted in accordance with the Assembly's by-law. The main difficulty is to get the right men engaged. Already in this field are some of the best ministers of our Church. If our Zion is to go forward and fulfil her evident mission, this branch of labor must be prosecuted with renewed earnestness.

In regard to the *Colored Evangelistic* work, circulars expository of the Assembly's plan were addressed to our ministers and sessions, and also to the ministers of the Reformed Church in America. The results have been meagre. The demands for help in this line have not been large, but larger than the funds. Appropriations have been made to the Presbyteries of Memphis, Central Mississippi, and Central Texas—partly from the Sustentation Fund, for the lack of other means. It is hoped more may be done during the current year. From none of our presbyterial reports does it appear that any, except the Presbytery of Memphis, is making earnest, extensive, and concerted efforts to evangelise this race. A few Presbyteries report Sabbath-schools and preaching by individual ministers.

Thus not more than a beginning has yet been made amongst us in this field so inviting and demanding so imperatively our attention. The obstacles are of no ordinary nature, and yet patient labor will overcome them. The scheme of the Assembly is acceptable to the colored people themselves, and seems to meet almost universal approval in our Church. It is high time there should be throughout our bounds a hearty and united effort to give this people the gospel in its purest form, who do so much need the regulative and elevating influence of Presbyterian doctrine and order. Faithful preachers of their own race should be instructed and trained, churches of their own planted and nurtured, plain but comfortable houses of worship provided, and Sabbath-schools organised and maintained.

The conclusion reached by the Committee, as to the "best

method of providing for the training of colored candidates for the ministry," which the last Assembly required should be considered, is that for the present this can be best secured by private studies under some approved divine of the Presbytery having charge of the candidate.

There being six annual collections already instituted by the Assembly, it is suggested by the Committee that they should be empowered to set aside, if necessary, 10 per cent. from the Sustentation Fund for carrying forward this colored evangelistic work.

From the *Invalid Fund*, appropriations have been made to twenty-three aged and infirm ministers, and sixty-four families of deceased ministers. These have ranged from \$25 to \$300. The whole amount has exceeded ten thousand dollars. It is believed that not a dollar has been unworthily bestowed. There are indications that the fund ought to be increased. This year \$665 was appropriated more than last year;—last year \$1,735 more than the year previous. It would be indeed a pity, if hereafter any curtailment of appropriations should be made necessary by deficient receipts. For the past two years the funds have been equal to the demands upon it.

On the lists of the *Relief Fund*, there are at present ninety-four names. Just at the close of the year two contributors departed this life—the Rev. Wm. Pinkerton, of the Synod of Virginia, and the Rev. Wm. Banks, of the Synod of South Carolina. The whole benefit accruing to the family of the former has been paid, amounting to \$360, he having paid in three annual instalments of \$30 each; also the first annuity of \$400 accruing to the family of the latter, he having paid in four annual instalments of \$60 each, thus entitling his family to six annual payments of \$400 each.

This fund now has \$16,000 of invested bonds.

THE ASSEMBLY'S ACTION ON SUSTENTATION.

On the sixth day, in the evening, the Assembly held a missionary meeting to receive and act on the Standing Committee's Report, through Dr. Stuart Robinson, chairman. The special points of interest in that report, as the Assembly adopted it, were

(1.) thanks returned to the Southern Aid Society ; (2) a call on the churches to support the scheme for evangelising the colored people, and authority given to the Committee to use 5 per cent. of the general Sustentation funds for this purpose, and a commendation of the Sunday-school Union's work amongst these people; (3) the approval of the Manual of Sustentation.

An eloquent and encouraging address was made by Dr. STUART ROBINSON, who was distressed at his own Synod's giving but \$1,000 and his own Presbytery but \$400 to this cause. And there are other Synods which do no better; but he called no names, for he was afraid of giving offence. He said he was afraid of the Revivals, for they seem to be filling up the churches with the same kind of material we have now—members of the Church who do not worship God with their substance.

Dr. PALMER spoke tenderly and sweetly of the communion of saints which this Sustentation cause realises. And he said that, poor as we are, we can replenish this treasury as well as raise the funds needed for the foreign work. It was a privilege also to take care of the orphans of the Church. He knew two widows of ministers, whose only support for themselves and their children was the \$100 from this fund.

Dr. GANSE, of the Reformed Church, had little say but much to feel. He had been riding two days to reach this place, and he felt his heart expand as he met those representing the vast missionary fields of Georgia and Alabama, and the great, broad Southwest. His church is accustomed to applaud the courage with which we came up out of the strife and difficulties and discouragements of the past. Brighter days are coming. Sympathy for you is coming too.

Dr. McILVAINE'S address closed the meeting. He said our Church will succeed. Her progress is onward. He saw it in the signs of the times, and knew it from indications about which he could not be mistaken. There had been material improvement during the past year. The churches have given 16 per cent. more in this year of hardness than last year. More churches give than ever before. There is one Synod in which a very large proportion of all the churches give. But some of you

represent Presbyteries not one-sixth of whose churches have given one cent to Sustentation ; and some to Presbyteries not one-fifteenth of whose families have given one cent to support the families of the deceased servants of the Lord. Some of our ministers let a whole year pass without taking up a collection for any cause. Nor is it only the weak and vacant churches that are remiss, but many strong churches neglect it. There is need of the exercise of authority—of authority tempered with grace.

REPORT ON EDUCATION.

Owing to interruptions from the removal of the Committee to Memphis, the report covers only three-fourths of the year, which closed April 1st. The Committee at Memphis began their work with a debt of \$3,846.27, in the form chiefly of appropriations to students which had not been paid. The liquidation of these claims was judged the first duty to be done. It was accomplished by the month of December. But the amount now due to our young men is \$3,992.45, which it is hoped will shortly be reduced to \$2,000.

There is an increase of nearly fifty in the number of contributing churches. Our candidates for the ministry, in all stages of preparation and under different kinds of control, is not less than one hundred and seventy. Of these ninety-two have been under care of the Committee, fifty-six of them being students of theology.

The receipts from all sources have been \$15,214.79. The Committee is now simply a disbursing agency, powerless to guard against a misappropriation of funds. They invite the Assembly to consider the possibility of enlarging their powers so as to give them joint supervision with the Presbyteries, and to authorise them to require quarterly reports of the standing, diligence, and piety of each beneficiary. They ask the Assembly to enjoin upon the Presbyteries the utmost vigilance in receiving candidates. The too great facility of admission for candidates is prolific of evil. Another obstacle in the way of the greatest usefulness of the Committee is the independent position occupied by some of our Presbyteries.

THE ASSEMBLY'S ACTION ON EDUCATION.

Dr. HENDRICK, chairman of Standing Committee, presented its report on the sixth day. The chief points of it, were, (1) urging on all the churches, especially the vacant ones, to do something for this cause, in order to raise the \$25,000 it needs this year; (2) enjoining on the Presbyteries greater vigilance and care in receiving and recommending candidates for the ministry; (3) that all our Presbyteries be recommended to coöperate, as far as practicable, with the Committee at Memphis; (4) that the chairman of the Executive Committee obtain from Professors in seminaries, colleges, and schools, a quarterly report of the diligence, progress, and standing of each beneficiary, these reports to be furnished to the Presbyteries for their immediate action in the premises; (5) that the last Thursday of February be appointed as a day of special prayer for the outpouring of the Spirit on our youth and our institutions of learning.

Dr. CHAPMAN urged greater rigidity in the examination of candidates by Presbyteries.

A lively debate followed, turning on the question, whether reports of the conduct and standing of beneficiaries should be made to the Executive Committee of Education, or to the Presbyterial Committees, or to both. Dr. SHEARER maintained the exclusive authority of Presbyteries. Dr. BOGGS would have the reports come to the Executive Committee and be sent by them to the Presbyteries. Whereupon Dr. SHEARER moved an amendment to that effect. Rev. W. V. WILSON held this to be a round-about way. He moved to amend by providing that the chairmen of the Presbyterial Committees should receive the reports. Drs. J. R. WILSON and SHEARER urged that the Secretary of Education was the proper channel through whom the reports should be sent to the Presbyteries. Rev. W. V. WILSON wished to keep the matter entirely out of the Executive Committee. It did not belong to them, but exclusively to the Presbyteries. The round-about plan would work evil by causing Presbyteries to feel released from their own proper duty. Another objection was, that after a while the rights of the Presbyteries in this matter would be forgotten, and when asserted, the

answer would be that the highest court of the Church must regulate. Rev. H. G. HILL sympathised in these views. He was utterly opposed to the Secretary having any thing to do with receiving reports of the scholarship and behavior of candidates. Dr. BOGGS, as a member of the Executive Committee, desired that the Assembly, without giving that Committee any jurisdiction, should yet make it their duty to furnish information to the Presbyteries respecting their candidates. They had already volunteered opinions where they thought a case was flagrant and no attention was paid to them. He said: I received not long ago a letter from a man who had been engaged for a long time in the Church's educational work. He stated to me that the most serious objection he had to beneficiary education, was this—that after twenty years of personal observation, he is persuaded that a very considerable percentage of the young men passed through our Colleges and Seminaries by this scheme, are in fact useless to the Church after they have graduated. He feels the utter weakness of our scheme right there, and that unless some plan can be devised to prevent the reception of a beneficiary education upon too slight recommendation, the result will be that the whole scheme will collapse and the Church suffer thereby. Dr. STUART ROBINSON said: There is no reason why the officer there at the centre should not have some voice in this matter. It is all good theory that the Presbyteries have the care of the candidates; it is also certain that it is the universal practice of the Presbyteries to be very nervous about stopping improper men and thereby offending their friends: and if they can divide the responsibility with the Secretary who does not know the family, they are glad to do it. The Presbyteries have not the backbone to stop a man who has not perhaps done anything immoral, but simply has not the brains, and run the risk of offending him and his kindred, perhaps a whole county. I hope the thing will stand as it is. While the Presbyteries have the jurisdiction, the misfortune is they will not and do not exercise it. Dr. Boggs has thrown out a most important consideration, one that I am alarmed at; one that I hear almost every month and week, the idea that is getting into the Church that the whole matter of

beneficiary education had better be given up, just for the reason mentioned. I hope we shall try to arrange matters so as to have a stricter supervision. Without that, I believe it will have to be given up. There is another matter I wanted to mention—whether we had not better change our system of Education and confine appropriations to the students in Theological Seminaries or in their last collegiate year, and call out their energy and that of their friends to secure the preliminary training. We are doing damage by taking them up in our arms and carrying them along. Let them and their friends struggle to get them through College, and let us take them through the Seminary. I know how it has been in my own experience. I am not ashamed to say that I was in difficulties once. Dr. LEFEVRE wished the reports made both to the Secretary and the Presbyterial Committees. Professor MARTIN joined him in this desire. No one connected with a college or a theological school can be ignorant that some stimulus is necessary. The Presbyteries are generally lax. Owing to laxity of supervision, or perhaps “want of backbone,” as Dr. Robinson has suggested, very unsuitable candidates receive appropriations. This is a crying evil and is jeopardising the whole scheme of beneficiary education. There is growing opposition to it. He hoped the Assembly would adopt any measure that promised to increase the vigor of Presbyterial supervision. There would be no difficulty in having duplicate reports sent forward. At Davidson College they do it now. He moved to amend the amendment so as to have these reports sent both to the Executive and the Presbyterial Committees. The Rev. A. C. HOPKINS preferred to have the Presbyterial Committees alone receive these reports. Ruling elder Livingston agreed with Dr. Robinson. He called for “the question,” and the call was sustained. Professor Martin’s amendment to the amendment was agreed to, and the amendment as amended was adopted. Dr. WADDEL, the Secretary, was then heard, and the report as a whole was adopted.

For ourselves, we cordially agree with those who desired to see the rights of the Presbyteries fully maintained. In fact, we have always been of opinion that the education of their candi-

dates would be better left altogether in the hands of the individual Presbyteries. But if the Church will manage it through a committee of the General Assembly, we can discover no objection to having duplicate reports respecting the candidates sent to that Committee as well as the Presbyterial Committees.

REPORT ON PUBLICATION.

The receipts have been as follows :

For general purposes of Committee,	\$6,875 34
For business capital on Endowment Fund,	523 30
For the Publishing House,	7,395 42
	<hr/>
Total from the churches,	\$14,794 06
From Merchandise,	34,175 60
“ Borrowed money,	4,295 51
“ Rents,	2,275 00
	<hr/>
Total available resources,	\$55,540 17

The disbursements have been as follows :

On Account of Stock,	\$29,346 57
Grants of books, papers, etc.,	5,945 32
Salaries,	9,192 00
Incidentals,	3,181 90
Principal and interest on building,	6,390 45
Insurance, Repairs, Taxes,	4,040 72
	<hr/>
	\$58,096 96

Excess of disbursements over receipts, \$2,556 79

The endowment fund now stands at \$39,191.89. The circulation of the *Children's Friend* and of the *Earnest Worker* have both diminished, and the receipts from these sources have fallen short of the expectations cherished some \$1,800. A correspondence with the Reformed Church's Board of Publication has resulted in a plan of business coöperation, subject to the approval of the two churches. It is proposed that the two publishing houses shall become depositories each for the other ; that no new book shall be issued without the approval of both the Committee and the Board, and the *imprimatur* of both houses placed on it; that the same Sabbath-school paper shall be used by both churches; the Board and the Committee publishing such a

paper, into which *The Children's Friend* shall be merged; while *The Earnest Worker* and *The Sower and the Gospel Field* shall also be merged into one, to be issued simultaneously at the two publishing houses, one of these papers being published at Richmond and the other at New York.

The account of the Publishing House stands as follows:

Received from churches and individuals for the Building	
Fund,	\$16,631 39
From Rents,	4,018 16
“ Interest on Deposits,	62 64
	<hr/>
Total resources,	\$20,712 19
Paid on Building,	\$14,000 00
“ Interest,	3,710 92
“ Taxes,	1,298 22
“ Insurance,	595 82
“ Repairs and fitting up,	2,162 13
“ Agent's salary and expenses,	1,156 00
	<hr/>
	\$22,923 09
Excess of expenses over receipts,	\$2,210 90
During the past ten years the Committee has received of contributions,	
	\$92,585 40
Grants during this period,	\$45,246 59
Assets at present,	43,828 79
	<hr/>
	\$89,075 38

So that the business of the Committee has about paid its expenses.

THE ASSEMBLY'S ACTION ON PUBLICATION.

On the sixth day, Dr. FISHER, chairman of the Standing Committee, reported. On all the points of the report, the Committee was unanimous, except the fourth, where there were two dissenting voices. The *first* point commends the ability and fidelity of the Executive Committee. The *second* recapitulates what has been accomplished during the year in this department of the Church's work. The *third* refers favorably to the plans of business coöperation agreed on between our publishing house and that of the Reformed Church. The *fourth* expresses the judgment that, notwithstanding the debt of \$31,000 overhanging the property at Richmond, it ought nevertheless to be held and not sold, and recom-

mends collections on the first Sabbath in March for our Publication interests, each church to specify the particular use to be made of its contribution. The *fifth* commends and returns thanks for the services of the Rev. S. J. Baird, D. D., which were to close in July. The *sixth* repeats advice of last Assembly, about stereotype plates. The *seventh* urges on Presbyteries the work of colportage. The *eighth* is a reply to the overture from Presbytery of Memphis, touching retrenchment, and commends both the prudence and the economy of the Committee. The *ninth* opposes any removal of the Committee to St. Louis, and re-appoints the same secretary and members of Committee.

This report gave rise to some debate. Dr. BOGGS favored selling the house. He thought our publishing work a great mistake, and that the sale he advocated would be the beginning of a change for the better. Corporations always were expensive things when they went out of their legitimate work. He would illustrate by Mr. McCombs, who, when he bought out a great railway, sacrificed the machinery for working over old iron rails, saying he could gain by having them done by others who give their whole time to such work. Dr. Boggs was opposed to fostering a home-bred literature. The policy is wrong. The Methodists and Baptists had tried it, flooding their churches with books of which not one in a score is of any value. Let private parties publish, and our Committee only purchase from such the right kind of supplies. He read a statement from an elder in Tennessee, a business man, to show that the secretary is mistaken in saying the work of the Committee had supported itself.

Dr. IRVINE maintained that it would not be for the honor of this Assembly to sell that property and break up that establishment. The experiment has not yet had a fair trial. Again, it would not be for the pecuniary interest of the church to sell that property. This would be a dangerous if not ruinous policy. The cost was \$43,000. It is worth now 60,000, and yet it is proposed to sell it for \$31,000, half its value. It pays now, by rents, 8½ per cent. interest. When all the offices are finished, there will be paid in annually more than the whole interest. Besides, our people have paid already \$14,000 on the debt. And

what will you do with that? Will you rob them? Will you rob God? That is a sacred trust given you by God's people, and you are bound to apply that money to the purpose for which it was given.

Dr. BAIRD was heard in explanation, but his speech is not reported satisfactorily, and we shall not attempt to reproduce his statements, except the declaration that leading publishers in New York and Philadelphia had expressed their astonishment at our success, beginning a new enterprise without capital. He had done his best, and the Committee the same.

The motion to sell was laid on the table, and the Standing Committee's report was adopted.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE REFORMED CHURCH.

Of the two delegates from this body, the *primarius*, elder JONATHAN STURGIS, having recently deceased, the *secundus*, elder S. R. W. HEATH, was introduced to the Assembly and invited to the platform by the Moderator. In connexion with this introduction, Dr. PALMER read the report of the Committees of Conference of the Reformed Church and our own on the subject of coöperation. The report set forth that it was agreed by the two Committees that actual denominational work be commenced betwixt the Churches, (1) in Publication; (2) in evangelising the colored people of the South; (3) in the establishment of but one united Church by any contiguous Foreign Missions of the two bodies; (4) in theological education; (5) in the interchange of annual reports.

This report was referred to the Committee on Foreign Correspondence, of which Dr. Joseph R. Wilson was the chairman.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE NORTHERN ASSEMBLY.

Dr. WILLIAM BROWN read the report. It had been unanimously agreed betwixt the two Committees, that the Conference should be held in private, and also by written communications, but not to the exclusion of oral conferences whenever desired by either side. It was opened on January the 7th, at evening, in the lecture-room of the Franklin Street church, Baltimore, and continued till the evening of January 15th, when, in joint session, it was declared to be adjourned, *sine die*. According to

the terms of the commission given by the Assembly of 1874, "the causes which have heretofore prevented fraternal relations between the two Churches," and what was believed to be indispensable for their "removal," were stated clearly and fully by our Committee in the Conference. The "results" were laid before the Assembly, in a copy of the correspondence held by the two Committees. The other party having asked consent to have the correspondence published, this was readily granted by our side, and accordingly it had appeared in all the papers of our Church. But it was not known that any publication of it whatever had appeared on the part of the other Committee.

This report and correspondence were referred to the Committee on Foreign Correspondence, which, on the fifth day, through its chairman, Dr. J. R. WILSON, recommended the discharge of the Committee of Conference from the further consideration of the subject intrusted to them, and the adoption of the following minute, which was unanimously adopted :

This Assembly, in the name of the whole Church, tenders special thanks to the Committee of Conference for the diligence, fidelity, and Christian prudence with which they have discharged the delicate and important trust committed to them; and whilst regretting the failure of the Conference as to its chief end, hereby approves in general the course of the Committee, and, in particular, approves and endorses, as satisfactory to the Southern Church, the condition precedent to fraternal relations suggested by our Committee, viz. : "If your Assembly could see its way clear to say, in a few plain words, to this effect, That these obnoxious things were said and done in times of great excitement, and are to be regretted; and that now, in a calm review, the imputations cast upon the Southern Church," (of schism, heresy, and blasphemy,) "are disapproved, that would end the difficulty at once."

As part of the history of this matter, we here append the minute adopted in the Northern Assembly. The reader will observe the bearing of the word *present*.

Resolved, That this Assembly deeply regrets that the negotiations in reference to fraternal correspondence between the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the Presbyterian Church in the United States, (popularly known as the Presbyterian Church South,) have failed; that the Assembly deems it inexpedient to press the question of fraternal relations at present by further negotiations, through the

appointment of another committee; at the same time the Assembly avails itself of this opportunity to affirm unequivocally its confidence in the integrity and Christian character of our brethren of the Southern Church, and to declare that all the acts and deliverances of the Northern Assemblies of which they complain are wholly null and void, and of no binding efficacy as judgments of the Church we represent, or as rules of proceeding for its Presbyteries and church sessions; and that in so far as they, or any of them, can be supposed to import any injurious imputations upon the *present* character and standing of the churches and members of the Southern Assembly as Christians and Presbyterians, such an application of them would be unjust to them and would be disapproved and regretted by us; and further, to reaffirm explicitly, in harmony with the repeated and emphatic deliverances of former Assemblies, our hearty willingness and our earnest and sincere desire for the re-establishment of fraternal relations between the two bodies, on terms and conditions which shall be mutually honorable, and in the spirit of Christian charity, forbearance, and brotherly love, and that we await, in charity and hope, the early coming of the day when we shall again mingle with our brethren of the Southern Church in Christian fellowship and co-operation.

Just before the dissolution of our Assembly, Dr. Stuart Robinson stated that on his reading this minute, he thought he saw that it had been so framed as to put us into the position of not accepting the "olive branch;" and so, with a view of estopping all clamor about this olive branch, he took the responsibility of sending the following telegram:

ST. LOUIS, May 29th.

To Rev. Robert Hays, or Moderator of General Assembly, Cleveland, Ohio:

Will your Assembly strike out from minute on fraternal relations, the word "present," before "character," and officially communicate resolution on Monday, by telegraph? If so, I will propose to appoint delegates.

STUART ROBINSON.

He had received no answer, but had observed that they had declined, in different forms, to do the very thing which he proposed. The morning after our Assembly was dissolved, Dr. Robinson received the following:

CLEVELAND, O., May 31st.

Rev. Dr. Stuart Robinson, General Assembly, St. Louis:

Our Assembly cannot, at this late hour, reconsider its action.

E. D. MORRIS.

It may be added, that in reply to Dr. Niccolls's fiery harangue

in the Assembly at Cleveland, the Rev. Ben Ezra Styles Ely had told them: "There are those upon the floor of this house who have letters now in their possession from leading men in the Southern Assembly, expressing the same opinion as that of Dr. Robinson, and indicating that if this Assembly would simply say that any reflections upon the Christian character of the Southern Church were to be regretted, they would be willing to appoint a delegate from their Assembly in St. Louis to meet with us in this General Assembly."

COMMITTEE ON COMMISSIONERS' AND CONTINGENT FUND.

This matter was at first referred to the Committee on Systematic Benevolence; but after discussion, was taken out of their hands and referred to a Standing Committee on that subject, as provided for by the last Assembly. On the seventh day, the Rev. H. G. HILL, chairman, reported at length; and on the tenth day, his report, after considerable discussion, in which Dr. LEFEVRE, Mr. GORDON, Dr. ROBINSON, Mr. NEIL, Dr. J. R. WILSON, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. AIKEN took part, was adopted. It confirms the action of the last Assembly, adopting a system for defraying the expenses of commissioners and the contingent expenses of the Assembly, by assessing each Presbytery so much for every church member in its bounds; the same to be apportioned by the Presbyteries amongst their respective churches. The money is to be paid over at the spring meetings of Presbytery, and forwarded by the commissioners to the Assembly's Standing Committee, at whose call the apportionment of each Presbytery and the bill of the travelling expenses of its commissioners is to be presented. The Standing Committee, at each Assembly, is to make an estimate of the expenses of the next Assembly, including the journeys to and fro of its members, and the *per capita* rate is to be determined accordingly. For the next Assembly it is to be eight cents per member, designed to raise the sum of at least \$8,000. Any Presbytery declining to coöperate, and preferring to pay the expenses of its own commissioners, is to contribute to the contingent fund at the rate of two cents per member, the remaining six being supposed to be what will pay the travelling expenses of its own commissioners.

The main ground on which the scheme was urged, is, that the distant Presbyteries ought not to have to pay so heavily in support of the General Assembly, it not being their own business on which they come, but the business of the whole Church; and not as any matter of charity to them, but in simple justice, the expenses of the Assembly ought to be met by the whole Church, the stronger Presbyteries paying much, and the weaker little. The Church is one body, a free commonwealth; its commissioners are sent from particular Presbyteries, but they do not represent each his own Presbytery, but the whole Church. They are not deputies sent to do the bidding of their own constituents, but they are *general representatives*, who hear all that is to be said on every question, and then, guided by an intelligent comprehension of it, vote as the good of the whole Church, and not of their own Presbytery, may require.

The main point of the opposition was, that the Form of Government, Chapter XXII., § iii., says, it is proper that expenses be defrayed by the bodies represented. It was maintained that the Assembly cannot require the whole Church to divide out the Assembly's expenses *pro rata* amongst its members, because of this provision of the Constitution. But it was properly answered that there has grown up a practical interpretation of this provision, which makes it consist with assessments by the Assembly laid on the stronger Presbyteries, with a view to lighten the burden of the weaker, because this old custom has all the force of law.

It seems to us that the provision of the Constitution in question does not apply to the Presbyteries as distinct from the Assembly, but as distinct from the ministers and elders sent to represent them. These are not to go at their own charges, but the Presbyteries represented shall pay their way. If the Assembly finds it necessary to provide additionally towards this end, surely the Constitution is in vain appealed to against any such measure.

The measure now adopted, it was said, had been pronounced against by a majority of the Presbyteries. We doubt whether that can be fairly stated; there was some misunderstanding of

the matter when it came last before our Presbyteries. There is no attempt to deprive any Presbytery of its freedom. They may coöperate with this scheme, or they may pay the expenses of their own commissioners; only those who do not choose to cooperate, are expected by the highest court of our Church to contribute to its contingent fund two cents per member.

But whilst we make little of the constitutional objection, it is not our expectation that this measure will secure the general cooperation of the Presbyteries. That ceremony prescribed to each commissioner, of "stepping up to the Committee's office" and handing in the apportionment on his Presbytery, and then his own bill for travelling expenses, will kill the scheme. It would kill one far more generally acceptable. Our Presbyteries will for the most part, be non-coöperating, but they will, every one, we hope and trust, send up the amounts assessed on them by the Assembly.

PROPOSED EXCURSIONS.

The President of the Denver and South Park Railroad invited the Assembly to take an excursion to Colorado. Thanks were returned. The ladies of the church where the Assembly met invited the Assembly to a lunch at the Fair-grounds, it being the annual *picnic* of the children. Mr. WEBB moved to accept. Dr. ROBINSON said he would like to be there, but did not like the idea of the Assembly adjourning to attend a *picnic*! He would recognise every kindness offered, but did not care to go into the *sensational*, so prevalent amongst our brethren from whom we have separated. Dr. LEFEVRE said it is always proper for a court of the Church to return thanks for courtesy extended, but the accepting formally any invitations, goes right across his views of what is becoming. Mr. WEBB modified his motion so as simply to return thanks, and it was unanimously agreed to.

PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

Savannah was nominated, on the invitation of the First Presbyterian church of that city, by the Rev. E. C. GORDON. Dr. PALMER urged the acceptance of the invitation, and hoped no other place would be put in nomination. That church was his first pastoral charge, had struggled with great difficulties, has

emerged gradually from obscurity, and is becoming an important church. He pleaded also the general interests of Presbyterianism in Savannah. Dr. ROBINSON said he had designed nominating Louisville, but after Dr. PALMER'S appeal he would not, unless other places were nominated. Dr. GIRARDEAU said Charleston greatly desired the Assembly to meet there, but waived all claim in favor of her sister city, Savannah. It was to be remembered, also, that Savannah made this same request last year, but had waived it in favor of St. Louis, because we had just then joyfully welcomed our Missouri brethren. Here, then, in St. Louis, let us now appoint Savannah for the next place of meeting. Dr. J. R. WILSON said that Wilmington church had asked for the next Assembly, but he would now prefer going to Savannah. Dr. ROBINSON then moved that the "vote be taken on Savannah unanimously, by acclamation." And the vote was so taken.

CASE OF THE FIRST CHURCH, LOUISVILLE.

On the fourth day, Dr. PALMER presented the Judicial Committee's report upon this case. It could not be taken up as an appeal, because the Rev. J. J. Cooke, not having been "a party aggrieved," in our technical sense of that term, could not appeal. As a complaint, it might be entertained by the Assembly; and as all parties desired the decision of it to be made by this body, (to which it has come,) over the head of the Synod of Kentucky, the Committee recommend that the Assembly should take it up. The whole difficulty arose from a difference of interpretation upon one or two points of constitutional law. (1.) It is alleged in the complaint that the Presbytery of Louisville, in receiving certain memorials, and upon the allegations in them, proceeding to exercise its visitorial powers in the First church, did, from the nature of the charges, commence what was essentially a judicial investigation, which should, therefore, have been conducted under judicial forms. (2.) From the action of the Presbytery, in proceeding to an investigation, Dr. S. R. Wilson took an appeal to a superior court, claiming that this must operate to suspend proceedings until it could be settled in the higher court. Upon both these points the Assembly might render a decision, and also upon any others where the parties appeared open to censure. Then,

by remanding the case to the Presbytery of Louisville, with an injunction to take it up from the beginning under these rulings, opportunity would be afforded all parties to retrieve errors, and the Assembly, in the tenderest way, would arbitrate between brethren who, for their past fidelity to the truth and kingdom of the Master, are entitled to the confidence and affection of the whole Church. Then followed the usual recommendation of the order of proceedings.

A discussion then arose upon a motion by Dr. J. R. WILSON to elect a commission of nine to review this case, decide it, and present their decision to the Assembly for its confirmation or disapproval. Some of the speakers held that the Assembly had no right to send the case to a commission; some were clear that the body did possess this right, and ought to exercise it in this case; and some, again, were favorable to a commission, but wished it to consist of the members of the Judicial Committee. Dr. LEFEVRE accepted the principle of the commission, though not its expediency in this case. Dr. GIRARDEAU was clear that the precedents of the Presbyterian Church would justify the appointment of a commission. And Dr. PALMER would very much prefer that our Form and Discipline should provide for the trial of every judicial case by commission rather than by the Assembly, and make that commission a court of final verdict. He trusted the time may come when that will be the case; but as such is not now our law, he objected to adopting that practice on the hurry and spur of an occasion like this. Only make the commission a true court, and then its decisions would be just as wise and just as valid by, say, twelve men, as if by twelve hundred. But when that practice is to be introduced, he wished it to be done deliberately, after full discussion and upon the naked ground of the principle itself, rather than to meet the exigencies of any particular case. Dr. J. R. WILSON insisted that the principle of the commission is settled amongst us, and has long been acted on. It is no new theory that the Assembly, or any other of our courts, can act by commission. Every Executive Committee of our Church is a commission as to the business committed to it. These executive agencies transact business which the Assembly

is unable to transact, not being in perpetual session. But then their decisions and determinations are merely provisional, and must be subjected to the revision of the Assembly, by which alone they can get permanent authority. Now, Dr. PALMER had said this case turned on points of constitutional order. Why, then, could not a commission of nine or eleven bring before this body these points, making them as luminous as light, bringing them out distinctly, first as they emerge from the testimony, and then pointing out clearly from the Constitution, or from custom and precedent, what should be the decision of the Assembly in the premises? In that way, if the business were well done, the whole matter could be so concentrated in a few points as to the facts, that we could ascertain them by a glance, and then the few points of controversy could be speedily adjudicated.

It appears to us very clear, that the principle of commissions generally is settled already amongst us, for it cannot be denied that our Executive Committees are such, and moreover, that the Assembly cannot do its work without them. And if all the other affairs of the Church can be legitimately superintended by commissions, (which nevertheless must submit their action to the inspection and review of the supreme judicatory,) we are unable to perceive why the particular business of hearing an appeal or complaint may not be transacted in precisely the same way. A large body cannot give its attention to all the details of an ordinary judicial case. The thing is simply an impossibility. But a smaller body can attend to and master these details, and can present them intelligibly and fairly to the larger. The principle of commissions is quite in harmony with Presbyterianism, which regulates everything by a few acting in the room of the many. The principle of the whole body managing everything itself directly, is the very genius of Congregationalism. What Judge CLAPP said, that no legislative body can delegate its legislative authority to any inferior body, and that on the same ground, no judicial body can delegate its judicial power, is true; but the principle of the commission delegates power of neither sort. It only enables the court *to get work done* which itself cannot directly perform, while the final decision is kept

in its own hand. Dr. PALMER'S idea of the commission, however, would make it "a true court, rendering a final verdict." This, we hold, would not be Presbyterian. We cannot make any new court, as we cannot create any new officer. Scripture gives us authority for the Session, a court ruling over one congregation; and for the Presbytery, a court ruling over several associated congregations; and for the Synod or Assembly, a court ruling over several Presbyteries, with their groups of congregations; and we conceive that Scripture warrants (as Dr. PALMER on another occasion pointed out,) the gathering of several Synods or Assemblies all over the world, when the time shall come for it, into one grand court—an *Œcumenical Council*. But it does not seem to us that Scripture warrants "a true court," made out of part of the Session, or the Presbytery, or the Synod, or the Assembly, and constituting a body separate from and independent of each respectively. It is Presbyterian to do by committee the *inquiring*, and by commission the *inquiring* and *acting*, which the court cannot do itself; but in every case of committee or commission, there must be a report made for final judgment by the appointing body. Our church courts are representative bodies, and they may not delegate to other bodies either their legislative or their judicial powers.

Judge HUNTON favored the motion for a commission. He had read the discussion in the papers, and regarded it as most unfortunate. Kentucky was famous for angry political discussions. He would not say there had not been in *those* as much vituperation and bitter denunciation; but he would say that in *this*, using the language of a Georgia Judge, there had been practised "a great economy in the use of soft words." The Georgia Judge was asked if a certain man was not the greatest liar in the State, and replied that "he would not say that, but he did say that the man used great economy, indeed, even a *penuriousness*, in the use of the truth." He did not wish these private quarrels brought before the Assembly.

Dr. STUART ROBINSON rose to a question of privilege. He must protest against the imputation of "economy in the use of soft words," so far as concerned the Presbytery and himself. He

challenged any to take the record and find any evidence of violence or passion. For the complainant, likewise, (Rev. J. J. Cooke,) not a member of the house; he must challenge any one to find in his paper aught constituting impropriety of language. It is not just to speak of this as one of those cases not fit to come in here. There was, indeed, an appeal alluded to in the report, (which has not been prosecuted,) that might have given rise to some personal feeling. But he wanted the Assembly to understand distinctly that, as conducted by Mr. Cooke, who has complained against the irregularities of our Presbytery, there is nothing in the case to call up the least feeling. He himself had never experienced more especially the blessing of God in giving him grace to keep down his Irish temper than in this matter. He had uttered nothing angry, except, perhaps, once or twice, in a hasty moment, which, as soon as checked by the Moderator, he had taken back and apologised for. The trouble has been that, by one party the appeal has, from the start, been to the outside world, through the secular papers; and from the tone of that appeal, people inferred that the other side were as violent. But the violence and passion were like his countryman's account of his ardent love for the girl that had jilted him. When asked if his love for Biddy was reciprocated: "Och," he said, "it's reciprocal enough, but the reciprocity is all on one side." Mr. Cooke's paper has some hard things in it, but he had a right to say them, and they are in no vituperative language. There is nothing that will come before this Assembly to justify this fear of taking up the case. I do not care to say a word about the question, but am perfectly willing that Mr. Cooke, on the one side, and Mr. Morris, on the other, who is an elder in the church, and not a lawyer either, should just tell the Assembly their story. You know it takes a great deal of grace to keep the Irish, and I might say, the Kentucky, temper down, under provocation. But I vow before God that I have not felt any bitterness. I have done nothing but what my duty as a presbyter compelled me to do in this case. I have prayed, and God has given me grace, as everybody in my Presbytery will testify. Why, sir, some of the people of Louis-

ville, surprised at my forbearance, think that I have got converted within the last six months.

The motion to appoint a commission was then laid on the table. The Moderator charged the Assembly, and the case was opened with the reading of the two complaints of the Rev. J. J. COOKE against the Presbytery of Louisville. On the next day, the fifth, the records of the Louisville Presbytery, as to the trouble in the First Church, occupied the Assembly's hearing until near evening. On the sixth day, the complainant was heard, occupying a large portion of the day. The main point attempted to be made was, that the investigation into the affairs of the Church asked for by the memorialists was really a judicial proceeding, since it must condemn or acquit one or both parties; and this being so, Dr. Wilson, as one of the parties, was entitled to take an immediate appeal to the Synod, the effect of which, from the very nature of an appeal, should have been to stop all proceedings in the Presbytery. On the next day, the seventh, Dr. STUART ROBINSON was heard on the side of the Presbytery. He argued to show that the investigation undertaken by the Presbytery was a visitation of the church which the Form of Government expressly empowers a Presbytery to make; also, that the appeal, so called, by Dr. Wilson, had none of the features of an appeal as described in our Book. Dr. ROBINSON did not conclude until the close of the night session, at half-past ten. On the eighth day, in the evening, Rev. Mr. COOKE was heard in reply. The roll-call for the expression of opinions by the members began at twenty minutes past ten p. m., and was continued till eleven, when the Assembly adjourned. This was continued on Saturday, the ninth day, and was resumed and concluded in the evening. The vote being taken, there were 38 to sustain in part, and 68 not to sustain, and some twenty or more absent or not voting. Afterwards, Dr. GIRARDEAU, from the majority, offered a minute, which proved acceptable to many who voted to sustain in part, and which, in fact, was adopted unanimously, or perhaps with one dissenting voice. Dr. PALMER, of the minority, also offered a minute, signed by a portion of those who voted with him to sustain in part, which he desired to have appended to Dr. Gi-

rardeau's minute, and then the Assembly would have approached a good degree of unanimity in the final settlement. His request was unanimously granted. These minutes were as follows:

The Minute adopted by the Assembly.—The Assembly, in voting not to sustain the complaint of J. J. Cooke and others against the Presbytery of Louisville, would be understood as passing judgment only upon the constitutional issues involved in said complaint; while, at the same time, there were, in its opinion, some irregularities in the proceedings of the Presbytery which it could not approve, but which it did not deem necessary to pass upon judicially.

Dr. Palmer's Minute.—The undersigned, being of the minority who voted to sustain in part the complaint of J. J. Cooke, accord with the minute adopted by the majority, with the exception that in some of the points termed irregularities in the above minute, they regard the Presbytery as having transcended the limits of their constitutional power.

As a part of the subsequent history of this case, we mention that shortly after the dissolution of the Assembly, a meeting of Louisville Presbytery was held, and Dr. Robinson, after some remarks, said to be very courteous to Dr. Wilson, proposed the following resolution, which the Presbytery adopted, along with another, which is here appended to it:

Resolved, That, as the General Assembly has decided all the constitutional points raised in the complaint of the Rev. J. J. Cooke adversely to the complaint, and in favor of the judgments of the Presbytery—bringing us to a point where this unhappy difficulty may be settled; and as the Presbytery is indisposed to impugn the personal character of Rev. Dr. Samuel R. Wilson, now, therefore, Presbytery hereby declines the prosecution of the charges tabled against Dr. Wilson.

Resolved, That, in view of the final action of the General Assembly at St. Louis, this Presbytery desires now to settle this unhappy difficulty in all its forms as speedily as may be consistent with justice and kindness to all parties, that the interests of our churches may receive immediate attention; and in order, therefore, that the Presbytery may shape its action intelligently in reference to the business now before it, the clerk of Presbytery be directed immediately to give notice to Dr. Samuel R. Wilson of the desire of Presbytery to know at once whether he now recognises the jurisdiction of this body, and will submit to its decisions concerning himself.

In reply, Dr. Wilson refused to recognise the authority of either the Presbytery or the General Assembly, and formally renounced their jurisdiction. His answer was received by the

Presbytery and ordered to be placed on file, and then, by unanimous vote, the Presbytery adopted the following resolution :

Resolved, That, Dr. Samuel R. Wilson having finally and formally refused to recognise the jurisdiction and submit to the decisions of this Presbytery and also of the General Assembly, the Presbytery hereby declares that said Dr. Samuel R. Wilson has no further authority from this Church to preach and administer ordinances, and his name be stricken from the roll.

Dr. Wilson has since been welcomed into the Northern Presbyterian Church.

ACTION UPON SUNDRY OVERTURES.

From the variety of overtures presented to the Assembly, and reported on favorably or unfavorably by the Committee of Bills and Overtures, through their chairman, Dr. GIRARDEAU, we select a few of special interest, being all we can make room for. The first one we introduce is on EDUCATION, Overture No. 8, from the Presbytery of Concord, asking the Assembly to consider the propriety of abandoning the present scheme of Education, and remanding this subject to the Presbyteries. The Committee recommend that, as the overture contemplates a radical change in the policy of the Church, a Committee of two ministers and one elder be appointed to consider the subject maturely, collect the sense of the Church by correspondence, and report to the next Assembly.

The next is on BIENNIAL SESSIONS, Overture No. 16, from the Presbytery of Macon, asking the Assembly to propose to the Presbyteries such change in the Constitution of the Church as to require only biennial instead of annual sessions of the Synods and the Assembly, and these to be arranged so as to alternate—the Synod meeting one year and the Assembly the next. The Committee recommended that the Assembly answer the overture in the negative.

Another is on the PRESBYTERY OF HANGCHOW, Overture No. 19, from Rev. M. H. Houston, Rev. B. Helm, Rev. H. C. DuBose, and Rev. J. W. Davis, members of the Presbytery of Hangchow, China, asking the Assembly to dissolve said Presbytery and restore the memorialists to the Presbyteries to which

they originally belonged. This overture raises the question of the constitutional power of the General Assembly to establish or dissolve Presbyteries on foreign soil, and also the important practical inquiry whether our missionaries abroad should become associated with natives in the composition of Presbyteries, or whether, holding their membership in the home Presbyteries, they should, as evangelists, sustain a catholic relation to the foreign field. In view of the difficulty of these questions, and the desirableness of settling our policy in regard to these matters, the Committee recommend the Assembly to appoint a committee, consisting of J. B. Adger, D. D., J. L. Wilson, D. D., and T. E. Peck, D. D., who shall be charged with the consideration of this subject, and who shall report to the next Assembly.

The only other one we can refer to is on the EDUCATION OF COLORED MINISTERS, Overture No. 21, from Rev. C. A. Stillman, D. D., and others, asking the Assembly, at its present meeting, to take action looking to the establishment of an institute for the education of colored preachers, in pursuance of the policy recommended by the last Assembly; or, in case the way be not clear to do that at their meeting, to appoint a Committee to take the subject into consideration, and, if they deem it expedient and practicable, to digest a plan for the organisation, management, and support of such a school, and report to the next Assembly. The Committee recommended that the Assembly accede to the latter alternative of this request, and appoint a Committee for the purpose specified in the overture, of which Dr. Stillman shall be chairman, and who shall report to the next Assembly.

In each of these cases, the report of the Committee was adopted.

CORRESPONDING BODIES.

The Rev. JAMES B. LOGAN was received as delegate from the Cumberland Presbyterian church, and the Rev. Dr. HERVIE D. GANSE, with Ruling elder S. R. W. HEATH, from the Reformed Church. They addressed the Assembly in very pleasant terms, and the Moderator gave them kindly replies. Dr. SMOOT and Rev. J. W. PUGH were appointed principal and alternate to attend the Cumberland Presbyterian Assembly meeting next May

at Bowling Green, Kentucky; and Dr. LEFEVRE and Hon. J. A. INGLIS, the General Synod of the Reformed Church at Jersey City in June of the current year.

SABBATH-SCHOOLS.

Dr. SHEARER, chairman of Standing Committee reported on the sixth day.

The No. of Presbyteries reporting in 1875 was,	55
“ “ Schools reported,	871
“ “ Teachers reported,	7,642
“ “ Scholars reported.	56,039
The No. of Teachers added to the Church,	328
“ “ Scholars added to the Church,	2,221
The amount of moneys contributed by schools,	\$30,058 00

There is a growing disposition to put the schools under the control of the Church. The standards of the Church are used largely, but not universally.

The resolutions adopted set forth—

(1.) That the Sunday-school is the old catechetical school, and should drill its scholars in the Scriptures and our Church standards.

(2.) That the pastor and elders, and such others as they may approve, are the divinely appointed catechists or teachers.

(3.) That family training is in no wise to be transferred to the Sabbath-school.

(4.) That the Sabbath-school is not to be allowed to interfere with the hours of public worship or family religion.

(5.) That the Assembly utters a solemn testimony against the sentimental, the sensational, and the formalistic in the music and literature of Sabbath-schools, and the devices invented to popularise them. Children intoxicated thus must have deeper draughts at the same fountains in maturer life.

(6.) That churches and presbyteries be earnestly exhorted to establish Sabbath-schools for the colored people whenever practicable and report to the Assembly separately. [This resolution was offered by Ruling elder KIRKPATRICK.]

EVANGELISTIC WORK.

The Rev. J. W. NEIL, chairman of the Standing Committee, reported. Only twenty-nine Presbyteries had made reports, three less than last year and five less than the year previous—and the reports made were extremely meagre. Some merely

mention that an evangelist is employed, some make no distinction between the evangelist and the stated supply. In the reporting Presbyteries, thirty-five evangelists have been employed for the whole of their time, and three for the one-half of it. No doubt this work requires men of peculiar gifts and graces. We have men enough, however, every way competent; but the deficiency is of funds.

But whilst so few of the Presbyteries have made any report directly to the Assembly, fifty-three of them did report to the Executive Committee. It is believed that it would be less likely to create confusion if the reports were all allowed to pass through that channel. The Assembly adopted this suggestion of the Standing Committee, and also passed resolutions urging the work upon the attention of the Presbyteries.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

Dr. LEFEVRE, chairman of Standing Committee, on the seventh day, reported seventy-seven students at Union, and thirty-eight at Columbia. It was recommended that the Assembly elect a Professor of Church History and Polity, and the Composition and Delivery of Sermons, for the latter institution. The last Assembly having altered the Constitution so that the Board of Directors should consist of twelve, one-third going out each year, and having actually elected twelve Directors on that plan, but this action not appearing on the Minutes, the Assembly required the twelve who were elected last year to determine, by lot or otherwise, at their regular annual meeting, which of them shall serve for one, which for two, and which for three years. It also appointed the Faculty and Board a Committee to enquire what changes, if any, in the Constitution would promote the usefulness of the Seminary, and especially charged them to consider the question of placing the election of Professors and the adjustment of their chairs in the power of the Board, the Assembly always reviewing their action; and also the question of putting the final determination of all matters of discipline in the hands of the Directors.

On the next day the report was adopted, and the election of Professor made the order for the day after at ten o'clock. Dr.

LEFEVRE was nominated but withdrew his name. Dr. JUNKIN and the Rev. C. R. VAUGHAN were nominated. Subsequently, Dr. LEFEVRE presented another report, stating that Dr. Plumer had tendered the resignation of his chair that he might be transferred to a chair to be called the chair of Pastoral, Casuistic, and Historic Theology. It was therefore recommended that the Assembly agree to this arrangement, and recalling all the previous action on the subject, proceed to nominate and elect a Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, leaving Church History and Government, and Sacred Rhetoric, to be taught by the other Professors. The next day, Saturday, this report was adopted, and Dr. Girardeau was nominated by Dr. PALMER, and his election urged by Drs. J. R. WILSON, McQUEEN, STUART ROBINSON, JUNKIN, and the Rev. T. E. SMITH, the nominee seeking to dissuade the Assembly and declaring that he could not accept. On Monday, Dr. Girardeau was elected unanimously and by a rising vote. Dr. GIRARDEAU subsequently thanked the Assembly for the highest honor ever conferred upon him in this mortal life. He professed to be impressed with the unanimity of his call by this supreme court, but begged for time to consider, and trusted that if he should find himself at last in the unhappy position of appearing to resist the unanimous will of the Assembly, his brethren would do him the justice to presume that only a profound conviction of duty and conscience, in view of all the facts known to the individual himself, could have induced him to take such a position.

SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.

Dr. BOGGS, chairman of the Standing Committee, presented its report on the ninth day. It set forth that only forty-six Presbyteries had complied with the Assembly's directions to forward their annual report on this subject—nine less than last year. Moreover, many of the reports sent up are both irregular and defective. The printed blanks of the Committee of Publication would enable Stated Clerks of Presbyteries easily to make these reports all the Assembly desires.

The forty-six Presbyteries which have reported embrace 1,313

congregations. Of these, 284 have contributed to the six schemes of the Assembly, 167 to five, 101 to four, 119 to three, 126 to two, 122 to one, 394 to none so far as known. The whole number of collections by these 1,313 congregations should have been (1,313x6) 7,878, but they have been only 3,674—less than half.

The chief causes which interfere with our success in this matter are undoubtedly (1) the failure of many ministers to expound the Scripture doctrine of worship with their substance; (2) the neglect of many sessions to afford the people opportunity to give to the six schemes. With regard to the first, it is pertinent to remark that the ministry is responsible to the Lord, above all other agencies, for the Church's enlightenment and her growth in this, as in other graces. Touching the second, the Committee are fully persuaded that the time has come to assert the binding force of the Assembly's orders to take up collections for specified purposes. If it be true that the solemn injunctions of the Assembly upon the Sessions are merely of the nature of advice which may be set aside without the sin of disobedience to lawful authority, then it is difficult to see wherein our system of Presbytery differs from Congregational Independency and Voluntarism. Now, "the jurisdiction proposed is solely over ministers and sessions, touching the matter of their presenting these beneficent objects to their people. . . . It does not trench in the slightest degree upon the individual Christian's private judgment and liberty in regard to giving."

The action contemplated in the succeeding paragraphs was unanimously recommended by the Committee, and on the next day, the tenth, was adopted by the Assembly:

1. The Assembly solemnly urges upon pastors and other ministers their obligation to expound fully to the people the duty and privilege of giving to Christ as an essential part of acceptable worship.

2. The Assembly urges upon all its constituent Presbyteries to include this branch of ministerial duty in their stated conferences upon the state of religion in their bounds.

3. The Assembly hereby solemnly enjoins the Presbyteries to require of church sessions, in case of failure to take up any one of the collections ordered, to report in writing the reason therefor, upon the validity

of which the Presbytery shall pass judgment, approving or disapproving, as the case may be. And the Presbyteries shall state upon the face of their annual reports on Systematic Benevolence in regard to their compliance with this injunction.

4. It is made the duty of the Standing Committee on Systematic Benevolence of each General Assembly, to ascertain from the Presbyterial Reports on this subject, how far the above injunction has been complied with, and to report to the Assembly what Presbyteries, if any, have failed to comply with either of them. It is also made the duty of the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly to enter upon the docket the duties hereby imposed upon the said Committee as an item of business, so that the attention of the Committee may be expressly called thereto.

5. In case any Presbytery fails to report on the subject of Systematic Benevolence, or to report in due and proper form, as ordered by the Assembly, or to report in regard to either of the requirements made in the above injunction; or, if the report in the case of any Presbytery shows that it has not complied with the injunction first named, in Section 3 above, viz., in regard to the requirement from church sessions of the reasons for their failure in any case to give the people an opportunity to contribute, the Moderator of the Assembly shall thereupon appoint some member of said Presbytery as the Assembly Commissioner thereto, to bring the failure to the attention of Presbytery. And the Presbytery shall send up to the next General Assembly, along with its report on Systematic Benevolence, a statement of the reasons for said failure.

6. In order the more surely to obtain collections from vacant congregations, (without, however, lessening the separate and full responsibility of the sessions thereof in the premises, and in the absence of supplies,) the Presbyteries are hereby enjoined to require supplies sent to such vacant churches to attend to this business; and, in case of failure to do so, to render a reason therefor.

Now let it be carefully observed that this action of the Assembly assumes no jurisdiction over private individuals, nor trenches on the Christian liberty of church members. It deals only with ministers and church sessions in their official capacity, simply requiring that they give the people an opportunity to contribute.

Let it be observed again that there is a necessity for some such action by the Assembly. The Foreign Missions debt of last year was \$15,000, and more than half our congregations contributing nothing! The General Assembly enjoins on its Presbyteries collections for this and the other schemes of the Church, but has never carefully supervised the Presbyteries to see if its injunc-

tions were carried out; and the Presbyteries have never carefully supervised the ministers and sessions respecting the matter. The results stare us in the face. And it appears very plain to us that these regulations adopted by the Assembly are *lawful*, were *called for*, and will be found *practicable*, and that as enactments by the General Assembly, both scriptural and constitutional, they should receive the cordial assent and coöperation of the Presbyteries and all concerned.

TRANSFER OF COMMITTEES.

On the ninth day, Dr. JUNKIN, chairman of the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions, made a supplementary report, ordering the transfer of that Executive Committee to Baltimore, on the ground of the necessity of better commercial and financial facilities. Dr. STUART ROBINSON, chairman of Standing Committee on Sustentation, also presented a supplementary report, ordering the transfer of that Executive Committee to the same place, on the ground of the difficulty of separating it from Foreign Missions and the additional expense such separation would involve, and "for other reasons."

On the next day the matter was again taken up and the Standing Committee's reasons for recommending the transfer of the Foreign Missions Committee read to the Assembly, viz., greater commercial facilities, and the expensiveness of gathering the Committee from points at a distance from Columbia. These were the reasons for the transfer, while against it were the expense of dividing the Committees one from the other, and the undesirableness of placing three of our four Executive Committees within the bounds of one Synod.

Dr. LEFEVRE expressed the readiness of Baltimore to welcome both Committees, and said a house for the conduct of the Church's work would be there freely provided. He perceived the force of the objection about the one Synod. If there was any *feeling* in any part of the Church on this point, he hoped the Assembly would not make the transfer.

The report was adopted, and the transfer of Foreign Missions made.

The question then came up of transferring Sustentation also.

The report was read. Ruling elder THOMSON moved to lay the matter on the table. Dr. STUART ROBINSON pleaded the expense and the difficulty of separating the two Secretaries. He urged the laying aside of all local feelings on the subject. The motion to lay on the table did not prevail, and the motion to adopt came up. The Rev. Mr. MURKLAND protested, that, in favoring the transfer, he had regard only to the glory of the Master and the good of the Church. Dr. BOGGS urged that the expense would be less if Sustentation were kept at Columbia than if removed to Baltimore, and pleaded what was due to the Synod of South Carolina. He urged that at least there be a pause for one year. Dr. J. R. WILSON urged that the Presbyteries of the Cotton States, if *ignored*, will *ignore*. Ruling elder SHELTON pressed the same view. Ruling elder LIVINGSTON said the Assembly erred in removing Foreign Missions, but must now needs remove Sustentation also. If you do this without consulting the Presbyteries, you will furnish the people an excuse for not giving. The two Committees must be kept together. He would like to have the first action reconsidered, and let both points go together before the Presbyteries. The Rev. D. C. BOGGS said the Sustentation Committee ought to be near either to the fountains of supply or else to the field of active labor. Baltimore was neither. The Assembly ought to be careful. The Rev. J. N. CRAIG called for Dr. McILWAINE'S statement, who then remarked that this was a Sustentation Assembly—twenty of the ministers present being chairmen of Presbyterial Committees of Domestic Missions. Moreover three members of the Executive Committee were in the Assembly, two from South Carolina, and one from North Carolina. He thought the reasons for removing Foreign Missions imperative. If sure that the debt now felt to be so heavy is the heaviest we shall ever be called to carry, we might be able to meet it at Columbia. In conducting Foreign Missions, when the time to pay money abroad arrives, it must be there. In Columbia he had not one particle of help in doing this. Had it not been for a firm of James Adger & Co., in Charleston, he did not know what he would have done. We must have commercial men at the back of the Committee. Still

further, it was necessary that Foreign Missions be committed to men trained to deal with such questions. Dr. Wilson cannot live always, and the Committee ought to be in its place of permanent location, and Dr. Wilson sent there to train a Committee for this business. Yet another reason: at Columbia we cannot get without difficulty the attendance of the ruling elders of the Committee. A fourth: the Committee as now constituted is scattered at Wilmington, Charlotte, Pendleton, Sumter, Augusta, and to get them together is quite expensive.

As to Sustentation, two things are to be observed: it ought to be put where the Church will be satisfied to have it, and where you can get a good Committee. He thought there was great force in the difficulty about jealousies. He had no views of a personal nature—whatever the Assembly should say, he would be content with.

Now as to separation of the Committees. The largest sum ever raised for Foreign Missions amongst us in one year was \$42,000. But our current expenses for this year will be \$58,000, and we owe \$15,000—in all, therefore, we must raise \$73,000, which is \$31,000 beyond what we ever have done. It can be done, with earnest effort, with combined, hearty, persistent, working power put forth. But if you separate these two departments, you must give Dr. Wilson an associate, at least a Treasurer, so that he may go forth into the field where there is immense dereliction. And he trembled when he thought of Dr. Wilson being left to carry forward this work alone under this weighty burden the present year. Dr. Boggs says any Secretary can get a couple of members of his Committee to carry on his correspondence. That might be so in Education—he would not like to trust anybody to carry on his in Sustentation or in Foreign Missions. You are obliged to have a man in the Foreign Missions office. He trusted the Assembly would not act upon the idea that Dr. Wilson could leave the office and expect any of the Committee to do his work in his absence.

The Rev. Mr. CRAIG said Foreign Missions must go to Baltimore. Sustentation must go with it, until we can support a third efficient man, when it might be placed at Nashville or St. Louis.

He saw no other way. And if the reporter will take down the speech of Dr. McIlwaine, and our papers will publish it, the whole Church will say what I say and will be satisfied.

Ruling elder J. ADGER SMYTH wished, as a member of the Executive Committee, to make a statement. He was not opposed to removing the Committee from Columbia, but did not believe the argument of Dr. McIlwaine will satisfy the Church of the propriety of this movement. The statement he would make is this: the venerable Secretary of Foreign Missions had expressed to him great doubts as to the propriety of this removal of Sustentation.

Dr. GIRARDEAU said, if we crowd our Committees into the extreme Northeast on the border line, it seemed to him a large portion of the sympathies of our Church will be alienated. The time has probably come for a division of these Committees, and he hoped Sustentation would be left for the present at Columbia.

It was then moved to postpone the further consideration of the subject until the next Assembly by a vote of 51 to 42. Dr. LEFEVRE then moved the reconsideration of the vote transferring Foreign Missions to Baltimore, on the ground of his profound conviction that the separation of the two Committees would be damaging to the Church. This was agreed to. The question recurred on the adoption of the report recommending the removal of Foreign Missions. After further remarks from Drs. Stuart Robinson and Chapman and Rev. H. G. Hill, the vote was again taken, and the report again adopted by 45 to 42.

Just before the dissolution, it was moved to reconsider the vote to postpone the question of removing Sustentation to Baltimore until the next Assembly. Dr. STUART ROBINSON urged the necessity of not separating the two Committees. We shall run the greatest risk imaginable of breaking down the whole concern. He would send both to Baltimore this year, with the understanding that, after they get through with their difficulties, we shall remove the Sustentation Committee to Nashville or St. Louis.

Some questions of order were here raised, and the hour being late, it was moved to adjourn, but lost. Dr. LEFEVRE then called

the question. The call was sustained, and the motion to reconsider agreed to.

Dr. E. P. PALMER urged the danger of serious complications, if the Committees were separated.

Dr. STUART ROBINSON pleaded for bridging over this year by leaving the two together.

Dr. BOGGS said Dr. Wilson had told him emphatically that he did not think it necessary to send the Committees together, and he besought the Assembly not to agree to this important change of policy at this late hour of the night.

The Rev. Mr. MURKLAND strongly urged the Assembly not to send them Foreign Missions without Sustentation also, and quoted Dr. J. L. Wilson for that view.

The Rev. Mr. SILLIMAN favored sending the Committee to Baltimore. He said Dr. Boggs had misunderstood Dr. J. L. Wilson. He had talked with him more than once on the subject.

Dr. ROBINSON said just insert the words "for the present year," and every body will be satisfied.

Under the call of "the question," the motion to postpone was not agreed to, and then the report of the Committee was adopted.

We agree entirely with Dr. Robinson that all *local* feelings in reference to these Committees ought to be abandoned. We "do not see (as he said) that it makes any difference where they are," so that we get a good Committee, without too much expense in bringing them together, and so that the Church is satisfied. Whether the Church will be satisfied to have three of these Committees in the Northeast corner of her boundaries and in one Synod, we cannot tell. But, for ourselves, we hope that the Presbyterians of the Cotton States will not fulfil Dr. J. R. Wilson's prediction, and ignore because ignored. The honest fact is that no ecclesiastical power belongs to these Committees—they are in no sense the old Boards. And no danger can possibly arise to the Church from their being crowded into any corner whether northeast or southwest, provided the brethren will just believe so and be satisfied. It is high time that we put away all these petty sectional jealousies, and view our Church as indeed

one body, with no diverse interests whatsoever. Surely we are little enough to keep us from such intestine divisions; and this is one reason why we oppose organic union with the North.

STATUS OF DISMISSED ELDERS.

On the tenth and last day, the Assembly took up the report on Overture No. 20, from J. R. Hughes and J. N. Saunders and others, asking the Assembly to decide the force of our Discipline, Chap. X., § 1, in relation to the status of a church member dismissed, who does not make use of but returns the letter of dismissal to the session; and also to say what is the official status of a ruling elder in the same circumstances. The Committee of Bills and Overtures recommended the Assembly to answer that the church member is to be recognised as a member, but that the elder is not to be recognised as an elder without a fresh expression of the wishes of the congregation to that effect.

Dr. BOGGS objected to that answer. There are but four ways in our system for putting an end to the functions of a ruling elder: (1) death; (2) degradation; (3) valid dismissal, which has become a consummated act when the dismissed elder becomes simply a member in the second congregation, possessing still the ruling eldership, but not the right of exercising it in that congregation; (4) an agreement between the elder and the session that he shall cease acting in the congregation where he has been an elder. The method now proposed of getting rid of elders comes in under neither of these four heads, and constitutes therefore a fifth and new method. We do not need a fifth. The report makes *ex post facto* law, and puts into the Constitution what is not there. He wished this important matter referred to an Assembly not so home-sick as this one.

Dr. LEFEVRE said he was opposed to the fundamental idea of the report. Dismissed elders are elders till received into another church—as much so as if they had merely gone on a visit to Europe and returned.

In the evening session of the last day, just before the dissolution, the subject was again taken up, and referred to the next Assembly.

There can be no doubt whatever that our Discipline (Chap. X., § 1,) leaves the dismissed member amenable to the jurisdiction of the church dismissing him until he is actually received into the other church. Now duties and rights stand and fall together. If amenableness to jurisdiction stands during the *interim*, the rights stand along with it. The one cannot be more enduring than the other. It would be orderly, however, for the session to take note of the return of the member to the rights and duties of membership.

Now as to the ruling elder, there can be no more question than as to the private member. Our Discipline expressly says (Chap. X., § 2,) that the same principle applies to the minister as to the private member—and why should it not apply also to the elder or the deacon? The highest officer amongst us—the teaching elder—cannot lay down his office without the Presbytery's act after hearing from the people. The logic of our system would seem to require that no ruling elder can ever be properly released from his office in any church, unless first the people are heard from by the session on the subject. If it be said that no such course is ever considered to be necessary, and that by usage and custom the eldership is left to stand or fall with the membership, then of course it must follow that, in the case under consideration, the eldership is restored with the membership.

SEARCHING FOR THE POLITICAL IN OUR ASSEMBLY RECORDS.

Dr. BOGGS offered the following paper, prepared by one on whose shoulders much of the responsibility devolved in the recent negotiations at Baltimore :

Whereas, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, did, at its first organisation in 1861, and also at various times since, formally and distinctly declare its conviction as to the nature and functions of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, especially as to its non-secular and non-political character ;

And whereas, notwithstanding this, it may be that certain expressions have been inadvertently admitted into some of the papers on our records, which, as it is alleged, are inconsistent with the well considered and formal views aforesaid ; therefore,

Resolved, That this subject be referred to a committee of three, whose duty it shall be to make a careful examination and make report to the

next General Assembly; to the end that no vestige of anything inconsistent with the clearly defined position of our General Assemblies may be left to impair the testimony of our Church upon this vital point.

He said it was rarely inexpedient to do right. It cannot hurt us as a Church to carry out those principles so dear to our hearts, and search our records, as with a candle, to find any thing there which is inconsistent with them. It has been said that some expressions have inadvertently crept in, which, while not to the full extent political, do nevertheless squint in that direction. He thought we ought carefully to expunge them from our records, or adopt explanatory minutes of doubtful expressions, such as "conserving slavery," etc. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

This is a good step, although it has already been and will again be misconstrued into the confession that our Assembly has erred like her Northern sister. We can afford to do right, however, even though misrepresented for it. But Dr. Boggs's suggestion about *expunging* strikes us unfavorably. We have no right to *expunge any thing* from our records, though we might explain. There will be found, however, very little to explain on the records of our Assembly. As to the expression quoted, it is not a political utterance at all, but a moral and religious one. The subject under consideration at the time by the Assembly at Charlotte, was the spiritual welfare of the slaves and the duties owed by us to them. It was only in reference to the moral and religious aspects of slavery the Assembly spoke. And viewing the slaves of the South as a sacred trust providentially committed to a Christian people, our Church spoke of slavery as the Church of Jesus Christ of old always did speak of it, and as the Scriptures speak of it, *conservatively*. We feel very little disposed to have our Assembly offer explanations of its language to the wild, radical, infidel spirit of this age which assumes to be better than the Bible. Let Northern Presbyterians pander, if they will, to this spirit—we hope our Church never will. Bible morality is good enough for us—whoever wants better dishonors God's word.

PRESBYTERIAN CONFEDERATION.

Overtures from four Presbyteries having proposed to the Assembly to revoke the action of the last Assembly and to adopt

measures favorable to this scheme, the Committee on Bills and Overtures, on the fifth day, recommended that this Assembly appoint delegates to the conference proposed to be held on this subject in London on the 21st July ensuing. The chairman, Dr. GIRARDEAU, stated that he acted simply as the Committee's organ, whose action did not represent his views. The report was made the order of the day for the next day at 3 p. m., but it was not reached, nor did the subject come up until the tenth and last day. Dr. ROBINSON then offered the following resolution as a substitute for the Committee's report :

Resolved, That this Assembly appoint a Committee on Confederation of the Presbyterian Churches of the world, with authority to correspond with similar committees of other Presbyterian bodies in reference to the Constitution to be proposed in such a general council, and, if the Committee deem it wise and practicable, appoint a delegate or delegates to the proposed conference, to be held in London on the 21st day of July, 1875.

He said he was not in favor of sending Commissioners, but of putting ourselves *in line* in the matter. We are making a mistake by isolating ourselves too much. We complain that we are not known, but are ourselves partly to blame. We ought to look into this thing; and if it is right, get into the Confederation circle. If we do not choose upon examination, we will not go into it. I do not like the idea of standing off.

Dr. PALMER was willing to appoint a Committee to consider the question, but Dr. Robinson's paper went beyond that and settles our policy. If adopted, we must go into that confederation. We cannot now, at the very heel of the sessions, adequately discuss the subject. Give us the interval of a year, and let us see the shape and form which the thing will take, and you may have our Church a unit for it.

Dr. IRVINE said the first meeting of the confederation is expected to be held in May, 1876. Dr. Palmer's judicious suggestion would render it impossible for us to take part in it till 1877. Again he thought it would be a serious error for this Assembly, which is just getting to be known and felt as a power amongst Presbyterians, to appear indifferent to this movement.

Ruling elder X. RYLAND said the proposition simply was, for all true Presbyterians to take each other by the hand.

Dr. CHAPMAN would amend by striking out what related to the appointment of delegates.

Dr. E. P. PALMER objected to intrusting the question to any Committee. Let the Assembly settle it.

Dr. GIRARDEAU said the various Presbyterian bodies have their standards, and through these they express their external unity; while if they desire to express their internal unity, there is the Lord's Supper, in which we hold communion with all our Christian brethren. He thought the action of the last Assembly should not be reversed. The ground then taken was, that this is not a matter relating to the coördination of courts. What is this confederation? Sir, it is a gigantic voluntary association. Label it Presbyterian, if you choose; but it is not a Presbyterian court that is proposed to be formed. It is not a grand œcumenical council, holding national churches together by one common bond. If it were, it would be a serious question whether we should keep ourselves apart from the current which would draw all Presbyterian bodies into that recapitulating Assembly. But, sir, just because this is a voluntary association, and is proposed to us as Presbyterian, let us not be deceived.

Are we prepared to be factors in the origination of this voluntary society? He did not see how we could do so in consistency with our principles. This body will be executive in its functions as well as advisory in its powers. And do you suppose that this great body gathering to itself the supreme intelligence of the Presbyterian Church will be content with doing nothing? It will lay its hand upon the moral sentiment of the Presbyterian world, and mould it to its will.

Further, it seemed to him inconsistent just at this stage of our history to go into this connexion. We had declined (and he thought on good grounds) to go into fraternal correspondence with our brethren of the Northern Presbyterian Church. They will go into that conference; if we go in as integers, we contradict the action we have here endorsed. He was for making haste slowly, and would have the question referred to the next Assembly.

The Rev. Mr. MURKLAND said: I am deeply pained, and it is

with diffidence that I oppose these venerable brethren; but I rejoice to stand upon this floor to advocate the scheme proposed for a Pan-Presbyterian Confederation; because it is one of the first steps by which our Church is coming to the front in the great movements of the Church of God, which our century is witnessing, and to which the providence of God is calling the whole Church of Jesus Christ.

When the last Assembly met, this measure was incomplete. We knew not whither it was going. It now comes before us with a written Constitution, with specifications which are definite; and we walk not in the dark, but on the broad platform of a written Constitution.

I take it, sir, that this great Pan-Presbyterian Confederation is simply in the line of presbyterial order of government by courts, parliamentary bodies—a realisation of the unity of the Church in these parliamentary Assemblies, rising from the church Session to the Presbytery, from the Presbytery to the Synod, from the Synod to the great Assembly of all the churches. . . .

I am one of your youngest members. This is the first time I have ever stood in this grand council of our beloved Church, and I rejoice that the first speech I make is in advocacy of our Southern Church stepping forward to the front, and taking the position that God in his providence calls us to assume. Born in the throes of a mighty political struggle, baptized in tears and blood, growing to spiritual maturity amid those intense afflictions which an all-wise and merciful God has placed upon our Church, this, the youngest born of the Churches of Jesus Christ, stands now in all the majesty of her virgin beauty, commanding the love and homage of the civilised world. I say that the duty of the Southern Church is to march to the front, to take the hands of her sisters, her mothers, to speed the Church of Jesus Christ—to join hands with the mother Church of Scotland, which, although her breasts are scarred with many a conflict, still bears, covering her scars, Christ's evangel and a pure Presbyterianism; to join hands with that old Presbyterian Church in England, which, against all the opposition of prelacy, has been able to uphold the banner of a pure gospel in the great capital of the world; to

join hands with our brethren across the border who transplanted the Presbyterianism of Scotland to the climes of Canada, and have built up a noble Church for Jesus Christ; to join with the Dutch Church which we all love; to join the Reformed Church of France, and the pure Church of the Waldenses, which has held the truth of God as untainted as the crystalline snows of her own Alpine summits—to join each of these, some old and some young, but we the youngest born of all—and march to the front, singing one song “unto Him that loved us,” and reaching forth to the realisation of that great end for which Christ gave his prayers and his life.

Judge BARTON thought the Committee should be appointed; he was perfectly in harmony with those brethren who wished to send a delegate now.

The Assembly then, the hour of recess being close at hand, proceeded to other business.

On the last evening the subject was resumed. The Rev. Mr. MURKLAND moved the adoption of Dr. Robinson’s paper.

The Rev. Mr. FRIERSON said there had come no motion or paper before the Assembly that he more cordially approved. The Presbyterian family is large—there are noble men in the Reformed Church of France, of Holland, of the Waldenses, of Scotland, Ireland, England. Are we to be Presbyterian Ishmaelites? I trust not.

Ruling elder CLAPP said these are progressive times. The world moves. We must move with it, or be left behind. He saw here no entangling alliance and no compromise of doctrine or church polity. He would resist as quickly as any man any innovation in our principles, but here he saw none.

Ruling elder OGDEN, referring to the remark as to this being a “progressive time,” quoted Bacon to the effect that in matters of natural science, all is to be held subject to improvement; yet in matters of civil polity—and much more, (said the speaker,) in ecclesiastical affairs—even changes for *the better* are to be suspected. He thought now that the course proposed is a distinct contravention of the system of the Presbyterian Church. That system has never attempted to rear a great indivisible Church in this

world. It is the small, compact, homogeneous churches that are the greatest workers for the glory of God. The Presbyterian system unites all believers in Jesus at his table, but favors no great hierarchy absorbing all the separate organisations. Some say there is no danger, it is only a "hand-shaking." But they have adopted a Constitution, and that is a cause for alarm. What is a Constitution? It is organic law—law that produces a creature, and brings into existence a being. And what is this being we are about to produce? It is one that is to be clothed with power from the very start, and to be the judge of its own statutes, so as to extend its power as far as it may choose. It will at the start send its deliverances, of course, as *recommendations*; but with your knowledge of human nature, do you not believe, that after a while its recommendations will come down as orders, and we shall be schismatics if we do not obey? And so a Presbyterian organisation, composed of heterogeneous materials from pure Presbyterianism down to Rationalism, is to give law to our Presbyterian churches! Sir, you are about to innovate—to change the principles working in our Church from the commencement, and you are about to do it with little thought or consideration as to consequences.

When Mr. Murkland, in his beautiful remarks, referred to the Waldenses, it struck me that the illustration saps the foundation of his argument. If there is a case in all history that bears me out in the claim I make to-night, it is that of the Waldenses in their mountain fastnesses, shut out from all the world, in absolute isolation and exclusion, preserving the principles of a pure Christianity while the grand hierarchy of the Romish Church was all around them, formed exactly in the way you propose to form this great confederation, which is to glorify man—to glorify the Presbyterian Church, but not to glorify God, because it adds nothing to the strength of the Church for good in God's kingdom. Let us be guided by the wisdom of Bacon, and innovate like nature, slowly. Here you propose at a single bound to jump the whole chasm and create this irresponsible body, over which you are to exercise no control.

The Rev. H. G. HILL said the last speaker represented what

is proposed as the formation of a grand Presbyterian court, to which all shall be subordinated who enter into it. But nothing of this sort was contemplated. He read freely from a plan of Constitution for the confederation, to show the correctness of his statement.

Dr. PALMER said, if this were to be a great Presbyterian prayer-meeting, he should not say a word against it. If it were to be a *bona fide* General Assembly for the whole world, he should be equally far from opposing it. Such a proposition might be premature; but seventeen years ago, in the General Assembly which met at New Orleans, he had, on the floor, expressed the hope that he might live to sit in such a General Assembly. But his objection was, that you were now to have a General Assembly with all the moral power such a body could exert, but none of the checks and limitations attaching to a properly organised church court.

Moderator, the Presbyterian Church in this country has always suffered whenever she has departed by the breadth of a hair from her recognised principles. She never has entered into compromises with Congregationalism,—or gone into the support of voluntary associations of any sort, without suffering in the end. Here, then, is the first objection which I raise—that you are creating a power, as Colonel Ogden has so eloquently stated, and which, therefore, I need not repeat. *You are creating a power.* It may profess not to decree; it may content itself with recommendation; but still it will stand up as the apex of the great Presbyterian cone. The decisions and utterances of that body will be regarded as the annunciation of the Presbyterian sentiment of the world, and its utterances will be *pro tanto* decisions. They will, in the force which they will gather around them, overbear the opinions, judgments, and utterances of the particular Presbyterian Assemblies of the particular countries where they are held. The very argument used in this Assembly, that we must “come into line,” will continue to prevail—that we must keep in line, that we must not break away from the path marked out by this great Council, which represents the thought and sentiment of the whole Presbyterian world. Sir, it is too great a

power to be irresponsible. I am afraid of it. I tell you, Moderator, I am afraid of it; and my only hope is, that before it shall be able to do any serious detriment to the Church of God, it will break down by its own weight and become disintegrated. If it does not. I tell you that it will become, in the end, a great irresponsible, infallible Presbyterian Pope, and there will be no power in any Presbyterian Assembly, standing in our place, to lift up her voice and measure strength with that "creature" which aggregates all the elements of Presbyterian power throughout the world, and which is not held in check by one solitary restraint which we can impose upon it.

I have another objection, sir; and I will endeavor to be brief. What kind of Presbyterianism are you going to put in this general Council at the apex of the cone? Mark you, sir, each constituent factor that goes into the composition of that body, must necessarily concede something which is peculiar to itself. And when you have aggregated all the concessions which are made by all the constituent factors in that body, you get a Presbyterianism of the lowest conceivable type—a Presbyterianism the least positive in the assertion of our principles—a Presbyterianism which, through concessions here, concessions there, and concessions everywhere, will be denuded of its power. Such will be the Presbyterianism which is to utter the Presbyterian sentiment of the world, and to overbear our testimonies which will then become feeble as lifted against theirs. Here is the Presbyterianism in Europe, which is linked with the State. Is it possible that we can go into that general Council with these Presbyterian bodies which are identified with the State, and lift up the testimony which you have uttered this very evening in the paper, unanimously adopted, in which we declare, in the most emphatic terms, the non-secular, non-political character of the Church? I tell my excellent brother, Dr. Robinson, by whose side I have been laboring all my life in defence of these principles, and contending for the non-political character of the Church, that, if he should go under the appointment of this Assembly and stand upon that floor, he will find his hands tied and his tongue paralysed as to any utterance which he shall dare to make in that

body in reference to the principles which God specially calls us to uphold and to proclaim. The Presbyterianism of that general Council will be a Presbyterianism created by concessions on every hand. And, Moderator, I would not have a Presbyterian system of that sort. If we are to have a Council, let it be a Council that grows up in the form of a legitimate Assembly, where there is no contravention of the spirit and principles of our government and order.

There was a grand opportunity given to the Presbyterian Church when it was transferred from European shores and stood upon this virgin continent, to work out untrammelled the principles of a pure and perfect Presbyterianism; but, alas! under the same infatuation which I fear is overbearing this Assembly, we went into an alliance with Congregationalism and Independency; and to this very hour, our principles and our practice are, to a large degree, tainted with the influence which was exerted upon us by and through that alliance. Sir, believing that this isolated Church of ours is, in the sublime providence of God, placed in exactly the position to work out a pure Presbyterianism, I consecrate my life to that; I am content with the sphere of this Southern Presbyterian Church. I have no ambition to walk the streets of Edinburgh, or to preach to the congregations in Scotland, if I must do so at the sacrifice of appearing as a delegate upon the floor of such an Œcumenical Council as this paper proposes. No, sir, the remainder of this life will be consecrated in the fear of God to the development, the perpetuation, and exposition of the principles of Presbyterianism as I understand them, as they are stated in the word of God, as they are summarily expressed in our Standards; and I am unwilling to run any ventures by which this Presbyterianism, which I desire to be more perfect in this Church of ours, shall be strangled.

I do believe, Mr. Moderator, that my excellent brother, Dr. Robinson, is making the saddest mistake of his life in giving his adhesion to this movement, and that he will find himself, from this period to the end of his days—unless he shall be led by considerations such as I am now suggesting, somewhat to review and perhaps reverse his decision—he will find himself crippled and

trammelled in the very work to which I know his conscience and his heart are pledged. I want to save him from that mistake. I want to save this dear Church from being entangled in alliances which will cripple her efficiency and her power. Be it so, Moderator, that like the Waldenses we are the conies upon the tops of the mountains, hanging to the ledges of the rock with our feeble feet; let us, in our feebleness, in our isolation, (still in that isolation the object of universal contemplation,) work out our destiny until the Lord pushes us to the front to do the great work in propagating our principles to the end of the earth. Here, in the corners of the world, let a pure Presbyterianism find a refuge—a Presbyterianism that I believe is on the eve of being strangled in the Northern Church, that cannot successfully, under present arrangements, be worked out elsewhere anywhere on the globe but here. Let us, in our isolation, in our obscurity, upon this plane, work out our mission, and the Lord will give us all the prominence that we deserve and all that we desire; and we shall speak out from this obscurity, from the chambers in which the Lord God has placed us for a time to hide us. a voice that will peal over the earth, and whose echoes will ring until that trumpet sounds which shall wake the dead to judgment!

He would briefly state a third objection. There have been changes made quietly in this paper—the fifteen original specifications “boiled down” to five, and one or two of the most alarming things dropped out of the specifications. But there remain intimations which he regarded as of exceeding danger. They did propose to undertake the protection of the feeble and push forward civil freedom throughout the world, and to speak to the Sultan and the Czar. And they do now propose to take up the whole question of temperance and of the religious interests of great cities. The very work committed to the Church in her organised form is to be assumed by this irresponsible voluntary association.

He had not wished to make this speech. It had been pressed out of him with great sorrow and pain. He had hoped for postponement and inquiry. But the debate has come, and now what will these brethren gain by pressing to a vote which strips the movement of all effect? You will have a split vote—not such a

one as that by which you ought to carry your Church into a policy so vast and of such important influences.

Dr. ROBINSON: It is so late in the evening that, as a modest man, I will only make a few remarks in response to the argument of Dr. Palmer.

As for the first argument, I understand it to be that he agrees with me thoroughly in the idea that if we could make this a sure enough General Assembly of the world, then he would go for it. Well, Dr. Palmer and I are thoroughly together in our doctrine, so that I have not changed my principles any. But, let me ask, how are you going to get that General Assembly of all the Churches in the world, unless you begin and have a Conference, a Council with your brethren, as the stepping-stone to it? How shall we make such a General Assembly of all the Churches in the world, if we stand off as strangers one to the other, never learning anything; keeping ourselves in isolation, not knowing what the Presbyterians of the world think, and they not knowing what we think? That argument, it seems to me, is answered; he has made an argument against his own position. I doubt very much whether he and Dr. Girardeau will stand faster by the High-Church principle than I do; but it is because I love that principle, and want to carry it out, that I beg Dr. Girardeau and Dr. Palmer to help me carry it out.

We are told that this thing will exercise a great moral influence, and my friend Ogden has pictured the danger of a great central power. The arguments of our friends on the other side do not agree together. Dr. Palmer wants a central power, and Colonel Ogden spoke against it as dangerous. I set off Dr. Palmer's theory against Colonel Ogden's theory, and I think they thoroughly nullify one another; only I will add this in response further, that you do not avoid the force of that moral power by not going into it. When all the Presbyterians in the world together shall undertake to decide these questions, will not that moral power be just as great, whether we are in the concern or not? Certainly we do not avoid it by staying out of it. We had better go in.

But, understand, my resolution does not propose to go in. It

proposes to say that we are all ready for that great General Assembly which Dr. Palmer and I look forward to. If we see that they are starting in the right direction, we'll go on; and if we find that it is un-Presbyterian, we can back out easy enough.

Well, we are asked, "What kind of Presbyterianism is this going to be?" Why, that is settled before we start. Didn't you hear read from that article that it was not to be a modern Broad-Churchism, of concessions here and concessions there? It is to be the *consensus* of the Reformed Churches. That is the platform, to start with; and whenever they depart from that *consensus*—as soon as they swerve from that, we can take our hats and leave. The basis is not to be the basis of your "moderate Presbyterianism;" it is going back to the old theology—the *consensus* of the Churches of the Reformation, which we stand by. And who more eloquently could stand up and plead for that *consensus* than Dr. Palmer himself? We all hold to that. We all meet this Broad-Churchism by pleading that *consensus*. It is, therefore, a mistake to think that this is to be made up of concessions. There are no concessions to be made. Every Church is to stand by its faith. The Council will have no control over the faith of the Churches. It is a Council for executive purposes, and your doctrines are settled in your General Assemblies, as they now are. It is only to deal with the question of the extension of our religion over the world: to help the feeble Churches, is one proposition.

That leads me to suggest another idea. We have been warned not to go into the Council, because we are small. It is like Rhode Island and New Jersey, those little sand-patches, being afraid of going into the American Union. A pretty story, for Rhode Island to make a fuss about going into the Confederation with other States! Why, it is the large party that have reasons to fear, because in the Council we shall be equal to the largest. And if that big Assembly at the North don't behave themselves and stand by the truth, we little bodies will conspire together and make them behave themselves! That is my idea of the thing. I am not afraid to risk the Southern Presbyterian Church in any common concern in the world. Let us only have a fair

and equal voice, and I am not afraid of our being overrun. I maintain that, in proportion to our numbers, though it may seem a little boastful, we have more brains and more orthodoxy than any, and can better defend ourselves in any common scrimmage. As I tell my people at home, I am not afraid to go into any of these coöperative things. Presbyterians have brains enough to stand up for their end of the matter, in any partnership they go into. But we are not going into any partnership. Dr. Palmer suggests that we put it off till next year. My complaint is that we have been playing Rip Van Winkle long enough. This thing has been going on for two or three years, and we are going to wait until it is all fixed, and then ask for admission! Sir, I want to be at the first. I want to go in there before the door is shut and I have to be voted in by these brethren at the North. I would rather take part in forming the Constitution than to wait until it is done, and then ask permission to come in. Dr. Palmer speaks of his pride in the glorious truths which we hold, and in being isolated in the teaching of them. Sir, I trust I love those truths, and I have as much admiration of them, and I feel as proud, as he, when I hear even the Northern brethren speak of us, as I have heard them, as the purest body of Presbyterians in the world; but I think Dr. Palmer mistakes his calling in what he says about holding them in isolation. That is not my notion. If we have got a pure Presbyterianism, I want to go and tell it to somebody else. I want "to tell to sinners round," what a glorious gospel we have found. It is not our business to "hide our light under a bushel." Jesus Christ told us to preach the gospel to every creature. I want to get our Presbyterianism into the "frontier and destitute settlements" of the North. I am proud to say that I had a sort of invitation to consider the question whether I would go to Philadelphia to take charge of a church that was a New School church before the reunion, and I had to make the reply that I was at the centre, at Louisville, and was too old to go into the frontier and destitute settlements.

That just brings up the grand mistake that I think my good brother Palmer, whom I love above all men in the Church, and admire the most, and Dr. Girardeau make. As I told the Nash-

ville Assembly, the grand trouble with the Southern Church was, that in the command to "go, teach all nations," they interpreted the "all nations" to mean their side of the Potomac and Ohio. I do not believe in that. We have got the true thing; we have the true metal, and I want to go out and ring it in the ear of these Moderates, and No-Churchmen, and Broad-Churchmen. I want to put ourselves in the position where our testimony for Jesus Christ, and for a pure Church, will be heard—not to stand here in our isolation, and the world know nothing about it. There is where Dr. Palmer and I differ—not that we differ in our admiration for the Southern Church; but I admire it so much that I want other people to see how beautiful and how strong it is. I have changed no principles that I know of, brethren. If I seem to have liberalised up a little in some of these things, I stand by my principles as I always did. I have so much faith in them—I used to be not so certain, but now I am so certain that my principles are true—that I want to go all over the earth and proclaim them.

Says Dr. Palmer: "Go into alliance with those Church-and-State men over there!" Sir, the Church-and-State system is tottering to its fall, and I want to go over there and help shake it down! I felt gratified when that book, "Discourses of Redemption," with that appendix bringing out the doctrine of the Southern Church so strong against Church-and-Stateism, was published in Edinburgh by Clark & Co., the great theological house. I do not know anything that delighted me more than to see those Scotchmen reading that appendix. I tell you the Church-and-State system is not going to trouble any of us very long. I do not believe it will last until the first meeting of this great Council. Understand, I am not advocating going in; I am only advocating discussing the matter with these brethren, and if they do anything we are afraid of, quit in time; but if we wait and go in after the thing is all formed, we have to go in at a disadvantage.

Dr. Palmer's third argument was that a change had been made in the paper. Well, he knows more about it, I see, than I do. He says that out of this paper there has been dropped the thing

that alarmed him most. Why, that proves that a more sensible set of men had got hold of the thing.

I agree with Dr. Palmer, that we cannot touch Congregationalism with any alliance. We have suffered from that. There is where we suffered in the Westminster Assembly when it compromised. I vowed to take that Form of Government at my ordination, and I take a great deal more. I take the Second Book of Discipline of the old original Scotch Church—that original Constitution that called for this Council of Presbyterians of all the world.

I would just say in conclusion, that I have been led to this simply by hearing, as you have heard everywhere, complaints that our Church isolates itself. I complained over there in Edinburgh of the way we were treated by the churches of Scotland and Ireland. They said, "Oh, we told our delegates to go to your Assembly as well as to the other." "Yes," said I, "but when you get there, you never find any United States south of Baltimore and Washington. The strip by the Lakes is all you see. You do not know any Presbyterian Church but this Northern body." "Yes, but we have sent delegates to your body." "Yes, and I prophesy that your delegates will go to the Baltimore Assembly, and when they are about going to Little Rock, those fellows will make them believe that they are in certain danger of their lives, unless they carry an arsenal." Good men, our friends, like Dykes of London, Rainy and others in Edinburgh, when I said, "You take the Northern accounts of us," said, "But you isolate yourselves; how can we get any account of you?" When Dr. John Hall, who is a friend of ours at heart, and of our principles, because he is a conservative man, said, "You have no literature in your Church at the South." I said, "We are a talking people, rather than a writing people." He said, "Why are you complaining that you are not known? that the world believes the stories of these Northern men? If you are foolish enough to give them all the writing and isolate yourselves, how can you expect the world to do anything else?" Therefore, I want to take the step. I doubt whether we shall have a delegate at this Conference; it is simply a Conference

to consider and amend this proposed constitution. I want to show, if we do not do anything else, that we are interested in this great matter. The general principle that governs me in this, is the same that made me ask the Assembly to thank the Sunday-school Union for their missionary work. We are poor, broken down, oppressed. We have got the truth, but we have not got the means of circulating it. I am for taking hold of everything that will help to hold us up, and carry our glorious Southern Presbyterianism, in its purity, to the end of the world. Therefore, I want this resolution passed.

The Rev. Mr. SILLIMAN: I feel that my good brother Palmer is too "scarey" in this matter. We cannot afford to let this opportunity pass. Stave it off another year, and it will be too late. I am entirely in favor of rescinding the resolution of last year.

Dr. IRVINE: I said a few things this morning, very briefly. I wish to say a few words to-night, if it is not too late. Perhaps it is unseemly on my part, as I am comparatively a stranger, to say anything in this Assembly; but a few things have been advanced by our respected and beloved brother Palmer and by his eloquent colleague from New Orleans, which I think have not been entirely met by the argument of Dr. Robinson; and it is on that account that I want to make a statement or two.

First of all, it is assumed by both these brethren, and it runs through their arguments, that a juridical or authoritative power is to be assumed by or conceded to this Council. There are two grand fundamental principles which the Presbyterian Church, from the days of Calvin and Knox to this day, has held, and for which this Church has most nobly contended. The first is that her doctrinal standards are founded on and are agreeable to the word of God. For that principle, more blood was shed at the Reformation than any other—I mean the first Reformation. The second principle is that which was admirably and forcibly brought out by the retiring Moderator—that the constitution and order of the Presbyterian Church are founded in God's word. For these two grand fundamental principles of our holy and heaven-

given Presbyterianism, our fathers in the motherland and you in this land have most nobly contended.

Now, Moderator, if that Constitution, a mere synopsis of which has been read to-night, and which is but tentative (it is thrown out for hints, and your delegate to London, if you send one, may tear it up if he likes)—if that or any other Constitution should interfere with these grand fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, I should at once lift my voice against sending a single delegate to London or Edinburgh. But this proposition leaves your Confessions as they are and where they are. It tells these holy and godly men who have been compared to the conies on the mountain tops of the Alps—it tells that ancient Church of the Valleys, that they may bring their Confessions of Faith with them, and that this will not be a juridical body, a General Assembly, (I would like to see such a one myself,) with any authority to introduce or alter one single sentence or section. It tells the Churches of Scotland and Ireland and England that they may come with their Confessions of Faith and their Solemn League and Covenant. It tells the General Assemblies in these States that they may all bring their symbols and lay them on that table, and that the Council will not dare to interfere with one solitary principle of doctrine held or maintained by these Churches. It says the same to the Presbyterian Churches of France, and of Switzerland, and all on the continent of Europe. It invites Australia with her united Church, (I remember when there were three,) and the Church in Canada, once three distinct Assemblies, but which meet next month in Montreal as one body, all singing the same Psalms, all fighting for the same great principles, the old Church having shaken off all the church perquisites acquired when Canada was ceded by France to Great Britain. This proposal, therefore, interferes with no solitary principle held by us or any of the various Churches. If it did, I would say, Away with all such proposals for union; it is building with untempered mortar; we hold no alliance with a body which dares to interfere with the glorious principles laid down in our standards.

With regard to the second point, what does it say there? There are some little elements of difference between the Church of the

Waldenses and ourselves in regard to government ; there is some difference between the old Church of Scotland, the United Church, and the Reformed Church, in regard to government. Now, in that great Council which it is proposed to hold, how much of the "establishment" element, to which Dr. Palmer has very justly referred, will you find ? You will find a few who are receiving some paltry sums out of the public purse in France, it is true ; and a few from Scotland who hold the old establishment principles and collect teinds and tithes. The Irish Church has flung off the *Regium Donum*, and the Established Church of Scotland is now suing before the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain for disestablishment. And what will be the result ? The result will be that the old Church of Scotland and the Free Church of Scotland will, probably, before Dr. Robinson or Dr. Palmer is called to the Church in glory, be all rolled up into one great body—the Presbyterian Church of Scotland—just as in Australia and in Canada.

Dr. LEFEVRE : I am suffering from a suppressed speech, but instead of making it, I call for "the question."

The call was sustained, and the question was taken on Dr. Chapman's amendment, to strike out the latter part of Dr. Robinson's substitute, leaving it to read : "*Resolved*, That this Assembly appoint a Committee on Confederation of the Presbyterian Churches of the world, with authority to correspond with similar committees of the Presbyterian bodies in reference to the Constitution to be proposed in such a General Council." This amendment was not agreed to, the vote showing, on a division, 37 to 41.

The question recurred on Dr. Robinson's substitute, which was agreed to. On the original resolution, as amended, a "call for the question" was made and sustained. A call for the ayes and noes was not agreed to, and the vote was taken by a division, which stood 44 to 28.

So the resolution as amended was adopted. The Moderator appointed as the Committee, Dr. Robinson, Dr. Lefevre, Mr. Murkland, and Judge Inglis.

Thanks having been voted to the citizens of St. Louis for gen-

erous hospitality and considerate courtesy; to the churches of the city which had been opened to our ministers; to the Railroad Companies which had reduced fares for members of the Assembly; and to the Postmaster at St. Louis for special postal facilities—the Assembly was dissolved, and another required to meet in the First Presbyterian church in Savannah, on the third Thursday in May, 1876, at eleven o'clock a. m. A hymn was sung, and the Moderator made prayer and pronounced the apostolic benediction.

NOTE.—The following was accidentally omitted on p. 614:

ASSEMBLY'S ACTION ON FOREIGN MISSIONS.

1. The Assembly, gratefully recognising the hand of God in the success and enlarged scope of our foreign missionary work, would express its strong conviction that this enlarged character of our operations demands increased liberality on the part of our people. The Assembly therefore enjoins upon all its Presbyteries to see that each of their respective churches shall have the subject of Foreign Missions presented to its consideration during the current year, and an opportunity afforded to each to contribute to the cause. And it further recommends that, in some methodical way, the Presbyteries shall strive to secure the compliance, on the part of all their Sessions, with the duty prescribed. The Assembly would urge the Presbyteries to make a most earnest effort to secure at least an average of eighty cents for each member in their churches. If this be done—and it surely *ought* to be done—the Executive Committee will be enabled to carry on its work without embarrassment, and to provide for the liquidation of its debt.

2. The Assembly heartily approves the course of the Executive Committee by which the present enlarged scope has been given to our foreign missionary operations. It would express, at the same time, the conviction that it would be injudicious to expand our operations in any way that will require increased expenditure, until present financial embarrassments are removed.

3. This Assembly calls attention to the remarkable fact that the gifts of our Sabbath-schools and the "Women's Missionary Associations," during the year past, amount to one-third of the entire sum furnished by the regular contributions of the churches. And in view of this fact, the churches are urged to a large increase of these Associations; and the officers, teachers, and pupils of our Sabbath-schools are appealed to, to make still greater efforts in this good work, assured they will realise the precious truth of our Saviour's words—that "it is more blessed to give than to receive."

ARTICLE II.

A PRESBYTERIAN CLERGYMAN LOOKING FOR THE CHURCH.

A Presbyterian Clergyman looking for the Church. By Rev. FLAVEL S. MINES, first Pastor of Trinity church, San Francisco, (under the signature of "*One of Three Hundred.*") New York: H. B. Durant. 1868. Copyrighted by the Treasurer of the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union.

We would rejoice to be delivered from the necessity of saying a word about this book and its deceased author, if we could do so with propriety. But it happens, that, though the author is dead, the book is not. It still lives, and is sent forth by the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-School Union, on its sinister mission, and is made an instrument for proselyting unstable souls, and leading astray plain and uninformed people. So that we have no right to keep silence while it cries aloud, and shall affect no reservation in speaking of the work according to its merits. It derives its whole importance, not from its author, but from the source whence it proceeds, and would not be noticed at all, but for the fact that it is now circulating among our own churches, and disturbing the minds of some who only need information to be delivered from its snares.

For us it was a very hard book to read. We did wade through it, however, only under a sense of duty. With premeditated design to sit down and deliberately undertake a volume of 580 pages duodecimo, made up of caricatures of our own most cherished doctrines, misrepresentations of the polity of the Church of our choice and our love, pointless anecdotes to cast ridicule upon it, and all this interspersed with derogatory observations about such saints of God as Drs. Miller, Alexander, Potts, Smyth, and others, and contemptuous remarks about the Presbyterian Church generally, required a good degree of courage, with a commendable stock of perseverance. At any time such reading is extremely irksome, and on this occasion it was a more severe trial

to our patience, since in no part of the book was there anything new or refreshing in the argument to elicit our interest. Moreover, the misrepresentations of our Church, our doctrines, and our polity, are the same stale caricatures, which have been repeated from author to author, and which Presbyterians and Calvinists have endured for many ages. In like manner, instead of any advancement in the discussion, we have served up to us a rehash of worn-out arguments, of obsolete exegesis, abandoned as irrelevant or untenable by genuine scholars and profound theologians among our Episcopalian friends, who would be loth to place the defence of their system on such grounds as captivated and satisfied this writer; but, nevertheless, the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union has the assurance to endorse and republish these absurdities.

We shall not attempt the task of going through the whole of this mass of misrepresentation to expose its shallowness and its want of fairness, for that would require a volume. As we expect to confine ourselves to the limits of an ordinary Review article, we shall be compelled to satisfy our readers with samples of the injustice done us, and with pointing out some of the inconsistencies, not to say the puerilities, of the writer. This book speaks derisively of the "sects;" it calls the Presbyterians "dissenters," p. 341; it runs a pretended parallel between us and Papists; it even classes us with the Mormons, Swedenborgians, and Spiritualists, p. 519; and indulges in much contemptuous talk, indicative of the fact that the writer and disseminators of it had become the narrowest of sectaries. Well, we shall give reasons which are at all events satisfactory to ourselves for not following the "three hundred" into the tangled web of Episcopacy and its various parties or "sects," such as Ritualists, Puseyites, High Churchmen, Churchmen, Low Churchmen, Broad Churchmen, and Reformed Churchmen, in a vain effort to find "the Church."

I. The author informs us at the very outset that he was not only born and bred a Presbyterian, but he became one by conviction; and toward the close of the book, we discover what an enormous conquest Episcopacy made in getting him, when, in-

order to justify himself for becoming, with pristine zeal, a High Church Episcopalian, he informs us he had been a "High Church Presbyterian," p. 575. And yet, on page 7, he tells us that, while he was a Presbyterian minister, "he had been at no pains to form a definite or fixed conception of the ministry, the sacraments, the keys, the Church, but had rather passed these matters over as things we were not required to define, and which perhaps it were better not to define too nicely," etc. Now, was not this a precious sort of Presbyterian? He had no fixed ideas on any subject pertaining to the very points of distinction between his own Church and all other Churches; yea, on those very questions which are vital to the whole system of Church polity, and which at once determine the matter for every honest inquirer. He was a "Presbyterian clergyman," but had no definite conception of the ministry; he administered the sealing ordinances of Christ, but had no fixed conception of the sacraments; he had opened and shut the kingdom of heaven, both by the key of doctrine and the key of discipline, but had no determinate conception of the keys—in a word, he was a minister of the Church, but had no decided conception of the Church itself! Is not this a most extraordinary statement to come from a man, who not only had been born and bred a Presbyterian, his father being a Presbyterian minister, but who at his ordination had solemnly, as in the presence of God, declared his belief in our doctrinal standards, and sworn to maintain them even at the risk of life, estate, and reputation, and who had in like manner declared his approval of the government and discipline of the Church? Now, the Confession of Faith has clear and distinct statements of doctrine on all the points suggested, covering the seven chapters from chapter xxv. to chapter xxxi.; and in addition to that, the practical application of these doctrines of the Confession is given in the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory of Worship. No Presbyterian has any excuse for not having a clear understanding of all these matters; and we hesitate not to affirm that no man has a just claim to the name, nor can he honestly assume the position of a Presbyterian minister, who does not receive and accept the clear and definite statements

of the standards of the Church on these subjects. Why, the very word Presbyterian suggests at once the doctrine that the presbyter is the highest order in the ministry of the Church; and all true Presbyterians have defined and decided opinions of that ministry, its rights, duties, limitations of power, etc.; and so of the other points mentioned. Now, according to his own account of himself, there is no just sense in which this writer ever was a Presbyterian; and as he had embraced no true Presbyterianism, notwithstanding his solemn vows of ordination, but confesses himself to have been at sea on the whole subject, his conversion to Episcopacy was no loss to Presbyterianism. He went out from us, because he was not of us. That we are not unjust in this judgment is made perfectly evident by a remarkable fact recorded of himself by the author. On p. 22, he says:

“Seven years before I entered the Church, I submitted my children, although secretly, for fear of the synagogue and elders, to Episcopal baptism; that *they* might hereafter the more readily glide into a Church which at this time I regarded as having no other advantages above ‘the fair daughters of the Reformation’ than in her manifest and tried conservatism, by virtue chiefly of her noble and unalterable Liturgy.”

Is it uncharitable in us to say that a man who could make such an extraordinary avowal as this was not a Presbyterian; that he went out from us because he was not of us? For seven years his professions of Presbyterianism were manifestly insincere. If not a wolf in sheep's clothing, he was at all events an Episcopalian in Presbyterian garb. For seven years, while occupying a Presbyterian pulpit, he was at heart an Episcopalian, though in disguise; and secretly, as far as he felt it safe to do so, threw his influence, certainly in his own family (but who believes it stopped there?) in favor of Episcopacy! He is dead, and we shall add nothing. The facts speak for themselves without the necessity of emphasis. We leave them to the judgment of honorable men, even among Episcopalians. We confess, however, that on reading this shameless avowal, we felt at a loss to know of what kind of material the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union is composed; seeing they give this book their endorsement, and circulate it for purposes of proselyting.

Is this kind of Jesuitry a part of their scheme of operations? Is Punic faith to be tolerated among Christians, and to be practised by those who make exclusive claims to all true churchism?

II. Throughout the book the writer indulges sometimes in anecdote, at other times in direct statement, and often in insinuation, charging that Presbyterians are drifting away from the principles and doctrines of their own Church; and sometimes the inference is adroitly left to be drawn, and at other times it is boldly asserted, that it is ignorance which made them Presbyterians in the first instance, and which still keeps them in that fold. (See chapters 6, 21, 22, 23, *passim*.)

To respond to such offensive insinuations, if they came from one who did not pretend to personal knowledge of the matter from his own experience, would be absurd. But here is an author who once was professedly a Presbyterian, and therefore ought to have known, and the public have a right to believe did know the truth of his allegations, and hence their damaging nature. There is this, however, to be observed, that most people are somewhat careful in taking vows; and because he was careless enough to take on himself the fearful obligations of ordination, in doing which he called God to witness that he firmly believed the doctrines of the Presbyterian standards and approved of its government and discipline, while his mind was unsettled on the whole subject, we are not to infer that others, ministers or elders, are as undecided in their convictions and as reckless in taking obligations as he was. Again, while we confess that there is not in the Presbyterian Church, or any other, as advanced a state of intelligence as we should desire, we feel safe in appealing to candid men among Episcopalians, and candid men every where, as to whether Presbyterians are one whit behind the foremost in intelligent attachment to their doctrines, and in the faithful instruction of their children. Indeed, until this recreant son came forward to defame the good repute of his mother, they have always been esteemed foremost of all in these respects. Nor does the anecdote told of the New York elder (p. 74), who was entrapped into denouncing the language of the Confession of Faith on the subject of baptism as Puseyism, when read to him

out of a Puseyite newspaper, prove the contrary. It would be an easy thing for an adroit reader, by putting the emphasis on particular words and phrases, and passing lightly over others, to change the apparent meaning so as thereby to mislead an elder who was not, and did not pretend to be, a theologian. And the fact that he was not familiar with the phraseology of the article of the Confession of Faith in question is easily accounted for. The Church has provided catechisms containing the very same doctrines which are designed for family and Sabbath-school instruction with which the eldership and membership of the Church are expected to be, and in considerable part are, familiar. But to make anything more out of the circumstance, and many other such recorded in this book, than a mere matter of pleasantry to be told as a joke on the elder in social conversation, is so absurd, that we feel sure no born-and-bred Episcopalian would condescend to use the anecdote as an argument, or to point an argument. The use made of it, however, and several similar anecdotes, manifests a spirit of resentment against the Presbyterian Church, and a disposition to speak of it in the language of ridicule, which is unaccountable to us. The fact, however, serves to illustrate the old adage that new converts are the worst enemies of the order they desert. The wonder is that such a book, written in such a spirit, can obtain the sanction and endorsement of the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union; that that body is willing to risk its reputation on such a performance.

But not only is the charge everywhere asserted or insinuated that our ministers and people are Presbyterians, or rather are not Episcopalians, aye, and Puseyites at that, because of ignorance—ignorance of the Scriptures, ignorance of the Fathers, and ignorance of their own doctrines; but, again and again, the author asserts (see Ch. IX.,) that the ministers do not believe the doctrines of their Church (pp. 552, 554,) and that the Church is drifting away from its moorings. Lest any one should contradict his assertion, he gives us to understand that he knows all about it; he was one of them, and has talked with them on the

subject. Where he himself had doubts and difficulties, he found others had doubts also.

Well, did he find nobody in the Episcopal Church who had any doubts? He was greatly distressed at the divisions among the sects; but did he find all the ministers of the Episcopal Church perfectly agreed on all the particulars of church doctrine and church order? This author was a Puseyite—had he lived till now, he would doubtless have been a Ritualist. Were his brethren all Puseyites? all High Churchmen? all Churchmen? all Low Churchmen? We trow not. Now, it is probable that, in conversing with Presbyterian ministers, he found them to be very modest in giving their views on questions not revealed, and that they abstained from dogmatising where they had no “thus saith the Lord.” For just there comes in the difference between Presbyterianism and the writer and publishers of this book. They are just as positive and dogmatical about rites and ceremonies, and ordinances confessedly of human origin, as Presbyterians are about things revealed in the Scriptures. But as to Presbyterian ministers as a class, or any considerable number of them remaining in the Presbyterian Church while doubtful of her doctrines or order, we flatly deny it. There is a capital method of escape for the Church from all such damage. It has the comfortable assurance that all disaffected ministers will soon follow the “Three Hundred;” and even though the number should reach five hundred, as this zealous convert thinks he might safely have stated it, it would be a most happy deliverance to a Church steadfast in its faith and order, such as the Presbyterian Church is, to get rid of all such unstable souls. Whether it is a matter of gain to the Episcopal Church, is a question which concerns it, not us:

Still further, we have already shown that “One of Three Hundred” was not, in any proper sense, a Presbyterian at all; and it happens to be the case that, while he was nominally connected with the New School Presbyterian Church, his associations, as he informs us, were much with Congregationalists, or those who had once been such. This element in great force entered our Church

many years ago; and as the Old School always contended, and as this author asserts. (p. 38,) they aimed to revolutionise the Presbyterian Church. They gave the Church much trouble, and kept it in constant agitation for many years, until the year 1837, when their schemes were brought to an end by the vigorous policy adopted by our General Assembly. Our New School brethren did not then see through their purposes, but thought they had been too severely dealt with; and the disruption of the Church was the consequence. In the New School body, the struggle was renewed; nor did that Church have any peace until the Congregationalists, defeated in their plans, gradually withdrew to themselves. Now, we suspect, all this talk which the author heard, derogatory of the Church, its doctrines, its polity, and its standards, was by the Congregationalists; or if not, certainly by those who had fallen under their influence. It was they who introduced the irregularities into the Church, of which he speaks, p. 81; and the new measures in revivals which scattered wild-fire and disorder over many portions of the land, and the heresies recounted on pp. 166-168, were brought in by them. But before he wrote his book, he and his publishers, the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union, knew, and ought to have stated, that there was a vigor and power in Presbyterianism, which had arrested those things altogether in the Old School Church, and were making valorous headway against them, in the New School body, where in like manner, the Church finally became triumphant, and the Congregationalists withdrew or subsided. We here speak chiefly of the polity of the Church. As to doctrine and the sacraments, it is well known that the Old School adhered strictly to the standards; and so far as the New School are concerned, we are safe in saying that, during all that controversy in the Presbyterian Church, no sermon was preached and no doctrine inculcated which would not have been received in the Episcopal Church without the slightest official objection from bishop or priest, provided the minister who preached it professed the subjection of himself and congregation to the jurisdiction of the bishop.

Now, we have a life-long knowledge of the Presbyterian

Church, and know whereof we affirm when we say that it is not so, that the ministers of that portion of it with which we are connected have ever expressed doubts about our doctrines, sacraments, or polity, in our presence; but they have unanimously sustained them, preached them with earnestness and zeal, and have professed to cling to them as the palladium of their salvation. Enthusiastic attachment to the doctrines of our Confession of Faith and our system of church order, we unhesitatingly affirm, notwithstanding the contrary statements of this book, is uniformly characteristic of our ministry, so far as we have ever heard, or had an opportunity of knowing. Those who know us, will think our opportunities have been abundant and of the most favorable kind for correct information. Nothing is more certain to us than that this writer took too much for granted when he presumed that his former ministerial brethren were as indifferent to the principles of their Church and as careless of their vows as he was whilst one of them. If occasionally one such person happens to stray into the fold by accident or mistake, he does not tarry long, but is soon found numbered with the "Three Hundred," to the great relief of the Church.

III. As an illustration of this departure of the Church from its ancient faith, he takes the sacrament of baptism. He says, p. 83, "As to the *sacrament* of baptism, we can scarcely say of it *stat nominis umbra*; it has got to be regarded and to be called an unessential 'rite.'" If he only means that Presbyterians do not hold that ritual baptism is regeneration, and do not believe that it is necessary to salvation, we grant it. But manifestly he means, and elsewhere says, that Presbyterians do not believe the doctrines of their own standards on the subject of baptism, and that they have ceased to regard it as a sacrament. We cannot reply to any such patent untruth as this, which every intelligent reader has the opportunity of testing for himself by simply attending a Presbyterian Church on any occasion of the administration of that sacrament. Equally baseless is the charge that Presbyterian ministers do not preach from the texts which give clear utterance on the subject of baptism, (p. 559.) He quotes eleven texts on that point, and then asks, "Who ever heard a

sermon from a Presbyterian pulpit on any of these texts?" "I never did." The reason doubtless was that *he* occupied the pulpit. We have often heard these texts discussed; they are quoted in every Presbyterian treatise on the subject; and in our own ministrations, we have ourselves preached on eight out of the eleven texts. It is only necessary to notice such reckless statements, because these lines may be seen by others than Presbyterians.

As proof positive, however, of a departure from our standards on this subject, an attempt is made to convict us of a great neglect of baptism for infants by a forcible array of figures, p. 52. Several of the leading Presbyteries of the country are taken as samples, and it is shown that the average number of infants baptized is one to every twenty-five communicants; whereas, in the Episcopal Church, the proportion is one to every five. Now this at first blush is a sad contrast. But let us stop a little and look at it. Does any body believe that the natural increase of the human family among Episcopalians is so great as one child to every five adults per annum? The thing is incredible. What then is the reason of the difference? The explanation is simple enough. Among Presbyterians, none are baptized unless either father or mother is a communicant. Not so among Episcopalians; but anybody's child, who can find a god-father and a god-mother who themselves have been baptized, is admitted to the ordinance. What baptism means when thus administered, we know not. We refer inquirers to the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union for information; but the reason of the difference of statistics is evident.

IV. One of the most adroit methods of discrediting the Presbyterian Church which this book and its sponsors employ, is the profession of giving the views and principles of Presbyterians with the strongest arguments which they use to support them; and then, having thus placed that Church in a false position, they come up with a great flourish of trumpets, and demolish the citadel of their own erection. For an example of this, witness the array of arguments which they profess to have got at Princeton against Episcopacy, (p. 43, elaborated in chapters 17-23.) 1st. Episcopacy is anti-republican. 2d. It is *now* conceded that the

official names of bishop and presbyter in the New Testament are of the same exact meaning; and hence the setting of bishops above presbyters is a usurpation and an anti-christ. 3rd. The Apostles were twelve in number, and their number was no more intended to be increased than that of the twelve tribes or the twelve constellations. 4th. Hilary declares that, "in Egypt, even at this day (say the end of the fourth century) the presbyters ordain in the bishop's absence," etc., etc.

Now, let any man who is a Presbyterian look over this array of arguments, and see whether he has rested his convictions on any such grounds, or whether he ever knew any Presbyterian who did. Indeed, it is incredible that the writer and disseminators of these misrepresentations did not know that Presbyterians do not base the argument on any of the above principles, nor on all of them put together.

It is true that sometimes Presbyterians, after proving the untenableness of prelacy from the Scriptures, have added as an additional objection the manifest fact that it is aristocratic and anti-republican; but this argument has always been considered subsidiary and cumulative. We do not believe that it was ever by any Presbyterian writer placed as a primary or fundamental proposition. With us the question is not, Is Episcopacy republican? but, Is it scriptural?

It is also true in conducting the argument, that Presbyterians, in order to explicitness, are compelled to refer to the fact that the titles presbyter and bishop are synonymous in the Greek Testament; and it is very proper to say that Episcopalians *now* confess it, because notwithstanding the contemptuousness with which this book treats Dr. Miller's language, when he says that prelatists "*now* concede" this point, and notwithstanding the positive assertion which it makes that prelatists have never denied that the two words mean one and the same officer—all prelatists—take Bishop Hobart as an example—have not always confessed it. *Now* all scholars acknowledge that the two words are titles of the same officer, as used in the New Testament. But of course the question here with us is this: Is the apostolical office perpetual; and is the diocesan bishop, as now established in the

Episcopal Church, the same scriptural office which was designed by Jesus Christ when he ordained the twelve apostles? The title of the office is comparatively a matter of indifference.

Again, it is true that some authors have contended that the apostolical college was to consist of only twelve, that the number was never designed to be increased, and that there actually never were more than "twelve Apostles of the Lamb;" but this never was asserted in any authoritative way by Presbyterians: it is the opinion of private individuals, who have no authority to speak for the Church, and do not pretend to do so. What Presbyterians require is, that every man for whom a claim is made to be an apostle, shall possess the apostolical gifts and qualifications which the Scriptures set forth, and shall be clothed with the evidences thereof, viz., apostolical power. And if this book could show that these things concurred in the cases of all the thirty disciples whom it calls apostles, it would violate no principle of Presbyterianism to accept them all. The question therefore is this: Do those who now claim to be apostolical successors, whether twelve, or twelve hundred in number, exhibit the scriptural qualifications of apostles, and perform apostolical functions?

Lastly, it is true that in order to turn its own weapons against Episcopacy, Presbyterians have quoted Hilary and Jerome, and others of the Fathers, to show that they do not give that full countenance to prelacy which Prelatists contend for. But Presbyterians care nothing for the Fathers, as their appeal is always to the law and the testimony. The question with them on the whole subject is not, What say the Fathers? but, What saith the Scripture?

Now, when this book comes to what it calls "The True Issue," (ch. 22,) it boldly takes up the scriptural argument, and to the satisfaction of the writer, proves, with a great affectation of learned discovery, that there were no less than thirty apostles in the primitive Church, all of them deducible from the Scriptures! In this, he out-Herods Herod; he goes farther than the boldest champions of prelacy among genuine native-born Episcopalians, who, so far as we are aware, have never claimed for several of these persons that they were more than bishops. What they

have considered doubtful, this zealous convert from "the sects" esteems as clear as noon-day; what they have confessed to be untenable, he maintains with a firm grasp; what they have rejected as unsustained by a sound scriptural exegesis, this voracious recruit swallows at a single gulp; and he seems to look with astonishment at his *quondam* Presbyterian friends, because they do not open their mouths as widely as he did, and swallow with as keen a relish the food which he sets before them, without asking any questions for conscience' sake. We think it was Horne Tooke who, when asked by the bishop at his ordination, if he believed the Thirty-nine Articles, replied, "Yes, my Lord; and I like them so well, I am only sorry there are not as many more of them." This convert from the sects had a more voracious appetite than even Horne Tooke, and refused to be satisfied with old-fashioned Episcopacy. He has found as many more reasons for Episcopacy as anybody before him, and has swallowed them down without mincing. He even manifests a sort of childish delight and triumph at every new absurdity which he has persuaded himself to accept. All this is accompanied with a pretension to learning which would make the whole thing ridiculous, but for the fact that the book was designed for popular circulation, and unfortunately the bulk of common readers have not always the ability to discriminate between learning and the affectation of it. We doubt not that this is the reason of the dissemination of this book among plain people; but the consciences of those who circulate it must be very elastic, or they must be very ignorant of the grounds on which their own church polity is defended by true Churchmen of all grades, and also of the reasons for opposing Episcopacy which Presbyterians assign, as well as those on which they defend their polity.

The argument of the book on this subject is something of a curiosity; the author approaches the discussion with much gusto in a taunting style; and with a triumphant air he marches on in his onslaught on Presbyterians, with Quixotic courage, dealing out right and left his trenchant blows. He shows us how his former Presbyterian prejudices against apostolical succession, which arose from ignorance, gave way before the prodigious dis-

coveries he made as he read for himself the Greek Testament and the Fathers. He had, as a good Presbyterian, believed that there could not be more than twelve apostles. But it happened to occur to him that there were actually thirteen, for, beyond a doubt, Matthias was the successor of Judas Iscariot—an indubitable proof of apostolical succession; and besides, that makes thirteen apostles. To be sure that there is no mistake in this, he gives the list without Matthias, and behold, it is full—there are twelve. Then he gives it again, adding the name of Matthias, and behold, there are thirteen! “The charm is broken. Thirteen is said to be a fatal number. Certainly it is fatal to Presbyterianism.” The wonder is, that no Presbyterian had ever before thought of this ingenious plan of ascertaining the truth which we have here exhibited, viz., the setting down of two lists, one with, and the other without Matthias, but both of them containing the name of the Apostle Judas Iscariot! But worse still for Presbyterians: on reading his Bible he came to the case of the Apostle Paul; and now he has “fourteen apostles—genuine, *bona fide*, large-as-life-apostles.” “And there is yet another: Barnabas is twice called an apostle.” And now “it is time to amend the catalogue;” and here we have it once more printed in full, but increased now to fifteen. “Gentlemen, if a thirteenth apostle puts you thus to your wit’s end, what will you do with the *fifteenth*. Remember we have now *fifteen*.” And what think you, O benighted Presbyterians! he is just half done! Hear him again. “Turning to Scripture, I found it said, ‘Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles;’ and I could not for my life perceive that either in Greek or English the passage would bear any other straight-forward, above-board meaning than that Andronicus and Junia were *apostles*.” “In like manner I found Epaphroditus called the apostle of the church at Philippi.” After rubbing his eyes, clearing his spectacles, and consulting Jerome, he says: “Accordingly I gave it up that Epaphroditus was an undeniable apostle.” “The next that troubled me was St. James.” But after full consideration and examining the Fathers, he accepts James the Just as an apostle. “And now my

catalogue runs thus;" and here we have it for the fourth time; but the list has grown to nineteen—yes, nineteen apostles! And thus on he went, and in a similar way he enrolls Timothy and Titus and Silas and Luke, until the number reaches twenty-three—yes, verily, twenty-three apostles in the Scriptures! and the very name apostle used with regard to every one of them! And there they are; for he now gives his list for the fifth time, so that we can look it over for ourselves and see that it is actually twenty-three, and no mistake. But here he stops in his rapid triumphal march to take breath, and makes a sad confession, (p. 419.)

"It is really not the most pleasing thing in the world to confess one's former ignorance.

Durum est

Quæ juvenes didicere, senes perdenda fateri.

"I did once believe that the apostolic office had perished with St. John, and that the twelve had passed away without successors; nor can I give a better apology for my mistake than that I had never thought the subject of sufficient importance," etc.

Now, is it not really distressing that a "Presbyterian clergyman," educated at Princeton Theological Seminary, should awaken to such a state of facts as this: that there in his own Bible, notwithstanding his "High Church Presbyterian" prejudices and training, he was compelled to see with his own eyes a record of such a company of apostles as twenty-three, and in every case the very name apostle confronts him! But worse and worse, he is not yet done. For, "of course, in this inquiry, I could not overlook . . . 'the angels of the seven churches.' The words angel and apostle both meaning 'messenger,' are much more nearly synonymous than the names presbyter and bishop." And so, after some consultation of the Fathers, he adds on these seven angels to his list. "It is unnecessary to pursue the succession further. Here is the catalogue, so far as we have gone;" and then for the sixth and last time he gives us his list, now increased to thirty. "Well, really!" will exclaim the Presbyterian, "according to this, apostles are not so rare on the earth as I had supposed."

Now, is it not a shame for our Theological Seminaries to keep our students for the ministry in such ignorance? But this new convert, we are happy to say, turned out to be too smart for them. They could not conceal these facts from him; for he discovered in his own Bible the very name apostle used with reference to these twenty-three different men, if not thirty. There certainly can be no mistake on the subject now; for this writer says again and again, "I have found! I have found! Eureka! Eureka!" and with his own eyes he tells us he has read the very name in English and in Greek—apostle—ἀπόστολος; moreover, he has published the fact to the world. What can Presbyterians say now?

It is some time since we have indulged in light literature; but we remember in our younger days reading a book on Irish character, in which one of the illustrations was that of an Irish youth who applied for admission to the Dublin University in order to take his degrees. The Professors set about his examination, but soon the whole Faculty was summoned to the contest; for the student was discomfiting the Professors at a fearful rate, man by man; and then the Regents and Fellows were called in; but still the young student held the ground; and at last, worn out in body and mind, the contest had to come to an end through sheer exhaustion, leaving the student master of the situation, he having triumphed over the whole University by *one word*. We think we have found the equal of this redoubtable Irish lad, and can match him with "One of Three Hundred;" for this book furnishes us the evidences of that wonderful learning which enabled this rare scholar, with the skill and ability of the youth of Erin, to vanquish Princeton Theological Seminary, its faculty, students, and alumni, and to remain master of the situation, ahead of all opposers, by one word; and though he is gone, the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union stands in his shoes, and flourishes his invincible shillalah, inscribed all over with the talismanic name, APOSTLE, and is waging a war against all Presbyterians, which threatens the extermination of the whole "sect." Presbyterians, avaunt!

But hold! Let us look around for a moment on the battle-

field, and see whether we are not more scared than hurt. For though this modern Goliath, panoplied in full armor, has come forth to announce great swelling words of defiance of the whole Church militant, except a single denomination, we must remember that it is not the distant sound of thunder, but the instant stroke of lightning, that kills; and though his staff or shillalah be as thick as a weaver's beam, it may be rotten to the core. While the triumphant gusto of the book can do us no conceivable harm, a smooth stone taken from the book of truth will overcome this redoubtable champion, and place his weapons in the custody of those he defies, for their own defence.

Then, seriously, what does all the argument which is here furnished on the subject of "the true issue," amount to? Simply to a play on words, or rather to an ignoring of distinctions which all scholars and intelligent Episcopalians have always recognised. To illustrate and prove our position is an easy matter.

The word Bible, in the English language, means simply and only the word of God. But it is derived from the Greek word, *biblos*, which means a book, and in Greek is used for all books, without distinction. The word presbyter, in English, is the title of an officer in the Christian Church, usually called an elder, and in English it means nothing else; but in Greek, the original word from which it is derived, means not only a church officer, but also sometimes civil magistrates; sometimes it is used of age, and sometimes as a mark of dignity or respect. The word apostle, in the English language, is used for those whom Jesus Christ called to be the witnesses of his resurrection, and the founders of the Christian Church; but in Greek it means one sent forth; *i. e.*, a messenger or a missionary. The word deacon, in English, means the lowest officer in the Church; but the original word means a minister or servant. Now, our translators, to prevent confusion and to make the word of God intelligible, in rendering into English the words above given, and many others which we might name, observed the above distinctions; and hence the word *biblos* is always translated book, and not Bible. The original words for apostle, presbyter, and deacon, are so translated as to convey the idea of the distinction between their usage as the titles of church officers

and their other meanings. The translators were chiefly Episcopalians, but in addition to that, they were men of unquestionable scholarship. The display of learning in this book chiefly consists in a contempt of those manifest distinctions which these translators carefully observed. Let us illustrate. The word translated deacon, as we have shown, means, and is ordinarily translated, a minister or servant; and in that sense it is used again and again in the New Testament, before the officer of the Christian Church known as the deacon was first appointed. Because it now has an appropriated meaning as the title of a church officer, it does not cease to have its previous meanings; but is used in Greek precisely as it had been used before, as a word descriptive of the fact that a certain ministry or service pertained to the person to whom it was attributed. Well, if this book, on this plan of confounding all distinctions, gathered together a great cloud of apostles, so also it arrays before us an innumerable company of deacons, by its method of reasoning; for, while none are deacons officially and technically but those called to serve tables, yet, since every follower of Christ is a minister or servant of Christ, they would all become deacons, according to this new system of hermeneutics. But it is not correct to say, as this book does, (pp. 376, 471,) that the apostleship is ever called "deaconship" in the New Testament, or that Paul ever calls himself and his fellow-ministers by the title of deacon, for the reason already assigned, viz., that the word deacon, though derived from the Greek, is an English word, which means that officer in the Church whose duty is to serve tables; and the word deaconship in English simply means the office of deacon. The apostles, indeed, appointed the deacons in the first instance, in order that they might give themselves to "the ministry (diaconia) of the word" (Acts vi. 5). Thus in the very verse appointing the deacon's office, they use the Greek word in its ordinary sense, with reference to their own work, which, in its official sense, refers to the office of deacon. In like manner, they call themselves and their associates, "ministers of the gospel," "ministers of the word," "ministers of Christ," etc., where the same word from which the English word deacon is derived is used in

its ordinary sense. In this latter sense, the Greek word occurs twenty-seven times in the Greek Testament; whereas, in its technical sense, as a title of office in the Church, it is only used three times. In these three instances, it is properly translated *deacon*; whereas, in every other instance, with equal correctness, it is translated *minister* or *servant*, since to translate it *deacon* would simply make nonsense out of the word of God. It only tends to confusion, therefore, to obliterate all these manifest distinctions, as this book does.

Again, to exhibit, in a still more striking light, the utter absurdity of this method of interpretation, let us take the word "*biblos*," from which our English word *Bible* is derived. It occurs thirteen times in the New Testament, but never in the sense of the *Bible*. Now, suppose we should imitate the manner of displaying learning or ignorance, as the case may be, which this book adopts, and wherever the word occurs should translate it *Bible*, what confusion of ideas would be introduced into the word of God. For example, we would have, Acts xix. 19, "Many of them also which used curious arts brought their *Bibles* together and burned them before all men; and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver." It is seen at a glance what shocking nonsense and falsehoods this method of interpretation would cause the *Bible* to utter. Now, it is just as true that the books of divination or conjury burnt by the converts at Ephesus, who had "used curious arts," were *Bibles* worth fifty thousand pieces of silver, as it is that Andronicus, and Junia, and Epaphroditus, and James the Just, and Timothy, and Titus, and Silas, and Luke, and Barnabas were apostles, according to the official meaning of that word.

V. We will now take up the question of the apostleship, as it is thus presented before us. Dr. Scott, the eminent Episcopalian commentator on the *Bible*, in his notes on 2 Cor. viii. 23, ("Whether any do inquire of Titus he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you: or our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers [in the Greek, apostles,] of the churches, and the glory of Christ.") of the word "messengers," says:

"Christ was the apostle of the Father" (Heb. iii. 1); the twelve were his apostles; "these (messengers) were the apostles of the churches."

We need not discuss Christ's apostleship at this time; our inquiry relates to the other two senses of the word. But it is evident that Dr. Scott makes as broad a distinction between the apostles of Christ and the apostles or missionaries of the churches, as he does between the apostles of Christ and Jesus Christ as the Apostle and High Priest of our profession.

1. What, then, was the calling, and what were the qualifications of the apostles of Jesus Christ? 1. They received their vocation immediately from Christ himself: Matt. x. 2-8; Mark iii. 14; Luke vi. 13; Acts ix. 15; Gal. i. 1. 2. Their special function was to be personal witnesses of Christ's doctrine, resurrection, ascension, and glorification: John xv. 27; Acts i. 8, 22; xxii. 15; xxvi. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xv. 8, 14, 15. 3. They were to preach the gospel, administer ordinances, and establish the Church: Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 15. 4. In order to qualify them for their work, God bestowed on them the gift of inspiration: Matt. x. 19, 20; Acts i. 5, 8; ii. 4. 5. God attested their commission by the power of working miracles: Matt. x. 1, 8; Mark iii. 15; Heb. ii. 4; Acts ii. 43; v. 12; iii. 6, 7, etc. 6. Their authority was several, supreme, and plenary (which necessarily follows from their inspiration): Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; John xx. 23; 1 Cor. v. 3-5. 7. They carried their office and authority with them wherever they went: Matt. xx. 19; Mark xvi. 15, etc. Now, wherever the claim to apostleship is sustained by the above gifts and qualifications, we care not how many applicants there may be for the office, whether thirty or thirty thousand, we are ready to accept their credentials and recognise their authority; but wherever any of these marks is wanting, we deny that there is any evidence of apostleship.

On all sides it is admitted that Jesus chose twelve disciples, to whom he gave the title of the "twelve apostles," and throughout the New Testament they are spoken of as the "twelve," or as "the apostles of Christ;" that is, those chosen and ordained by Jesus Christ himself. Matthias was added to the number through the casting of the lot by the eleven, after the apostasy of Judas and the ascension of the Lord; but the Scriptures nowhere mention him

afterwards, nor is there any indication as to whether the action of the apostles in that matter met the divine approval, except the silence of the Scriptures on the subject. This fact some interpret as an approval of the transaction, while others infer from it the reverse. But Paul, though called out of due time, was constituted an apostle by the Lord himself, which fact leaves no room for doubt in his case. If the apostles had been authorised to add to their own number, here was an appropriate occasion for the exercise of that authority. Throughout the Bible, and to the end of the world, God honors his own ordinances. If such authority belonged to them, it would be in accordance with the divine method of procedure for the Lord to direct them to set Paul apart: but instead of that, he was commissioned by Jesus himself, without the mediate agency of any man or body of men. Hence he claimed to be an apostle of Christ, equal in authority with the chiefest of the apostles; moreover, he draws a broad distinction between the apostles of Christ, officially so called, and all others who go by the name of apostles, that is, missionaries. In inditing his Epistle to the Galatians, he says: "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." Here the distinction is clearly drawn between the apostles of men, who were also ordained by the agency of man, and those chosen and called directly of the Lord. Epaphroditus was an apostle of the Church at Philippi, (in our English version, "messenger,") and though many suppose that he was merely a delegate or legate sent from Philippi to bear a contribution to the apostle, and possibly to consult him, there is a probability that he was what Paul meant by an apostle of men, and by man; that is, that he was a minister of the gospel and a missionary of the Church. For every minister sent out by the Church to carry the gospel to the destitute, is an apostle of the Church, according to the Greek; a missionary of the Church, according to the Latin; or a messenger of the Church, according to the French, from the Latin—the three words, apostle; missionary, and messenger, all radically meaning the same thing. There is a sense in which every minister is an apostle of Christ; but in its technical sense none are,

save those chosen and commissioned personally by the Lord himself.

A claim is made (p. 408) for the apostleship of Timothy, from the fact that Paul joins him with himself in writing several of his Epistles. But let us examine in what manner the apostle introduces the name of Timothy. The first time it occurs is in the salutation of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians: "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy our brother." What a broad distinction is here drawn between these two ministers! If Timothy was indeed an apostle in the sense in which Paul was, may we not add, what an insult is here given to this servant of God? Paul arrogates to himself the name and authority of the apostolic office, but refuses to recognise his companion Timothy as entitled to it. Does any man believe Paul would have been guilty of such treatment of his "son Timothy," even setting aside divine inspiration? But when we take that into the account, it becomes more incredible still, unless we adopt the irreverent supposition that the object of this particular verse was to obscure the truth.

We shall see how much strength is given to this view of the subject, by turning to the next place in which Paul joins Timothy's name with his own. It is in Phil. i. 1: "Paul and Timotheus, servants of Jesus Christ." In the original it is "the bondsmen of Jesus Christ." Here we see the kind of parity which Paul recognised. When asserting his divine commission as an apostle of Jesus Christ, he could not join the name of Timothy with himself; but when he lays aside all official designations, and aims to express the common relation between the Lord Jesus and all His people, then he places himself along with Timothy and all his fellow-disciples as bondsmen of Christ, purchased by the blood of redemption. When, however, he proceeds from the salutation to perform his apostolical function of commanding the churches, the name of Timothy is immediately dropped, and the apostle writes in the first person singular. This, again, would have been a striking violation of propriety, if Timothy were indeed an apostle in the official sense, and would doubtless have had the effect to cause the churches to treat his au-

thority with contempt. On the other hand, when the apostle united the missionary or evangelist Timothy on this and other occasions with himself in the salutation to the churches which he was addressing, it was bestowing on him a mark of confidence, honor, and love, before all the churches of Christ. The apostle adopted a similar course in several of his Epistles, uniting others of his companions with himself in the salutations, and in part in the exhortations of the Epistles. But when he does so, in every instance he suppresses all official titles of himself and of them; while in every other instance he describes himself as an apostle of Jesus Christ. This would be very remarkable, if they were equally apostles with himself, and possessed of the same official authority.

Still further: when Paul comes to deliver his charges to his companions, Timothy and Titus, before leaving them for the crown that awaited him, he does so as "an apostle of Jesus Christ," but does not call them apostles, nor speak to them as his successors, nor commit to them his official work. But, on the other hand, he tells Timothy to do the work of an evangelist, and his charge to Titus is based on the same conception of his work that he had already enjoined on Timothy; and hence it is manifest that Titus was an evangelist also. And now how utterly absurd would Paul's affectation of superiority to Timothy and Titus appear in these Epistles, if they were apostles equally with himself, equally inspired, and his coëquals in authority! How remarkable, moreover, that he should omit the apostolical office altogether in explaining to them the character and qualifications of church officers, whom they were to ordain, if apostle-bishops were also to be chosen and ordained by them! These things are unaccountable on the theory we are combating.

This book (p. 409) differs from us in our view of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and argues that they contain internal evidence of the fact that they were instructions from the apostle Paul on assigning them episcopal charge of the churches of Ephesus and Crete. These are the only cases out of this new batch of apostles, whose claims Mr. Litton, in his book on the

“Church of Christ”,* deems worthy of discussion at all. The claims of all the rest he sets aside as untenable on general principles, without even arguing the cases separately. As to Timothy and Titus, Mr. Litton makes a careful examination of the Epistles addressed to them, and clearly proves that neither the episcopate nor any other permanent office was intended to be established in their cases; but that the internal evidence furnished by these Epistles is conclusive that their commission was temporary. He says, pages 292, 293:

“In fact, Timothy and Titus belonged to a class of persons occupying a conspicuous place in St. Paul’s Epistles, who may be called apostolic delegates or commissioners; who, from the resemblance which their functions bore in some particulars to those of a bishop, and probably from the fact that the first bishops were chosen from their number, were, by a later age, easily mistaken for formal bishops.” “St. Paul, in his Epistles generally, appears attended by one or more of these apostolic delegates; and by a comparison of these compositions, we can discover with a high degree of probability many of their names.”

Dr. Jacob,† in his “Ecclesiastical Polity,” uses very similar language. We quote from p. 73, as follows:

“Timothy at Ephesus, and Titus in Crete, were delegated by St. Paul to perform for him what we might call episcopal functions, in ordaining, superintending, reproof, or encouraging the ministers of these churches, as well as endeavoring to promote the general well-being of the Christian communities there. But they are never called ‘bishops,’ or any other name which might indicate a special order or ecclesiastical office. Their commission was evidently an exceptional and temporary charge, to meet some peculiar wants in those places during the necessary absence of St. Paul: and there is no intimation of any kind that such appointments were of general necessity—no intimation that they were needed, or that

*The Church of Christ. By the Rev. Edward Arthur Litton, A. M., Perpetual Curate of Stockton Heath, Cheshire, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, England.

†The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament: a Study for the Present Crisis in the Church of England. By Rev. G. A. Jacob, D. D., late Head Master of Christ’s Hospital. A *verbatim* reprint. From the American Edition. New York: Thomas Whittaker, No. 2 Bible House. Dated 1871.

they were made, or ought to be made, in any other churches of the time."*

Both Mr. Litton and Dr. Jacob describe, without naming, the function already alluded to, which Presbyterians still recognise as essential to a progressive and expanding Church—that of the evangelist; and that is the precise office or work, as we have already shown, which Paul exhorted Timothy to perform, viz., the work of an evangelist. Dr. Wm. Smith takes precisely the same view of these cases as Mr. Litton, except that he designates, as we have already done, these companions of Paul as evangelists. Dr. Bloomfield, on Eph. iv. 11, says:

"We learn from Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, v. 9, and other writers cited by Suicer, that in the Apostolic Church, evangelist, *εὐαγγελιστής*, was the appellation given to those preachers who aided the labors of the apostles," "not by taking charge of any particular church, but by acting as itinerant preachers and teachers, wherever their labors might be needed." "We can scarcely doubt that to those duties above mentioned may be added that of evangelising the heathen—in fact, discharging the kind of duties performed by the missionaries of modern times."

That this observation is correct, is manifest from Paul's declaration to Titus, that he left him "in Crete, to set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city." In concurrence with the above is the testimony of Theodoret, who,

* We make the following characteristic extract from the book under review, p. 412:

"These Epistles to Timothy require such interminable straining and forcing into a sense so entirely non-natural, in order to get rid of the episcopal prerogative, that some more skilful Presbyterians, who have felt the pressure, and who can, *a la Hudibras*,

———' divide
A hair 'twixt south and southwest side,'

have fallen on the expedient of allowing Timothy a delegated authority to act temporarily in the place of Paul, as a sort of *tertium quid*, or intermediate thing between the presbyters at Ephesus and the apostle."

How impotent is this language aimed at Presbyterians, when we find that the view of the cases of Timothy and Titus, which he charges on Presbyterians as an evidence of moral obliquity, is that not only of Litton and Jacob, but also of Scott, Bloomfield, Smith, Conybeare and Howson, etc. What a contrast is here presented! This book *versus* such a host of Episcopalian scholars!

according to Smith, describes the primitive evangelists as traveling missionaries. Undoubtedly, Timothy and Titus were evangelists.

Again: an argument for the apostleship of Timothy, and Silas also, is derived from 1 Thess. ii. 6. In the salutation of the Epistle, Paul had united Timothy and Silvanus (or Silas) with himself; and throughout the Epistle he writes in the first person plural. In the verse above alluded to he says: "But we might have been burdensome to you, as the apostles of Christ." Now, argues our book, since the salutation of the Epistle includes the names of Timothy and Silvanus, and since Paul here writes in the first person plural, saying "we," they are undeniably called apostles in this verse. In confutation of this, we find that while neither Dr. Scott nor Dr. Bloomfield discusses the special point, they both speak of the declaration of the apostle as being personal, and relating wholly to himself. Conybeare and Howson translate the Epistle throughout as if written in the first person singular; and the above-quoted expression is given by them thus: "*as being Christ's apostle.*" In explanation of their manner of translating, they say, Vol. I., p. 391:

"It is important to observe in this place, once for all, that St. Paul uses "*we*" according to the idiom of many ancient writers, where a modern would use "*I.*" Great confusion is caused in many passages by not translating according to his true meaning, in the first person *singular*; for thus it often happens that what he spoke of himself individually, appears to us as if it were meant for a general truth," etc.

Unmistakable internal evidence is then given, that though he uses the plural form, he meant to speak only for himself.

A passage which has occasioned more discussion than probably any other, is Gal. i. 19, where "James the Lord's brother" is named, who, according to the common translation, is there called an apostle. Who is here spoken of, is a difficult question, about which scholars, ancient and modern, are much divided. The most prevalent view is, that the word "brother" is not here used in its absolute sense, but in the sense of a near kinsman; and that hence the allusion is to our Saviour's cousin, James the son of Cleopas, or Alpheus, (he is called both,) and Mary, the sister

of our Lord's mother, who was one of the original twelve. Drs. Scott and Bloomfield take this view, following Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. Eusebius says that James, the Lord's brother, was a son of Joseph by a previous marriage; and he, as also the spurious Apostolical Constitutions, gives a list of fourteen apostles, viz., the twelve, Paul, and James. Conybeare and Howson are in doubt as to who this James was; and we suppose most others are in a similar state of mind. Litton confesses that it was James, the brother of the Lord, referred to in Matt. xiii. 55, who presided over the council of Jerusalem, and exercised some sort of presidency over the Church there, but denies his apostleship. The expression in Gal. i. 19, "save James the Lord's brother," which creates all the discussion and originates all the doubt, is susceptible of a translation equally correct with the common version, which would remove all the difficulty, thus: "But other of the apostles saw I none; but *I saw* James the Lord's brother." This rendering is advocated by many Episcopalian scholars, along with Winer, Schaff, etc. There is scarcely a question more disputed, or on which scholars are more divided, than on those which arise here, as to who the several Jameses were, what was their relation to our Lord, to each other, to the apostleship, and to the apostolic Church. Questions of scholarship, however, do not stand in the way of this book and its theory. In the most summary manner, with the dash of a pen, all such matters are fully disposed of to the writer's abundant satisfaction.

Another text where this book gets two more of its thirty apostles is Rom. xvi. 7: "Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles." "When we say that Washington was of note among the Presidents, . . . the whole world at once perceives our meaning." P. 401. Now, there is a bare possibility that Andronicus and Junia were missionaries; but the great probability is that they were simply private, or at the most, official, members of the church at Rome. Chrysostom and many others think Junia is the name of a woman; and Olshausen calls her the wife of Andronicus. Dr. Bloomfield renders the expression, "*of note among the apostles,*" thus: "who were well known and had in

consideration by or among the apostles." Conybeare and Howson translate the phrase thus: "who were well known among the apostles." Dr. Scott makes it "well-known and esteemed." Dr. Alford (and also John Calvin,) takes the word apostles in its wide sense of messengers. Dr. Wm. Smith calls Andronicus "a Christian at Rome," and uses precisely the same language of Junia. Kitto says of them both, "they were doubtless Jewish Christians." These are all eminent Episcopalian authorities; and if there is any one "of note" who sustains this book, we have not met with him. How perfectly characteristic, therefore, is the assurance with which it is said: "I could not for my life perceive that either in Greek or English the passage would bear any other straight-forward, above-board meaning, than that Andronicus and Junia were *apostles*." What was perfectly plain to this sapient writer, cannot be seen at all by Episcopalian scholars:

Passing by, for the present, the cases of Barnabas and Luke, the remaining seven of the thirty whom this book enrolls on its final list are "the angels of the seven churches of Asia." As the whole book of Revelation is symbolical and prophetic; as writers are about equally divided in ancient and modern times on the question as to whether these angels were personifications, symbols, or heavenly guardians, on the one hand, or human personages on the other, it is perfectly idle to spend time in discussing them with reference to any theory of the Church or of church government. A reply to this book on that point would be useless, though we believe the Presbyterian theory covers the case more completely than any other possibly can, if it be admissible to attempt their interpretation on any theory of ecclesiology. We will only observe, however, that the words *angel* and *apostle* are not synonymous; and even if they were, the word *apostle* is the official title, the omission of which is fatal in this case to the writer's theory.

2. We have shown that Paul makes a broad distinction between the technical usage of the word and its primitive meanings and ordinary use. The first time it occurs in the apostolical history, when, we think, it does not have its official sense, is in the account of the first mission of Barnabas and Paul to the Gen-

tiles, to which they were set apart by the laying on of hands by the Presbytery of Antioch, Acts xiii. 1-4. In the next chapter these missionaries are once called "the apostles," and once "the apostles, Barnabas and Paul." (Ch. xiv. 4, 14.) But that the word is not here used in its technical sense, but in the ordinary meaning of missionaries, is manifest to us, first, because, while Paul is uniformly called "an apostle," this title is only given to Barnabas on the two occasions above referred to, both of which related to the same great mission; and in the next place, in the Epistle to the Romans, written fifteen years afterward, (Rom. xi. 13,) Paul claims to be "the apostle of the Gentiles," conveying at once the idea that no one had been associated with him in this trust, which was untrue if Barnabas was also an apostle; and, that the office being indeed one of immediate divine appointment, was not transmissible; for he makes no allusion to limitation of time or possible transmission of the office. This is in striking contrast with the use of his title of office in other places. In the salutation at the beginning of ten of his Epistles, Paul calls himself "an apostle" of Jesus Christ, but in no instance in any of his writings does he call himself "*the* apostle of Jesus Christ;" because, when strictly construed, the language would be as untrue as it would be arrogant; for he was only one of a number of apostles of Jesus Christ. On the other hand, he twice calls himself "*a* teacher of the Gentiles," 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11; (not *the* teacher,) because he was only one of many teachers of the Gentiles. How carefully he discriminates—he is *the* apostle, but only *a* teacher of the Gentiles.

When we find him so careful in using language strictly correct and courteous to his fellow-apostles in every instance when speaking of his general relation to the apostolic work, we must believe that he always uses accurate language in speaking of himself with regard to all parts of his work. Now, is it to be supposed that Paul the aged, after having carefully guarded the phraseology of the salutation of his Epistle to the Romans, forgot all his previous good manners when he came to write the 11th chapter, and began to magnify his office above measure, and to play the braggart by calling himself "the apostle of the Gentiles," if Barna-

bas, and Titus, and Timothy, and some ten or twelve more, were also apostles of the Gentiles? For, remember, he and Barnabas were, at the same time, by the Presbytery of Antioch, sent forth to the Gentiles, (Gal. ii. 9,) that they actually went together on their first mission, and that if Barnabas was an apostle at all, in the official sense of the word; Paul was no more "the apostle of the Gentiles" than Barnabas was. The same would be true of all the other evangelists whom the Bible calls apostles, in the sense of being missionaries.

This book, p. 398, places much emphasis on the fact that Barnabas's name takes precedence in several instances of that of Paul, from which it infers that Barnabas was at least the equal of Paul. But does the appointment of a layman as chairman of a committee, with ministers or even prelates under him, prove that laymen are officially equal to those officers? Assuredly not. Now, these servants of the Church were sent out on a mission for the organisation of churches, the ordaining of officers therein, and the preaching of the gospel, but not necessarily to perform any apostolical functions. Barnabas had been at Antioch at the introduction of Christianity into that city. He himself had gone from thence to seek Paul in the first instance, and had induced him to come there. Certainly he was before Paul in the order of time in preaching the gospel in that region. This may account for the fact that his name precedes Paul's on several occasions. But all this is immaterial, since, in the 13th verse, (Acts xiv. 13,) Paul is named as the chief of the embassy; the rest were "his company;" and besides during that mission, Paul for the first time asserted apostolical authority and exercised apostolical power, while Barnabas made no such pretension. True, the intimation that he was to fill the apostolic office had previously been given to Paul by divine revelation; (Acts xxii. 15; xxvi. 16;) but until now we see no assumption of apostolic authority, nor the exercise of any gifts which were not common to all the preachers of the gospel at that day. But now, on this mission, he stands forth as an apostle of Christ, with the divine credentials, viz., the power to work miracles. Barnabas did nothing of the kind, and appears never to have claimed any such gifts, nor

to have performed any apostolical functions. His work was that of the evangelist.

Again, this book (p. 399) errs in saying Paul includes Barnabas among the apostles in 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6. This it requires no scholarship, but only common intelligence, to see is not correct. The apostle is discussing ministerial support; and he claims the right of himself and Barnabas to live and marry, and be supported by the Church, as much as "the other apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas." Says this book, with characteristic assurance (p. 399):

"Can any man, in his senses or out of his senses, tell us why Barnabas, who is not mentioned again in the whole Epistle, should be named in this connexion, unless he were an apostle as well known as St. Paul, and as well entitled to the support of the Church at large?"

Now, in reply to this, we ask. Were all "the brethren of the Lord" apostles, in the technical sense? If not, then men "in their senses" cannot draw the inference from this passage that Barnabas was one. Indeed, Paul is not discussing the question with reference to the apostleship, but with regard to the rights of the gospel ministry generally; and the conclusion which he reaches is given in v. 14: "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." Then his whole argument pertained to the rights of those who "preach the gospel;" and all that is involved in the introduction of the name of Barnabas in this place is, that he was a preacher of the gospel. The name of Barnabas is doubtless used because he was well known as a pioneer missionary or evangelist, and as a companion of Paul, when they both labored at their own charges.

To this class of ministers we have already shown that Timothy, Titus, Silas, and all Paul's companions and associates in labor belong. Luke was one of the most faithful, constant, and laborious of them all, and is by many called an evangelist, not only because he wrote one of the Gospels, but because he was a distinguished missionary and preacher of the gospel. The claim which this book makes for his apostleship is based on 2 Cor. viii. 23, because Luke was sent with Titus to Corinth. Now, is it not astonishing that this writer did not see, in this reason for calling

Luke an apostle, that he deluded himself by a word! Assuredly we have no objection to confessing that Luke was an apostle in that sense; in other words, that he was an evangelist or missionary.

In the place just alluded to, however, (2 Cor. viii. 23,) and also in Phil. ii. 25, the word apostle, in the Greek, is rendered "messenger," in our common version. While the words, missionary and messenger, have radically the same origin, they are not precise synonyms in our language. We think our translators were right in rendering the word into English in those two verses. In the first case, Epaphroditus, whoever he may have been, whether a private member or the pastor of the church at Philippi, is sent to that church as the bearer of their contribution to the aid of Paul while he was at Rome. Paul writes them a letter and acknowledges their bounty, which he had received by the hands of their messenger, deputy, legate, or ambassador, (in the original, apostle,) Epaphroditus. There can be no mistake as to the meaning of the word in this case; it certainly no more means apostle, officially, than the Greek word *biblos* meant Bible in Acts xix. 19. Epaphroditus was their messenger, viz., he was the bearer of their bounty.

The other case is equally clear. Paul had enjoined the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 2, 3) to lay by in store their alms, to have it in readiness to be sent up to Jerusalem by "whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters." In 2 Cor. 8th chapter, he sends to Corinth Titus, and "the brother whose praise is in all the churches," probably Luke, (who also was chosen of the churches to travel with him to carry their contributions,) in order that they might stir up the Corinthian church and hasten their liberality, as he was about to leave for Jerusalem. Those persons, then, who were chosen of the churches and sent with the Apostle to carry their alms to Jerusalem, are very properly called the messengers of the churches; and the Greek word apostle is properly translated "messengers" in that case. It is probable, indeed, that these persons were not only messengers for that special object, but also that they were in the wider sense of the original word missionaries or evangelists, as there is scarcely a doubt that they

were chosen from among the companions and helpers of the Apostle. The epistle was sent to Corinth by Titus and Luke, who were both of them co-workers with Paul; and Titus at least, as there is reason to believe, was frequently sent out by him on missionary tours to perform the work of evangelist. The probability is, that the same is true of Luke, though some doubt. Archbishop Thompson is followed by Smith's Dictionary in calling him a missionary or evangelist. We need only add that among modern Episcopalians, Alford, Scott, Bloomfield, Litton, and Conybeare and Howson, together with Kitto's Cyclopaedia and Smith's Dictionary, all agree with the translators of the Bible, that Epaphroditus was not an apostle in its official sense, but only a messenger, deputy, or legate, from the church at Philippi to Paul at Rome. Conybeare and Howson think he was a leading presbyter of that church; while some suppose him to have been its pastor; but it is all surmise, since there is no trustworthy historical testimony. Moreover, all the authorities to which we have already referred, and all to which we have had access, agree with Dr. Scott and our translators, that in 2 Cor. viii. 23, the word does not mean official apostles.

We have shown that the mere use of the word apostle in the Scriptures proves nothing unless there is other evidence to establish a claim to apostleship. But in none of these cases is there the slightest evidence. Some of the missionaries or evangelists, for whom this claim is set up, were doubtless inspired; but there is no proof that any of them wrought miracles; that any of them claimed to have been commissioned as apostles, by direct revelation, or to be able to give personal testimony to the resurrection and ascension of our Saviour. Hence, no one of them ever claimed to be anything more than a minister of the gospel and a missionary of the Church, otherwise called an evangelist; and some of them were probably private members of the church. In Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, in Kitto's Cyclopaedia, and in Bloomfield's Notes on the New Testament, we cannot find a hint that anybody ever thought that Andronicus, Junia, Epaphroditus, Timothy, Titus, Silas, or Luke, or the angels of the seven churches, belonged to the rank of apostles. If any

one besides the author of the book under review now thinks so, neither Smith nor Kitto, nor any of their learned co-laborers, thought his views to be of sufficient importance to combat them or even state them. Hence in the judgment of these eminent Episcopalian scholars, to whom we have referred this grand list of thirty apostles, which our new convert found in his Bible, and which the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union has ventured to accept, dwindles down and becomes beautifully less, till it is found to include only the original apostolic college, viz., the eleven, with Matthias and Paul, to which some would add the names of Barnabas and James the Just.

We wish we had room for the whole of the learned and conclusive argument by which Mr. Litton maintains that not only did the original apostles have no successors, but that Episcopacy was not founded by them; but our room forbids it. On p. 377, he proposes to inquire, "first, whether Episcopacy can be proved to be of divine right, or to have been instituted by Christ himself; secondly, whether the *sole* evidence of Scripture is sufficient to enable us to pronounce it to be of apostolical institution; and lastly, whether we can fairly draw this latter conclusion from the *joint* testimony of Scripture and ecclesiastical history." The first and second of those questions, after full examination of the whole Scripture argument, he answers negatively, (see Jacob, pp. 75, 79,) though he answers the third question in the affirmative. But his previous answers settle the matter in the minds of all Presbyterians. For the sole authority, for them, is the Bible. What cannot be proved from it, they reject. But Mr. Litton is a true Churchman; to a certain extent he accepts tradition and the testimony of the Fathers; and hence, he gave the last question its affirmative answer. With us, however, the simple and only question is, What saith the Scripture? Notwithstanding all the vaunting of this book, and its triumphant quotations from the Bible, when the Anglican scholar and theologian, Mr. Litton, takes the witness stand, he is compelled to confess that the Bible, which is the sole rule of faith and practice, does not, without external aid and additions, give support to diocesan Episcopacy.

With him agree Archbishop Whately and Dr. Jacob. With us, that fact is conclusive.

VI. The reasoning of this book in favor of the rite of confirmation is fully as triumphant in tone and as destitute of scriptural foundation as its reasoning on the subject of the apostleship. It bases the rite wholly on Heb. vi. 1, 2.

“ ‘Leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.’ According to this, ‘*the foundation,*’ ‘*the principles of the doctrine of Christ*’—what are they? ‘Repentance, Faith, Baptism, *Laying on of hands,* the Resurrection, the eternal Judgment.’ Let me think, said I within myself—is this the order of teaching among Presbyterians? They teach, first, ‘*Repentance.*’ Very well: for St. Paul says, first, ‘*Repentance.*’ They teach, secondly, ‘*Faith.*’ very well, again; for St. Paul says, secondly, ‘*Faith.*’ They teach, thirdly, Baptism; very well, once more; for St. Paul says, thirdly, ‘*Baptisms.*’ But at the fourth stage, St. Paul and the Presbyterians part; St. Paul says, fourthly, ‘*the laying on of hands.*’ Presbyterians break the chain binding our youthful Isaacs to the altar, and our young Samuels to the temple, and cast the bright link away.” Pp. 91, 92.

Now, all this and much more which is given us on the subject is just as clear as mud. But notwithstanding its triumphant tone, the very thing to be proven is taken for granted, and assumption and assertion take the place of exegesis and logic. No proof is offered, for there is none, that there was in the apostolical Church any such rite as that of confirmation; and in the absence of any such scriptural evidence, it is simply a pragmatistical assumption that “the laying on of hands” (Heb. vi. 1, 2) alluded to confirmation. The laying on of hands is a custom of very remote antiquity, which was used in pronouncing a blessing, offering sacrifices, setting apart to an office, etc., etc. Moreover, it was used by the apostles when imparting the gifts of the Spirit, when working miracles, and when ordaining church officers. No matter: there was the custom of laying on of hands, argues this book, and bishops now lay on hands in confirmation. Now, without any attempt at argument or proof, but simply and

only because the expression "laying on of hands" is found in Heb. vi. 1, 2, and because the same rite is now used in confirmation, this book goes into raptures at its triumph over Presbyterians on this subject. Such reasoning tramples on logic, exegesis, and common sense; but for the multitude, who from want of knowledge, can be imposed upon, it answers just as valuable proselyting purposes as if it were a work of true learning. On this point we shall again turn over this book to our prelatial friend, Mr. Litton, for answer. He says that the apostles could, by the imposition of hands, communicate spiritual gifts, such as "wisdom," "knowledge," "faith," etc.; but that, after the apostolic age, these gifts were not imparted as they had been by the apostles by the imposition of hands; and then in a foot note, p. 380, he says:

"Hence the groundlessness of the assumption that our rite of confirmation is identical with the apostolic imposition of hands. There is hardly anything between them in common, save the outward sign. The apostles, as *apostles*, had no successors; and the signs which accompanied the apostolic rite, and which constituted its specific difference, have long ceased; there only remains the imposition of hands, which they practised, and we practise now. The fact is, that the *ceremony* was continued in the Church, as a salutary and scriptural one, when the effects that once followed it were withdrawn; and as a useful and scriptural custom of the Church it can only now be regarded."

Dr. Jacob takes precisely the same view of this matter with Mr. Litton; but we cannot spare room for his clear and convincing statement. We need, however, say no more in reply to the profound and triumphant observations of this book on this subject.

VII. But "the Fathers"—Dr. Miller did not quote the Fathers in full—did not quote them fairly; and hence it is no wonder the young men who come from Princeton are good Presbyterians! About Dr. Miller's quotations of the Fathers, we shall say a few words directly. But, first, did he not quote the Scriptures correctly? That is the main question, the only question with us. Presbyterians draw their doctrine and their church order from the Bible alone, which they hold that God has given us for our infallible guidance in faith and life. The Fathers do not speak

by the inspiration of God, as do the prophets, evangelists, and apostles. And from the predictions which Paul gave by divine inspiration of the fearful corruptions which, from the ambition of men, would originate in the bosom of the Church immediately after his departure, and similar warnings by the other apostles; and especially when we remember the disorders and irregularities that sprang up while the apostles were still present—it does not seem to Presbyterians that they have much encouragement to look from the infallible Scriptures to the fallible Fathers to learn anything about the constitution and order of the Church, any more than about its doctrines; and more especially do they thus feel in view of the fact, that nearly all the decisive quotations from the Fathers on these points are in dispute, and many of them are without question spurious.

Hence Presbyterians read the Fathers just as they do the writings of other pious and learned men, receiving what is according to the Word of God, and rejecting whatever is not in accordance with the inspired writings. So it matters not to a Presbyterian what may be proved from the Fathers: our appeal is always to the law and testimony. When a Presbyterian agrees to refer to the Fathers, it is to meet Prelatists and others on their own ground—to use their own weapons against themselves. But let them prove what they may by the Fathers, it amounts to nothing with us; for the Bible is not only an infallible rule of faith and practice—it is the only rule, to the exclusion of the Fathers, the traditions of the Church, and every thing else which is not of divine revelation. The frailty of human nature is such, that Moses could not remain forty days and forty nights away from the congregation without the people corrupting the worship of God by idolatry with Aaron at their head; and when we consider the warnings given us in the apostolical Epistles, and the fulfilment of those forebodings as exhibited in the book of Revelation, we should be very careful to construct the Church, its doctrine, its order, its worship, according to the pattern shown in the mount; that is, according to the commandments of the Lord, given us by his inspired apostles, who were commis-

sioned by him for that very purpose. We should never forget that the Church is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.

But let us return to the charge made in this book, that Dr. Miller misquotes and misrepresents the Fathers. On p. 432, the author says :

“I left Princeton sure that at least Augustine and Hilary and Jerome and Cyprian were Presbyterians at heart, as much as Dr. Miller was. And if they were not, it certainly was not the Doctor's fault, who did his best, by every *ex post facto* art, to make them so.”

On p. 445, we find the following, referring to Dr. Miller's references to Hilary and others :

“Very queer quotations these of the Doctor's. But no matter. Hilary must serve them one more good turn before they can let him go.”

And in the chapter on “Presbyterianism and the Fathers” throughout, he represents Dr. Miller as garbling them so as to make out a case ; with misrepresenting them intentionally so as to deceive the students, etc. ; and in view of it all, says on p. 454 :

“Is it to be wondered at that the students at Princeton are satisfied with Presbyterian ordination ?”

The above quotations will show the animus of this assault on Dr. Miller, and will leave no room for any one to doubt that the charge is clearly made, that he garbled, misinterpreted, and misquoted the Fathers, to suppress their testimony in favor of Episcopacy, and to torture their language into an approval of Presbyterianism. This charge of dishonesty is made in the most offensive form, viz., that of covert insinuation. We shall say but little about Dr. Miller, because he does not need it. He did not need it when living, nor does he now since his ascension; need any defence of his integrity and moral character against the attacks of so reckless a book as this. But to show how outrageous these accusations are, we will refer our readers to the same book from which we have already quoted Mr. Litton's “Church of Christ.” On p. 388, he says :

“The most remarkable instance in which a deviation from the rule that bishops only should ordain appears to have taken place in the well known one of the Alexandrian Church, in which, as Jerome reports, it was the custom for the presbyters ‘to choose out one of their own num-

ber, and, placing him in a higher position, to salute him bishop; as if an army should make an emperor, or the deacons should elect one of themselves and call him archdeacon.' To the same effect is the testimony of Hilary the deacon, and of Eutyehius of Alexandria. To the evidence of the former writer, Mr. Palmer (on the Church, part 6, c. 4,) objects that the word 'consignant' which he (Hilary) uses signifies not 'ordain,' but 'confirm,' and to that of the latter, that he lived too late (in the tenth century) to have any weight in determining such a question. But, however indecisive the expressions or the opinions of each writer separately may be, the presumption in favor of the obvious meaning of Jerome's language created by their united testimony is very strong, especially as it is confirmed by a passage which occurs in the book printed with Augustin's works, *Quæstiones de utroque Testamento*: 'Nam in Alexandria et per totum Ægyptum, si desit episcopus, consecrat presbyter.' Quæst. CI. By the Benedictine editors this work is pronounced spurious; but the author is supposed to have lived not later than the close of the fourth century."

Now compare the above candid and just observations from this distinguished Episcopal author and advocate with the shameless charges of the book under review. The quotations from and the allusions to the Fathers made in the above extract from Litton, the honest Episcopalian, are the chief ones referred to in this author's allegations against Dr. Miller. It will be seen that Litton throughout sustains Dr. Miller in all his translations, quotations, and allusions to the Fathers.

Additional illustrations of the want of fairness of this book, in quoting from and alluding to the Fathers, we must omit. But we confess that the further we go in examining the book, and the more we see of its jesuitry and unfairness, the more it becomes a difficult problem to solve, what sort of people they are who endorse it.

VIII. On p. 518, this book says: "Presbytery has also, without compunction, added to the ancient creed, or substituted for it, the dogmas of predestination, limited redemption, and, in short, the resolutions of the Synod of Westminster." But, in contrast, "Episcopacy maintains the ancient creed *intact*, as the ancient compact and sacred bond of union; and would no more presume to add to that sacred instrument, or to take from it, than she would alter or mutilate the Scriptures." Now this writer once

professed to be a Presbyterian minister, and ought to have known that the Apostles' Creed is part and parcel of the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church, though it is far from occupying the same place in our esteem as the word of God. At the end of the Shorter Catechism, the Apostles' Creed is inserted in the Confession of Faith, as it was in the Westminster Confession as held by the Church of Scotland, and so it is always published with the Shorter Catechism and universally committed to memory by our children along with it. Moreover, parents are required to teach their children the Apostles' Creed along with the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. (Directory of Worship, ch. IX., sec. 5.) Again, he misstates the truth with regard to the Church of his new love, in order to give a stab at the Church he had abandoned. "The Presbyterians have substituted the resolutions of the Synod of Westminster," says he, "for those of the Creed;" but with what holy horror "the Church" would look at any addition to or abatement from the Creed! But all this time, what about the Thirty-nine Articles, not of the Synod of Westminster, but of Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth? Again, the Westminster doctrines are derided, and Presbytery is held up to contempt, because it inculcates the doctrine of predestination; and afterward we find one of the justifications which this author offers for quitting the Presbyterian Church, is that it taught this doctrine. Now, let us turn to the 17th of the Thirty-nine Articles; and what do we find? There, in all its naked deformity, is this very doctrine of predestination. The difference is that the Presbyterians hold the doctrine of predestination as stated in the Westminster Confession, and Episcopalians profess to believe the very same doctrine taught in their Thirty-nine Articles, while both Churches hold and teach the formulary called the Apostles' Creed! That is all the difference. Such, once more, is the trustworthiness of this book, which is now circulating under the auspices of the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union!

But we must bring our criticisms to a close. Our readers can judge of the whole book by these samples of its method of presenting its cause and these illustrations of its unfairness in stating the position and views of Presbyterians. There are many other

accusations just as baseless, which we must pass over for want of room. If there is a single instance in which it represents us correctly, we have failed to find it. The venerable maxim which forbids our speaking anything of the dead but that which is good has been in our mind; but we have felt it to be a mixed question in this instance. For though the author is dead, the book is not; but is still promulgated by the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school Union. Whilst we would not invade the sepulchre with the language of opprobrium, we cannot consent to allow a book which affects great fairness, but which in point of fact is glaringly prejudiced and uncandid, and freighted with untruths, to go unrebuked while it is circulated to our injury and has living endorsers. We feel, indeed, as though we had not done ourselves and our cause full justice in our exposures of it, from the restraint we have put on our language. Our indignation, however, is far less at the original writer than at the endorsers and disseminators of it. It is manifest that he was gullible to the last degree; and as he seems, in the first instance, to have taken Presbyterianism on trust without much thought or serious examination; so, on changing church relations, his facile susceptibilities led him to embrace everything which seemed to favor Episcopacy, without exercising sufficient judgment or discrimination to save him at all times from appearing ridiculous. Moreover, he was actuated by a twofold zeal, first, to justify himself for abandoning the faith of his fathers, on which point he seems to have been very sensitive, resenting in advance the apprehended criticisms of his former confreres; and secondly, to vindicate his embrace of Episcopacy. Moreover, he appears to have been urged on by a necessity to exert himself to secure the confidence of the Church he had entered, when, as we infer from some statements on p. 35, etc., he received an inverse welcome; and hence he was tempted to go to greater lengths in advocating pretentious Episcopacy, and in opposing Presbyterianism, than the more sober-minded and original Episcopalians venture to go. But the aforesaid Sunday-school Union has no such excuses: they are impelled by no such necessity. This book they must know is utterly untrue in its representations of Presbyterianism as well as in its pre-

tences of arguments for Episcopacy. That "Union" knows perfectly well that Episcopalian scholars do not maintain many of the absurd positions taken in this book, on the subject of the apostleship, the rite of confirmation, etc., etc.; and they ought to know that Dr. Miller's quotations from the Fathers were perfectly correct, and that his translations were the same as those given by their own wisest and most learned writers. They are, therefore, to be greatly blamed for the circulation of a book which vilifies Dr. Miller, and is calculated to mislead; a book which inculcates ignorance, instead of true learning, and circulates slanders against Presbyterianism, instead of the truth of history. How they reconcile this conduct with their consciences, we know not; but certainly such proceedings are deserving of the condemnation of all honest men, especially among Episcopalians, since the character of their Church is affected thereby. It is a mendacious book, like *Theodosia Ernest*; and like it, is only used for proselyting purposes among plain people, ignorant of the facts involved, who cannot see through its irrelevant reasonings, its misstatements of history, its want of scholarship, and its glaring misrepresentations. The upright, honorable, and learned men among the ministry and membership of the Episcopal Church, assuredly can look on this publication and its vendors only with disapprobation and shame.

ARTICLE III.

SKETCH OF THE MINOR PROPHETS.

Were a person of taste to visit the Bodleian Library, he would see a quantity of books. But suppose the librarian had told him of a miniature volume, not larger than the *Essays of Bacon*, filled with practical sense and sacred eloquence, the visitor would be apt to seize the work of which its admirer had spoken. The Minor Prophets are to be judged, not by the quantity, but quality of what they wrote. Their number reminds us of the Hebrew tribes, of the apostles sent forth to the Gentiles, and of the holy city, each gate of which is an insulated pearl. In a moral sense, these small books are more valuable than the twelve gems on the embroidered plate of Aaron, though fastened on his breast by rings of gold.

No commentary is intended on these Prophets. The one chapter of Obadiah would fill this article, for all Scripture admits of expansion. In the thirty-sixth of Genesis, Esau is said to be Edom. The statement opens all Idumea to the commentator. The fraternal discord engendered heavy woes for the Edomites, who exulted over the calamities of Jerusalem. The fourth of the Minor Prophets predicts that divine anger will rest on the dukes of Edom, the sages of Teman, the crags of Seir, and the red-stone valleys of Petra. Though thy nest be in the clefts of the rock, or among the stars, it shall be rent in pieces for thy violence against thy brother Jacob, and thou shalt be cut off forever. And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Esau shall be stubble, for the Lord hath spoken it. Burckhardt and other travellers have testified to the literal fulfilment of these prophecies. Ruin has reduced its temples; goats have been browsing for centuries on its mosses, and camels slowly winding through ravines once embellished by the variegated architecture of Petra. The apostle Jude wrote but a solitary chapter of the New Testament, and yet important truths are made known in that brief document. There are men of our times who have spoken evil of dignities. From colonial dependence, our country

rose to be a dignity among the nations of the earth; but the Constitution of 1789 was reviled, because, like the Milky Way, it was visible from the South as protecting our rights. That instrument is now thrice dead and plucked up by the roots. But let the pen beware of politics when discussing scriptural subjects. We learn from the single chapter of Jude that Michael, the defender of the Jewish people, according to the twelfth of Daniel, entered into a contest with the evil one, from whom he demanded the body of the Hebrew lawgiver. He wanted it for the transfiguration of our Lord, that he might deliver up the system of sacrifice to him who was to accomplish his decease at Jerusalem. And he would have called for the body of Elias, that he might have yielded up the prophetic system; but Elias had long since been translated to heaven as a type of our Lord's ascension. But both were present at the transfiguration, which probably took place on some mountain to the north of Tabor. Paul's letter to Philemon is short; but poor Onesimus escaped from Colosse, that at Rome he might become rich in faith and an heir of the kingdom.

Bishop Horsley wrote a commentary on Hosea, at Fulham, but not republished in this country. We have never read it, but doubtless it is an able work. He was not so illustrious a chemist as Priestley, for to the latter discoveries seemed to come without being sought. And yet the London prelate was an incomparably superior theologian. This appears from their trinitarian controversy. The Northumberland divine was subject to mistakes, particularly about the French Revolution. He erred in common with Mackintosh, Price, and as great an orator as Robert Hall. He instituted a comparison between our Lord and Socrates, but did not prove himself a skilful Plutarch. Did a supernatural star lead wise men to the place at which the Athenian was born? Did the air become an orchestra filled with angels who touched melodious lutes? Did he hush the tempest that swept over the sea of Tiberias? Did he feed thousands of men, women, and children on the grassy slopes of Palestine? Did he restore a ruby bloom to the faded cheek, and strength to palsied limbs, and citron orchards to the eyes of the blind? And when dying,

did he receive nine-and-thirty stripes ere the scourge by which he was tortured dropped from the hand of Pilate? Or did he wear for us the crown of thorns and exclaim, "Eloi, Eloi," or bring night into the splendor of noon, and rend alike the rocks of Golgotha and the curtain of the temple which prefigured his incarnation? Though very learned, there are some objections to Horsley. He was overbearing in the House of Lords; he regarded the English people as ciphers, and the king as their integer; and when Sir Joseph Banks was made President of the Royal Society, the bishop forgot Michael, and railed at him without any forbearance. Sir Joseph may not have been very profound; but his love of botany took him round the world in search of useful plants and crimson flowers. He introduced the Spanish chestnut into Lincoln, the shire where his property lay, and this was something *pro bono publico*.

The work of the late Dr. Moore of Nashville, on Hosea, was sufficiently learned. Learning ought to be used for the detection and enforcement of all the piety taught in the Oracles of God. One of the great duties of the ministry is to search the Scriptures and evolve their hidden meaning. No publication undertaken with such a view will ever lessen ministerial influence; but the herald of the gospel must not publish the wine-songs of Herrick, the plays of Young, or the satires of Churchill, unless he deliberately wish to be shorn of his locks.

Some perhaps may think that the marriage of Hosea to Gomer was literal, instead of a prophetic vision. If literal, we pity the son of Beeri; for if a reality, she must have been a more depraved woman, if possible, than the Lydian Jezebel. And yet an advocate of prelacy contends that Jezebel was the wife of the angel of Thyatira. This is an argument to prove that angel is used not in a collective sense, but to designate an individual bishop. We are sorry for that bishop and his diocese; for his consort could not have been a helpmeet. Our prelatial friend never could have eaten such a bitter roll. He could as soon have swallowed the rod of Aaron. In the fourteenth chapter and sixth verse of the Apocalypse, the word angel is used to designate the flight of all the agents who were carrying the gospel

through the horizontal heaven, which Christianity had introduced. We must expect figurative language in an Oriental Bible. Idolatry may be represented by a fallen woman like Gomer of Diblaim, whilst in the twelfth of Revelation a pure Christianity is set forth by a woman clothed with the sun, and her temples adorned with apostolic stars. Gomer is an allegorical character, representing the degradation of idolatry and petitioning Baal for her bread, water, wool, flax, oil, silver, and gold. She had a son, whose allegorical name was Jezreel, because the valley bearing the same designation was the scene of a rabid idolatry—the residence of Jezebel—and where Jehu's dynasty was established for eight-and-twenty years. And she is represented in the vision as having a daughter. This indicates that the women of the Esdraelon valley were devoted to idols like the men. The men of Samaria probably paid divine honors to Ashima, and the sisters of Ruhamah to Astarte. What a pity that such a lovely vale as Jezreel should have been so morally disfigured! Grim idols stood among the beautiful works of God. There is Carmel, whose summits are laden with fragrant flowers, its declivities wrapt in verdure, and its base moistened by lucid brooks that hurry away to the Kishon. Its heights command noble hills, smiling corners, enchanting prospects, and blue mountains in the distance. In the twenty-third chapter of Ezekiel, two women allegorically represent idolatry as imported from Egypt, as they are thought to be of Egyptian origin. Aholah is Samaria, and Jerusalem is Aholibah. This pair of sisters had no personal existence; but they stood for idolaters, without being transubstantiated into Samaria and Jerusalem. In the fourth of Galatians, Paul the logician makes an allegory out of a bond and free woman. At the tenth verse of the twelfth chapter of Hosea, God thus speaks: "I have also spoken by the prophets, and I have multiplied visions, and used similitudes, by the ministry of the prophets."

It is generally thought that Joel lived in the reign of Uzziah, more than eight hundred years before the advent of our Lord. He was the son of Pethuel, but the incidents of his life are obscure. We wish that Josephus had given us the lives of the twelve Minor Prophets. Such a work would have been devoured

by both Jews and Gentiles. We would like to know more of their genealogies, tribes, haunts, and schools. Chatham would have joined us in this wish; for in addressing the House of Lords, he caught from these prophets his strong language, abrupt appeals, thundering declamation, and lightning gleams. No wonder he admired the style of Joel; for it is graphic, elevated, bold, and rich as the purple of Tyre. Like one of the hinds of Naphthali, it seems to roam in elegance. We cannot tell whether his locusts are spoken of in a literal sense or whether he uses them as descriptive of Chaldean or even Roman armies, for the eye of prophecy may have reached Rome before it was reared. In the days of Joel, the Tiber may have flowed in its sluggish current; marble palaces may not have been built, nor the hum of industry been heard on its banks, nor may armies have emerged from the gates of Rome for the conquest of the world. Grasshoppers have been destructive in our own times, and the worms of Joel did not bark up the wrong trees. The germs of the fig-tree were nipped; citron blossoms fell as if touched by polar snow; palms bowed their stately heads; vines lost their clusters; herds roared aloud for cisterns, and flocks in the drought rushed impetuously to exhausted brooks, but found nothing save a mirage. Such are divine judgments on idolaters. But if they create an Eden, and hungry insects pass its gates, that Eden may perish like the gourd of Jonah.

The style of Amos, though not so intensely glowing as Joel's, is still distinguished by uncommon vehemence. He seems to have executed his office in Samaria during the reign of the second Jeroboam; but the king being told of his denunciations, he returned to Tekoa, which lay to the south of Jerusalem. The town was on a height. In the prospect of an invasion, Jeremiah calls on the people to sound a trumpet at Tekoa; and from that elevation Amos probably surveyed the herds of which he was keeper. He threaded forests in search of sycamore trees, the fruit and wood of which were valuable in Palestine and Egypt. He was not the son of a prophet, but was called to that office; and faithful was he to the distinguished vocation. His menaces extend from Damascus to Edom, and his threatened fires involve the palaces of Ben-hadad, Gaza, Tyre,

Bozrah, Rabbah, Kirioth, and Jerusalem. He would have torn the horns from each unhallowed altar, and drowned the calves of Bethel and Dan in the Sea of Salt. Seek him, he would have said, who maketh the seven stars and Orion ; for canst thou bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades, and turn back the tide of vernal fragrance, and crush the violets of spring, or extinguish the brightness of a constellation which God gave to our southern hemisphere ? The herdsman of Tekoa not only cast his eye on Syrian plains, the hills of Bashan, the deserts of Judah, but on stars that wind on empty space, and constellations whose distance shades their overwhelming radiance. The divine works are great. Were Abdiel to ply his wings for a hundred centuries, could his staff measure the breadth of worlds, or his plummet sound the depth of seas ? Could he roll up the blue canopies unrolled from an infinite mind, or cast off his sandals at the fountains of boundless power ? No.

Jonah was of the tribe of Zebulun, of which Jacob said, He shall dwell by the sea, and be a haven for ships. From the fourteenth of Second Kings and twenty-fifth verse, he was the son of a prophet, who lived in Gath-hepher, not far from Tiberias. He seems to have been timid, of a gloomy temperament, and somewhat fretful ; but the Lord condescended to his infirmities. He was sent to Nineveh, but like a careless soldier, he disobeyed his orders. We find him at Joppa, a remarkable place, though a rabbit might leap across its narrow streets. Its sea views have invited the pencil of the artist ; knights spurred their steeds over the adjacent plain of Sharon during the crusades ; and in 1799 twelve hundred Turks were shot to death by order of Napoleon. And there Peter, the first Pope, once lodged with one Simon, a tanner, before his temples felt the triple crown of the Vatican. Jonah found a ship at Joppa, fully equipped for Tarshish, and instead of going to the Tigris, he tried to reach the Guadalquiver in Spain. He did not covet the Spanish metals, but wanted to evade the command. The prophet intimates that he had gone out from the presence of the Lord ; but this was impossible. He must have meant that he had escaped from where the Shekinah was often visible, and be-

fore which Abraham knelt when interceding for the cities in the vale of Siddim. A great tempest arose, and the prophetic sinner was detected. The mariners acted with all the nobleness characteristic of the class to which they belonged. They were naturally fearful of being wrecked, and who is not, of Adam's shuddering race? Paul would not have fancied being on board the *Pulaski*, the *Arctic*, the *Cospatrick*, the *Japan*, or the *Rose in Bloom*. Nor would Falconer, who sung the shipwreck. The prophet was willing to encounter the billows of the sea, like his great Antitype, who, after lots were cast on his vesture, exclaimed, *Lama sabachthani!* Yes, the seer of Gath-hepher was a willing victim, who, from the depths of his sufferings, threw the arms of his faith and the beautiful wreaths of his love round the circumference of the divine will. He said to the waiting fish, Receive a timid prophet; and after three days and nights, the angel of the covenant said to the winds and waves, Be still, and there was a great calm. And after one of the sublimest prayers ever uttered, the marine monster turned his head to the dry land on which the feet of the prophet stood, whose second commission was executed with results universally known. The herald preached a short sermon; the King of Assyria was alarmed: idolaters wrapped themselves in sackcloth of hair; Nineveh became like Hadadrimmon; the ruin of the city postponed; the prophet displeased; a worm smote his gourd; a curtain is drawn on the messenger, who probably found a grave at Gath-hepher.

Micah the Morasthite, so called from a town in the west of Judah. Whose son he was, we know not; for many of the Jewish registers have perished. Certain it is that he was not Micah, who, in the time of the Judges, set up his idols, but the Danites deprived him of his image and his Levites; for the prophet of whom we write was the foe of dumb idols. He denounces woes on Samaria and Jerusalem, but a mellow tenderness seems to pervade his comminations. "What is the transgression of Jacob? Is it not Samaria? What are the high places of Judah? Are they not Jerusalem? Shall images be seen on the summit of Zion? Therefore will I wail like the dragons,

and mourn like the owls; or like a sorrowing dove, wander off to the desert, and find my God." He exults in the advent of our Lord. "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. And he shall be great to the ends of the earth." Our Lord was the invincible enemy of idols, for he told the woman of Samaria, God is a Spirit, and they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. Ye Samaritans know not what ye worship. We know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews. Your Ebal and Gerizim, where idols were denounced, testify against you. Have you forgotten the day when curses passed from mountain to mountain in awful and alternate responses? He revered the temple, he scourged the money-changers beyond its limits, and he spake of the temple of his body because divinity resided in that noble structure. So in his body; it was a place for sacrifice; and so in the decease of his body, he finished his atonement on the high day of expiation. In the temple was the mercy-seat, which prefigured his entrance into holy places not made with hands, as our great High Priest. He was made under the law, and went on no foreign mission; but he sent his twelve apostles to the Gentiles, whilst Paul became one outside of the twelve. He was one *sui generis*. Though of the tribe of Benjamin, he did not seek after spoil. His own hands ministered to his necessities. *Particeps criminis* in the martyrdom of Stephen, yet, after his conversion, a peaceful, spiritual hero among the nations he invaded.

We know but little of Nahum. He reports himself as of Elkosh, supposed to have been situated in Galilee. If a Galilean, there is no occasion to reflect on his speech, for his style is the most vivid of all the Minor Prophets. His prophecy, though brief, is a furnace of fire. He portrays the mingled goodness and severity of God. He calls on Judah to keep her solemn feasts; and yet clouds, wearing the rich hues of the sun, are but the dust of Jehovah's feet. Bashan, Carmel, Lebanon are withered, and populous No devoured. "The chariots shall rage in the streets of Nineveh; they shall jostle one against another in

the broad ways; they shall seem like torches, and run like the lightnings. And Huzzab shall be led away captive, and her maids shall lead her as with the voice of doves, tabering on their breasts.' But we need not quote where every sentence is sublime.

In the arrangement of our Bibles, Habakkuk and Zephaniah are next in order among the Minor Prophets. In the former we have the Chaldean invasion, and concluded with one of the grandest odes ever penned by man. Though the flocks had been cut off from their folds and the herds from their stalls his confidence in God was unshaken. The just shall live by faith. Mont Blanc cannot be overthrown by the application of a needle; nor can the vicissitudes of life or the desolations of war disperse the joys of the Christian, or turn the songs of the heart into the cries of the bittern, or the lamentations of the pensive doves. His dependence is in Him who made Arcturus and his sons, and who forgets not the tables of the needy in the circuits of his goodness. Zephaniah was of the tribe of Simeon, whose territory bordered on Judah. He is supposed to have prophesied in the reign of Josiah, and six hundred and thirty years before the coming of our Lord. His prediction concerning the fall of Nineveh, contained in his second chapter, met with a signal fulfilment.

Haggai abounds with brief but animated appeals for the rebuilding of the Temple in the reign of Darius Hystaspes. And Zechariah is employed on the same blessed mission. The latter, though probably a young man at the time, appears to have been zealous, faithful, and devoted. He was taught in visions. The builders were surrounded at the time by enemies who could not understand the symbols—the reason possibly why such mystical language was employed. Under the explanations given to the prophet, the meaning of these symbols is perfectly obvious. The attentive student can easily solve the mystery. Zechariah is clear in his predictions of the Branch or rod from the stem of Jesse; and that Shepherd who was wounded in the house of his friends. He came to his own, but they received him not. And Malachi, the last of the Minor Prophets, foresees the advent of the Messiah; and in the fulness of the time, he made his appearance.

This slight sketch has been drawn that it may be filled out with some practical truths. It is a truth, then, that our Creator abhors all idolatry, and even the most distant approaches to such sacrilege. Any act of the kind turns a Beth-el into a Beth-aven, or a house of God into a house of sin. God is possessed of infinite attributes, and man may worship in each and all of those perfections, but must not carry into those august temples any images created by his fancy. This is forbidden in the Decalogue. The divine indignation would rend your image and toss the fragments into that fire which all the oceans of earth can never quench. In reading the Old Testament, we find that the pens of inspiration are employed in protests against the hideous sin of idolatry. There was some improvement in this respect after the introduction of the synagogues, because in them the law of Moses was read on each Sabbath-day. From Genesis to Malachi, the war was incessant against deities in high, conspicuous places, and in cedar, elm, and poplar groves. Abraham reared his altar to the only true God; and Jacob buried all the strange gods of his household under the oak of Shechem. Moses was justly incensed at the calf of Aaron, though gold entered into its composition. Even the wise Solomon became an idolater. The worship of the one living God pervades every part of the Old Testament and the New; for the Apostles were uncompromising among the mythologists of Greece, and in the temples of Diana the huntress. Far be it from the writer to doubt that tens of thousands of pious Jews escaped the plague of idolatry. Indeed, our Saviour said, *Ye believe in God. When children, you learned this belief; but add to this faith belief in him who came out from God.* The Minor Prophets were all true to the Decalogue. A few citations will establish the fact. Israel and Samaria are not only reprov'd by allegory, but by awful threats of punishment, and judgments creating general desolations. "Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone." Gibeah was punished for its sins, which led nearly to the extermination of the tribe to which its people belonged. "In a morning shall the king of Israel be cut off." I gave you silver and gold, but they were carried to the service of Baal. "Out of the house of thy gods will I cut off the graven image and the molten

image." Ephraim shall say, "What have I to do any more with idols? Who is wise, and he shall understand these things." But passages need not be multiplied, for this would be to transcribe a great part of the Old Testament. Prophets, great and small, are equally hostile to idols, and jealous for the exclusive worship of Jehovah. King Josiah burnt the bones of the priests on the very altars at which they had served. Hezekiah, in scorn, called the brazen serpent Nehushtan, when it became an object of adoration. God will not acquit the wicked without repentance on the part of the guilty, and therefore we find Jews in Babylon suspending their harps on its weeping willows, and Israel marching in trains to the feet of Shalmanezzer, laden with the spoils and products of Samaria. The ten tribes seem hidden from recognition, and Judah and Benjamin dispersed like chaff over the world. In defiance of prophetic thunders, the dominant party in an apostate Church fell into the sin of idolatry. His change was gradual. The constitution of the Church was in the revealed will of God. That was the very constitution to which Wickliffe, Huss, and Luther appealed. And should our country be covered over with satraps, kings, emperors, cardinals, and popes, we would still dig up the elementary principles of our government, and read them among the dismembered pillars and rent wreaths of our capitol. The Papists need not quarrel with us about their amulets, beads, teraphim, pictures, and sundry other things too numerous to be mentioned in this schedule. The feud commenced in their own synagogue. Greek emperors, Reformers, and Dissenters figured in the combats which shook Rome as with an earthquake. Paulicians, Albigenses, Waldenses, Bohemians, Huguenots protested, until the apparel of the so-called Church dripped far and wide with the blood of the saints. What a heavy weight! Superstition persevering in its progressiveness led all Europe into the night of the dark ages. Papists must quarrel with all the sects to which their innovations gave rise. Nestorius was one of them; but the stronger party hunted him to his death, and the truth for which he bore witness could not restrain the fury of the hounds. The Pope can always find persecutors. He resembles the Prince of Tyre, who said, I am a god, and sit in the seat of

God in the midst of the seas; and yet Ezekiel would say, even to our present infallibility, Thou art a man and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God. The omniscient Judge can find out these popes, whether they dwell at Samaria in the corner of a bed, or at Damascus on a couch. And many of them have received the due reward of their deeds.

There are religionists anxious to effect a divorce between the Old and New Testament; but what God hath joined, let not man put asunder. Nor is this desire confined to the ignorant. When Hannah More, in a letter to Walpole of Strawberry Hill, hinted at the sanctity of the Sabbath, his reply was, that the Sabbath was made for semi-barbarous Jews. Semi-barbarians! Could he have reached the grandeur of Hebrew poetry? Had he forgotten that Moses and Samuel have helped the jurisprudence of the world; that the Pentateuch suggested "Paradise Lost;" that Isaiah has inspired many bards; and that the pencils of Flemish, Italian, and American artists have left their colors among the historical incidents of the Bible? Orators have drawn vehemence from the Minor Prophets; the book of Ecclesiastes taught Johnson the vanity of human wishes; Franklin derived his caution and economy from the Proverbs; and George Buchanan, the materials of his tragedies from the record of Jewish kings. We do not think that Walpole could have reared the tabernacle of the wilderness, and much less the temple on Moriah. Solomon and the Hiram of Tyre had quite as much sense as the antiquary of Twickenham—a good deal more, we suspect. But, strange to say, Milton seems to think, in his work on theology, that the Sabbath was to cease at the ending of Judaism. It was instituted, however, before Judaism began to exist, and it was blessed by the Creator, who ceased to work on the seventh day. And this is the reason for its observance given in the Decalogue among thunderings which we can never roll away, and lightnings which we can never quench. Ours is not a Church of nine commandments. If we can abrogate one, why not all? What sort of a world would this be, if the other nine were revoked? We should see thousands of petty gods, instead of Jehovah, his name impiously used, parents dishonored, a plenty of homicides,

thieves, false witnesses, and of those who covet the books, spoons, and ambrotypes belonging to other people. But the change from the seventh to the first day of the week. From its very institution Judaism was to terminate in Christianity. The seventh of the week had been its memorial day for fifteen centuries; but upon the introduction of a nobler system, it was thought that the resurrection of its Founder ought to be commemorated. Accordingly, in the year of our Lord, ninety-six, the Apostle John, being under the teaching of the Spirit, speaks of the Lord's Day. Expiation for sin is the cardinal doctrine of the New Testament; but the resurrection of the High Priest, by whom the atonement was made, is its cardinal fact. Milton seeks to evade this statement of the Apostle. He thinks it alludes to some Christian festival different from the Sabbath. But the New Testament Christians were famous for neither fasts nor festivals. The supposition is truly violent, that the lonely prisoner of an emperor on a barren island was celebrating a feast, when reading the programme of the Church spread out before him by the Spirit. There is another class of religionists, who tenaciously cling even to rites and ceremonies of the Old Testament which have fallen into the yellow leaf. Churches that designate their ministers as priests, are Jews rather than Christians, and Romanists rather than Protestants. Many find some hidden charm in a priest. The Papists all rallied for Becket against their king, the second Henry. The Minor Prophets, however, were men of a different type. They saw no sanctity in a priest, unless his moral character corresponded to all the purity which the office required. They never could have smiled on the Vatican, or on ultramontane palaces. They denounce all priests who eat up the sin offerings of the people, and false prophets who wear rough garments to deceive. They never hesitate for a moment to place such men under divine malediction. We ask the reader to search the Minor Prophets. They can easily ascertain whether this statement is true. In the fourth and fifth centuries, the priests of Judaism reappeared in Rome, and ever since their flocks have been visible in Europe. Even Papal bishops are coming to our colored friends in the South. In 1620, our Fathers on James River took

the strangers in and made three or four millions of them sound Protestants. Had they been rejected and carried to the West Indies, they would have become Papists; but many of them at present can easily outreason priests:

The Minor Prophets were faithful servants for Him by whom they were commissioned. They flatter neither the kings of Judah, the judges of Samaria, nor the merchants of Tyre. Sent to Israel and Judah by the King of kings, they regarded not crowns unless in the way of reverence for those by whom they were justly worn. They did not pretend to civil government, nor usurp dominions. They were not popes to receive territory from Pepins, Charlemagnes, Matildas, and Lombard kings. Their office was to exhort to righteousness, that rulers and ruled might alike forbear to sin against the commandments of the universal Ruler of heaven and earth. They were not afraid of any king either in or out of Palestine. Says Amos, "He will cut off the judges of Moab, and slay its princes." Yes; there were judges in the days of the Minor Prophets, like Bacon and Jeffries, who asked for bribes and rewards; who turned judgment into gall, and the fruit of righteousness into hemlock. A corrupt judge is but the worm-wood star of the Apocalypse, falling from his exalted sphere, and men die among waters embittered by his sin. Are there any such in our land? If so, we hand them over to history; but what is that tribunal compared with the bar of the Omniscient? When party spirit ascends to the zenith of a government, a sense of human rights sinks to an invisible point. It was not so in the origin of our government, when Jay, Ellsworth, Rutledge, and Marshall, went their circuits, like four Hebrew Samuels; and inferior judges took their cue from the ermine of that bench. We quote Zephaniah, when he speaks of Jerusalem: "Her princes are roaring lions; her judges are evening wolves; they gnaw not the bones till the morrow. Her prophets are light and treacherous persons; her priests have polluted the sanctuary, they have done violence to the law." Could any description be more gorgeous than the one given of Tyre in the twenty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel? That city had multiplied its merchants like the stars of heaven. Wealth had engendered every species of sin, and

the idolatry of Phenicia had corrupted the ten tribes of Israel. Grim idols appeared where patriarchs had sojourned, and where Joseph was buried; and their shrines were reared where Elijah supposed that every knee had bowed to the image of Baal. The Minor Prophets announce the fall of Tyre. It has been plundered by Greeks, Romans, and Turks. The nets of fishermen have succeeded the coat of many colors, in which it was once proudly dressed by the hand of commerce. Merchants who live in large cities have often applied their wealth to useful purposes, and accomplished great good. They have built churches, founded hospitals, reared asylums, provided homes for destitute widows and helpless orphans, opened schools, collected public libraries, endowed colleges, started young men in business, encouraged artists, and embellished cemeteries. Some of our own countrymen have led the way in such acts of munificence. But men of kindred pursuits often differ. There are merchants devoid of all noble aims and generous deeds, whose coffers are never sufficiently full to satiate their avarice, who give nothing even when famine stalks abroad, who manipulate money into a deity. When they die, no abject children of want will ever stand like so many weeping willows round about their graves. And such, we fear, was the character of the Tyrian merchants denounced by the prophets.

The Minor Prophets were inspired. They preached and wrote by an external impulse. No prophecy of the Scripture was of any private utterance. What they spoke was given to them from the Spirit on high. Communications might have been made through the Shekinah. God talked with Aaron by and through the Urim and Thummim. Such instructions were given in the Holy of Holies; but it is probable that the Shekinah went abroad into various parts of Palestine. Possibly it might have been visible at times from Dan to Beersheba, as it was to Abraham in the vale of Hebron. When it is said that God went up from communing with the patriarch, it surely means the rising and withdrawal of some symbol of the Divine Presence. He had heard all that God designed to say at that special time. It is difficult to define the Shekinah, and more so to define the Urim and Thummim. Perhaps both modes of communication were

purposely involved in mystery ; for it is a solemn thing for an all-holy God to speak with apostate men. And he did talk with his servants, whether they were patriarchs, prophets or apostles ; or whether they were kings, princes, shepherds, goat herds, publicans, or tent-makers. Some of them give the month and day, and if they had pleased could have named the exact hour and even minute on which they received the message which they were to deliver, and the truth they were to unfold, and the commands they were to proclaim. The Infinite Mind operated on their minds in the way of superintendence against error, and of elevation into subjects beyond our mental vision. Gas may enlighten our rooms, and its brilliancy may cheer our nights and gild our homes. But this is mere natural light. Revealed light must come from a source transcending the materiality of aeriform fluids. But the inspiration of the Bible has been ably defended, and the book is only endeared to us by assaults on that inspiration. Such assailants forget that the Bible carries along with it internal as well as external proofs of its veracity. The more we read it, the higher does it rise in our estimation. We ascend into a kind of pleiocene period in which we find the pearl of great price. The volume is remarkable for the purity of its style, its unity of purpose, though prepared in different ages, for the minuteness of its details, and the accuracy of its geographical, topographical, and ceremonial statements. It is not a mirage deceiving caravans of men, by whom it is approached in their march through the wilderness of earthly disappointment. 'Tis like that district in Persia, not far from Shiraz, remarkable for the production of every kind of fruit known among men. Its fruits are moral and spiritual. We know that Rationalists concede that the Minor Prophets were indeed inspired ; but so were Galileo, Copernicus, Kepler, Newton, and Columbus. But there is an inspiration of Providence totally distinct from that which created our glorious Bible. If God created the world, we suppose he suggested the discovery of our continent, and endowed Columbus with the qualities requisite to so great an achievement. To Him be the glory, and to the Genoese as his agent. And so of the philosophers. They speak of themselves as interpreters

of the divine works; but God is his own interpreter, using them as his instruments. But for the help which he supplies to human faculties, Sir Isaac Newton might have been no more than a wild man caught in some German forest. Linnæus was led on step by step to classify the plants which a divine hand has dispersed over the world, and he recognised his leader; for coming suddenly on a bed of English flowers, he fell down on his knees in adoration of the Great Supreme. No Christian denies that God influences the minds of men. We could not be Christians without divine teaching, for who teacheth like one of Infinite Wisdom? He makes ready the niche which each of our philosophers is to fill. He whispers the laws of nature to the students of philosophy. In the times of Chaucer, English literature was an azoic, and its growth has been promoted by a series of simple incidents, subject to divine direction, until England and our own land have become rich in its diamonds and rife in its flowers. But we should like to see our great men attempt the formation of a Bible. Their inspiration, we think, would be incompetent to the task. A queer book it would be. Would it give a record of stupendous miracles which evince that the laws of nature have owned their Author and Master? Would it portray the destiny of nations, and utter prophecies to be literally fulfilled in after ages? Would it foretell the fall of empires, the rise anti-Christ, the Papal dynasty, the ruin of cities, the solitude of Babylon, the mounds of Nineveh, the destruction of temples, the pulling down of brazen gates, the stripping of Tyre, the advent of the Messiah, his crucifixion, the captivity of the ten tribes, and the dispersion of Judah and Benjamin to the ends of the earth? No, it would not attempt prediction. The memory of man can look on our own lives, and through the lens of history we can muse on ten thousand things which have taken place in distant lands; but futurity contains secrets which we cannot decipher. God has been pleased to fix before that futurity the frontispiece of his flaming sword which none have ever passed, save his own chosen prophets. Among them were the Minor Prophets of whom we write. And now Layard, Botta, Rawlinson, *cum multis aliis*, are throwing light on their predictions, and thousands are following the ex-

plorations of Palestine with interest the most intense. Chambers of images have been opened, halls of record searched, treaties found, walls examined, mural tablets deciphered, idols disinterred, steeds with their gorgeous trappings and vermilion riders, and trains of mourning captives awaiting their destiny, all evincing that prophetic pencils were filled with the hues of descriptive truth.

With Malachi the canon of the Old Testament is brought to a close. Ezra was a ready scribe in the law of the Lord, and it is probable that we are indebted to him for the revision and arrangement of these sacred books. The Jews hold him in peculiar reverence. He was one among the many inspired writers, and a good judge of works claiming the same inspiration which he possessed. The Apocryphal books were never admitted into the Jewish canon. They are self-condemned by their own absurdities and puerilities. At one time they were published by the British Bible Society, as part of the Old Testament; but its managers found in the Rev. Andrew Thompson, of Edinburgh, a foeman worthy of their steel. Nor did his Scotch trumpet sound an alarm in vain. Papists and Tractarians could not stand before such an adversary. His logic is irresistible. If there be history in the ten Apocryphal books, the history should be published apart from our Bible. The two cannot walk together except they be agreed. But the Minor Prophets harmonise with all that God has revealed. As they approach nearer to the advent of our Lord, they seem to have been favored with views of that Spirit under whose agency they wrote. Joel predicts a large effusion of that Spirit who, in Genesis, moved on the face of the waters, and in the close of Revelation says, Come to the provisions of the gospel. Says Micah, "Truly I am full of power by the Spirit of the Lord." "Is the Spirit of the Lord straitened?" "Not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts. Who art thou, O great mountain? Before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain: and he shall bring forth the headstone thereof with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it." This Spirit seems to have favored the schools of the prophets among the Jews with his habitual presence. May his influence be felt always, and never extinguished in our

Theological Seminaries. In the study of the Bible, may they seek interpretations from him by whom it was inspired. They have ever been the most successful heralds of the cross who dwell most on the work and offices of that Divine Agent. With such ministers, God will ever find out a people for himself, where there are not a people. They will seek the huts of poverty, corners of obscurity, and the dens of wickedness. They would be faithful among the willows of Babylon, or in a captivity like that of Chebar. In periods dark as that through which the Minor Prophets passed, God has ever had a people. "Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another; and the Lord hearkened, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them who thought upon his name." Many chapters of pious conversation were enrolled in that complicated volume. Should our own beloved Church ever fall into degeneracy, we need not fear. Men will be reared up to keep alive the coal of piety on its altars, and vindicate the truths it has nobly defended. There is but one Church, which consists of the penitent, believing, and obedient throughout the world. You may collect together all the individuals who have ever been photographed from the natural sun, and many of them are still the children of fashion, levity, and Ritualism; but call into one vast assembly the countless throngs who have been photographed from the Sun of righteousness, who rose with healing in his wings, and we will show the Church of God, for they are a people wearing the moral image of the great Hebrew Luminary. May that Exalted Luminary soon enlighten all nations, that the earth may begin its regenerated pilgrimage foretold both by the greater and lesser prophets! Then shall Rome and Constantinople cast their idols to the moles, and the last Jewish foot turn away from its wandering, and enter a reëmbellished Palestine, where the long disowned Messiah will feed his heritage in Bashan and Gilead as in the days of old. All this and far more may we believe, without being ranked among the Millenarians, whose creed in some particulars borders on the fanciful.

ARTICLE IV.

THE NUMERICAL FIGURES OF THE BIBLE.

There were those in the early days of Christianity, who saw a type in every historic event recorded in the Scriptures, a figure in every precept, and a hidden meaning in every doctrine. The extravagances of these led plain, sober Christians to a more literal interpretation of the word of God, in its straitest and strictest significance.

There may be an extravagance of caution as well as an extravagance of presumption. The historic books of the Bible, if they have no typical import, would be no more instructive than profane history, except that they tell of God's dealings with his people. The ceremonies of the Mosaic economy would have no higher import than the ceremonies of Buddha and Confucius, if they did not all point to the new and better dispensation of the gospel.

But we need not reason about the right to seek for a mystic meaning in the historic or doctrinal parts of the Bible. The practice of Paul is sanction enough. We want nothing more. We read in Genesis of Hagar, the handmaid of Sarah. The narrative is simple; no typical truth seems to be wrapped up in it; but Paul tells us that this Hagar is Mount Sinai—the type of the law, with its bondage and death. We read how Moses struck the rock in the wilderness, and how the water gushed forth into a stream, which followed the pilgrims in their weary wanderings. It is a historic fact, recorded as part of the history of the Israelites. We read it as such, and infer nothing more from it than the power and protecting care of Israel's God. But Paul tells us that this rock was Christ, following his people in the wilderness of life with his refreshing and purifying presence. We read a description of the veil of the tabernacle, and learn that it was a curtain suspended between the holy place and the Holy of Holies. Our knowledge goes no further, then, than this, that it shut out the mysteries of the inner sanctuary from the vulgar

and profane gaze. But Paul tells us that this veil was Christ's flesh, which was rent to open up direct access to the invisible God. In short, what is the whole scope of the book of Hebrews? Is it not an elaborate argument on the part of the great apostle to prove that the whole ceremonial law of the Jews was but a foreshadowing of the higher and nobler dispensation of the gospel of grace?

Having the sanction of the preaching and teaching of Paul, we feel that we are guilty of neither presumption nor extravagance in calling the attention of our readers to the significance of the numerical figures employed in the Sacred Scriptures. Reject all that may appear vague in our speculations, and pass by all that may seem wild and unsupported by reason and truth. The theories of a poor worm of the dust are fallible even in earthly matters. They are to be received with great caution, when they relate to Him whose throne is encompassed with clouds and darkness.

We believe that theologians agree as to the meaning of the four numbers, three, four, seven, and twelve. Three is the symbol of the Trinity, and in some sort is recognised as the symbol of deity among many heathen nations—the triad or demon-worship of the Greeks, the three-faced Vishnu of the Hindoos, the triangular pyramid of the Egyptians, etc. A trace of this we see in the mystic symbol of the triangle in all languages and among all people.

Four is the type-number for the world and worldly matters. Seven, which is three plus four, represents God in a Sabbatic or church relation with the earth. Every seventh day was the Sabbath; every seventh year was a Sabbatic year, in which no work could be done. Twelve, which is three multiplied by four, represents God in a political or governmental relation with the world, as its Sovereign.

Now, if we keep the signification of these four numbers in view, viz., three, four, seven, and twelve, we can see through a glass darkly the import of other numbers. Their full meaning we will not know till faith is lost in sight. As an illustration, we refer to the scene by the lake of Tiberias, when our risen Lord

ordered the disciples to cast in the net again, and they drew it to shore full of great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three. We shall surely feel a higher interest in the number when we observe that it is 12 times 12 added to 3 times 3. The glorious Second Person of the adorable Trinity duplicates the theocratic political symbol and adds it to the duplicate of the symbol of Godhead, in the food which he provides for his disciples. Have we not here the double assurance given that God will so rule the world that his own people shall be fed? "I have been young and now am old, yet have I never seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." May we not believe that the disciples understood the type-number, and that, therefore, John has recorded it so carefully?

All the numbers in the range of arithmetic above seven are made up either of multiples of three, multiples of four, or the sums of their multiples. Thus, $8=2 \times 4$; $9=3 \times 3$; $10=2 \times 3 + 4$; $11=2 \times 4 + 3$; $12=3 \times 4$; $13=3 \times 3 + 4$; $14=2 \times 3 + 2 \times 4$; $15=5 \times 3$; $16=4 \times 4$; $17=3 \times 3 + 2 \times 4$; $18=6 \times 3$; $19=5 \times 3 + 4$; $20=5 \times 4$, etc.

When you see a number in the Bible, resolve it into its elements, and you may get a glimpse of a great truth hitherto hidden from your gaze.

We shall confine ourselves to the consideration of the number three, and shall attempt to show, *first*, that the three Persons of the Trinity worked on alternate days in the creation of the world; *secondly*, that there are but three tempters to sin and but three classes of sin, and that each sin is specifically directed against some one Person of the glorious Trinity; *thirdly*, that piety consists of three Christian graces, each of which does special honor to a particular Person of the Godhead; *fourthly*, that the number three ran through the whole Mosaic ceremony, and occurs everywhere in the new, and that its type meaning is always the same.

First, the creation. We read that on the first day God said, "Let there be light, and there was light." There can be no doubt that this was the work of God the Father. The apostle James says that "He is the Father of lights, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." "The Lord God

is a sun and shield." "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all."

On the second day the firmament was created, by which we understand the material universe, the framework of the worlds. Here we clearly have the work of the Son. "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." On the third day, vegetation sprang up, the life-principle was first manifested. Here we can have no difficulty. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth;" *i. e.*, that giveth life. Vegetable as well as animal life is the breath of the Spirit of God.

On the fourth day, the sun, moon, and stars were created. Here we have, again, the office of the Father of lights. The geological difficulty, the difficulty in reconciling science with the Scriptures, the difficulty in the explanation of the work on the fifth and sixth days, we cannot remove; but if the solution ever come, it must come through the recognition of the doctrine of the glorious Trinity.

Secondly. We can conceive of but three tempters to sin, the world, the flesh, and the devil; and these three tempters induce to three forms of sin, the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life; and we suppose that each tempter induces to his peculiar and appropriate sin in the order named. Pride is universally regarded as the sin by which the devil and his angels fell; and we regard this as a trace left in the human mind of a truth once taught. The sequences of the other two temptations are obvious, and need no explanation.

The three temptations were all addressed to Eve at once, and by the great tempter in person. She saw that "the tree was good for food, pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise." Here we see the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, all three appealing to our frail mother at once through the one suggestion of the archfiend. Jeremy Taylor gives us certain tests by which we can discriminate between a temptation suggested by the flesh, and one suggested by the devil. But we imagine that the evil one always brings in the other two agencies of the world and the flesh. So it has been regarded for ages in the English law, where criminal

indictments set forth that the felon was moved and instigated by the devil. We find accordingly, that the devil employed all three agencies in his temptation of our blessed Redeemer. He tempted his flesh by urging him, when hungry, to turn the stones into bread. He tempted him with the world, by offering him all its kingdoms. He tempted him with pride, by urging him to make a vain display of the ministry of angels attending and guarding him, should he throw himself from the pinnacle of the temple. Still, we suppose it to be true that the pride of life is the peculiar and darling temptation of Satan.

It may seem an extravagant hypothesis that each of the three classes of sin is specifically directed against a particular Person of the Trinity. But our Saviour himself tells us that there is one heinous, deadly sin which is against the Holy Ghost, and which has never forgiveness in this life, nor in the life to come. So Peter said to Ananias, "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?" It is plain, then, that certain sins are peculiarly heinous to the Holy Ghost, such as blasphemy, lying, etc.

As our Redeemer came in the flesh and suffered in the flesh to mortify the deeds of the flesh, we suppose that material, bodily sins are peculiarly odious to Him, such as gluttony, drunkenness, sensuality, theft, murder, violence, etc., etc. Mental emotions arising from worldly temptations, we suppose peculiarly offensive to the Father, such as covetousness, ambition, frivolity, worldly conformity, etc. Satan is called the Prince of the power of the air; and the word air, as all know, being the same as that which expresses spirit, we have supposed that there was a peculiar antagonism between the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Darkness. So it seems to us that what may be called breath sins, (since breath and spirit are expressed by the same word,) cursing, lying, idle talk, obscene language, etc., are in some sense sins against the Spirit. Paul, with his classic taste, compares the body to a temple—the temple of the Holy Ghost; and as the utterances of the Oracle were from the Temple, so he exhorts that the temples of our bodies may be pure so that the utterances from them—our daily speech and conversation—may be pure and seemly.

Our classification, then, places positive transgressions under these three heads of mental sins, bodily sins of a material character, and breath sins. But, *thirdly*, Paul resolves vital piety into the three graces—faith, hope, and charity. Jesus is the end of faith, as he is called the author and finisher of faith. We suppose that each of the other two graces has its special object. Hope seems to belong to the Father, and charity to the Spirit. We have also three stages in the Christian life. He has first to be justified, that is, acquitted as a criminal in the sight of a holy God. He is next taken up and admitted into the family of the sons of God. This second phase of the Christian life is called adoption. The Spirit of God now takes up the newly adopted one and fits him more and more every day for the blessed society into which he has been admitted. His love of sin is more and more subdued, and his longings after holiness become stronger and stronger. This process is called sanctification, and will continue unto the end of life.

The Lord's Prayer taught by our Saviour seems to recognise the principles we have been unfolding. It is a triad in every aspect in which you can regard it. It is divided into three parts. 1st. What relates to God. 2d. What relates to man. 3d. Doxology. Each of these three parts is again threefold. Thus, in the first division, we pray that God the Father's name may be hallowed; 2d, that Christ's kingdom may come; 3d, that the Spirit's will may be done. In the second division, we pray for three things: 1st, our daily food; 2d, forgiveness of sins; 3d, for protection against temptation. The doxology is triform, ascribing kingdom, power, and glory to the adorable Trinity, the three Persons and one God in that awful and mysterious union in the Godhead.

Now, we suppose that no rational man, who is not an infidel, will believe that our Saviour accidentally arranged this prayer in a triple form with a triplet in each. Such a hypothesis is too wild for any intelligent human being to make. We are shut up to the conclusion that there is a glorious significance in the arrangement of this holy and blessed prayer.

Fourthly. We come now to the last division of our subject, the

occurrence of the number three in the Mosaic economy and Christian dispensation.

There were three great feasts of the Jews. "Thrice in the year shall all your men children appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel." Exod. xxxiv. 23. The blessing of Aaron pronounced on the children of Israel was threefold, Num. vi. 24-26, corresponding to that used in our churches, which was given us by Paul, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. The Old Testament was divided into three sections—Law, Prophets, and Psalms; or historic, prophetic, and devotional. When Peter suggested, on the Mount of Transfiguration, the making of three tabernacles, he had this in view. Moses stood as the representative of the law, and Elijah, of the prophets. Trench says that Peter was not *demens* but *amens*: not out of his head, but in a state of ecstatic inspiration. The New Testament has a similar division into Gospels, Epistles, and Apocalypse—historic, doctrinal, and prophetic. The sacrifices of the Jews were threefold—animal, vegetable, and liquid. The animal sacrifices were subdivided into whole burnt offering, trespass offering, and peace offering. The tribe of Levi had its three classes of high priest, priests, and Levites. The last was subdivided into three families—Kohathites, Gershonites, Merarites. The high priest was distinguished by his mitre, his breastplate, and his girdle. On the Sabbath-day, there were three kinds of offering—lambs, flour with oil, and the drink-offering. Num. xxviii. 9, 10.

All the Jewish rites can be divided into festivals, sacrifices, and purifications. The first was an acknowledgment for temporal mercies received, the second pointed to the great Sacrifice on Calvary, and the third was typical of the cleansing and purifying influences of the Spirit.

The most instructive lesson of all was the tabernacle. Here glorious truths were taught by visible signs. It was divided, as all know, into three parts—the outer court, the holy place, and the most holy place. Into the first, the people could enter freely; the second, which was separated from it by a curtain, could only be entered by the priests; and the third, separated from the second by the veil, excluded all save the high priest, and he had

access but once a year. In the holy place was, 1st, the golden candlestick with its seven branches, each containing a lamp—the whole typical of the Father of lights; 2d, the table of shew-bread, with its twelve loaves, typical of the bread that came down from heaven; 3d, the altar of incense, emblematic of the Spirit inditing, perfuming, and presenting the prayers of the saints. The position and the arrangement of these three types of the Trinity were also full of meaning. On lifting the outer curtain, the visitor first encountered the candlestick—symbol of knowledge as well as symbol of the Father. He was thus taught that knowledge must precede religious experience. “He that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” Heb. vi. 11. The candlestick was pregnant with meaning. There were three branches on each side of a centre piece rising above the branches, and a lamp or bowl at the end of each branch and of the centre piece, making thus seven lights in all. The shape of the whole was that of the cross. The duplication of a number intensifies its meaning. Here we have the duplication of the sacred number, three, uniting in the cross and forming the sacred number seven.

The divine ingenuity seemed to exhaust itself (we speak it with reverence) in throwing sacredness around the cross. It flashes with light—the symbol of Godhead. The lights are seven in number, throwing a Sabbath holiness over the whole. The centre piece, upon which the glorious Sufferer was to be hung, being supported on the right and left by three branches, indicating the united support of Godhead in his sufferings.

The loaves on the table of shew-bread represented the bread from heaven, upon which we are to feed by faith. But why were they *twelve* in number? Was it merely to represent the twelve tribes of Israel? Is it not also the political number? Let us learn that we are to carry our religion into all the affairs of life, and let it sanctify all its relations.

The altar of incense was the nearest to the most holy place, where dwelt the Shekinah, the visible manifestation of the Triune God. This incense represented the prayers of the saints. Its nearness to the Shekinah teaches that the Christian is never so

near his God as in the act of prayer. Its coming, after the golden candlestick and the table of shew-bread, teaches that *intelligent faith must precede acceptable prayer.*

In the most holy place was the ark of the covenant, and it contained three things—the tables of the law, the pot of manna, and Aaron's rod that budded—types of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Perhaps the chiefest of these most instructive lessons of the Tabernacle was taught by the vail. St. Paul, after alluding to the high priest's entering within the vail once a year, says: "Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh." We must accept the vail of the tabernacle, then, as the representative of Christ's flesh. But it is also spoken of as the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile; and as the vail which is over the heart of the Jew, when he attempts to read the Scriptures. It is sometimes spoken of as excluding from direct access to God, and sometimes as introducing to him. The different significations have puzzled theologians, and it is with diffidence we attempt the solution of the difficulty.

It seems to us that humanity is the primary import of the vail. Christ's humanity is typified in a secondary sense. It has the first meaning, when it is spoken of as excluding from direct access to God; and it represents Christ's flesh, when it is said to open up a way of direct approach. It is human nature in every case, but this nature allied with the divine in the glorious Second Person of the adorable Trinity, when it opens up a new and living way to the Holy of Holies.

The vail was, as stated, a curtain hanging up before the inner chamber of the Tabernacle, called the Holy of Holies. It excluded all except the high priest from approach to the mercy seat, where dwelt the bright light called the Shekinah, the visible manifestation of the Godhead. Adam could talk with God face to face, as a man talketh with his friend. But after his fall, he and all his descendants lost communion with God, and worshipped him through the intervention of priests and sacrifices.

The veil hung up in the Tabernacle as the representative of that fallen humanity which shut out from direct access to God.

It had the three royal colors of blue, purple, and scarlet, upon a ground of fine twined linen, perfectly white—the emblem of innocence. The colors were four in number, the type number of the world, and thus appropriately expressed an earthly object, viz., human nature. The three royal colors were blended with the white to express the royal union of the Trinity with the human nature of Christ, the innocence of that nature being expressed by the white color.

Now, the reader will observe that the very moment our Saviour died, the veil of the temple was rent, and the sun, which had been shrouded in darkness, burst forth in all his splendor, and lighted up the inmost recesses of the Holy of Holies, which had hitherto been hidden from mortal gaze.

Direct access to God is now secured to all. No need now of the intervention of priests and sacrifices. The middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile is now broken down. The heathen can approach his God with as much freedom as the Israelite. Now, too, the mercy seat is no longer shrouded in darkness and mystery. The rent veil has admitted light from above upon it, and changed it into the family altar, around which we may bring our little ones and commend them to Him who dwells between the Cherubim!

The word three uncompounded occurs 131 times in the Old Testament, and 33 in the New. If we take its compound three times, three days, three months, three years, three score, three hundred, and so on, we will have to add several hundreds more to this 164. And we shall observe that the triplet occurs in a vast number of cases without the number being expressly mentioned. Thus the poor Israelites were allowed to gather three things—the grape, the olive, and the corn, without the number three being mentioned. Thus God is called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But we are not told expressly, that He is the God of these *three*. Why are three mentioned? why not two? Why not simply say the God of Abraham? Did not Abraham, in offering up his only son, stand as a type of our

heavenly Father offering up his well-beloved? Does not Isaac stand as a type of our glorious Redeemer? Is not Jacob, who always prevailed in prayer, a type of that Person of the Trinity, whose office it is to indite and present the prayers of the saints?

At the calling of the Gentiles, why was the great sheet let down three times from heaven? Did it not denote the concurrence of the blessed Trinity in that call?

If we come to the last days of Jesus, we find them full of this mysterious number three. He took apart three disciples on three distinct occasions, on raising the ruler's daughter, on the Mount of Transfiguration, and in Gethsemane. In Gethsemane, he prayed three times and returned three times. The prayer contained three sentences—address, condition, and petition. He was tried three times, by Caiaphas, by Herod, and by Pilate. The three orders of chief priests, scribes, and elders were his accusers. He was denied three times. Three crosses stood side by side at his crucifixion. There were three superscriptions over his head—in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew.

These set forth three things—his name, his residence, his offence. He was crucified at the third hour. There was darkness over the land for three hours. God raised up three witnesses, outside of the discipleship, to attest to his innocence—Joseph, Nicodemus, and the Centurion. Three women are specially mentioned at the cross—two Marys, and Salome. He lay three days in the grave. One angel was the guard at the door of his sepulchre, while two were within. And so we might go on almost indefinitely.

What is the meaning of all this? Is it an accidental occurrence? The mathematician will tell you the theory of probabilities makes such a supposition a monstrous absurdity.

But we find this mystic number everywhere in nature, as well as in the Bible. Man is a triple compound of soul, body, and spirit. His life has the threefold division of youth, manhood, old age. The days of his mortal pilgrimage consist of morning, noon, and night, and these are faithful emblems of his earthly career. In the morning, his shadow projects forward just as his childish hopes launch out into the future. At noon, his shadow

rests a moment at his feet—manhood is absorbed with the busy present. In the afternoon, the shadow goes back to the east. In old age, our thoughts revert to the past, and we live over our youth again.

In the future, some Christian Champollion may arise who can give the world the clue to the interpretation of biblical numbers. For the present we must be content with calling the reader's attention to them, and assuring him that they all have a meaning.

The chemist finds numerical relations in liquids and gases. The geologist finds them in the strata of the earth. The botanist finds them in trees and flowers. The mineralogist finds them in rocks and metals. The biblical student finds them in the Sacred Scriptures, because the God of grace is the God of nature. But while geologist and chemist, mineralogist and botanist, have devoted years of weary study in investigating these numerical relations, what student of the Bible has devoted a year, a month, a day, an hour, to a similar investigation of biblical numbers? How the zeal of the student of this world puts to blush the indifference of the Christian!

We close by alluding to three optical phenomena. Standing on the shore of Corpus Christi bay, we have frequently seen in the morning an object thirty miles distant, and of course really below the horizon. This optical phenomenon is called "looming." The object is *real*, but it is magnified in dimensions and elevated in position. This is the first illusion of early life. The heart goes out after some coveted object which looms up before us in enlarged proportions and unnatural elevation.

On the same shore, we frequently saw pictures on the clouds of our encampment, of men, horses, cannon, wagons—all accurately delineated, but all inverted. Here is the second illusion of youth. His desires go forth to objects which are at best but painted shadows—riches, power. And alas! these objects are always inverted; that which should be above is below, and that which should be below is above. It is thus with his affections; that which should be supreme in them is lightly esteemed, and that which should be despised has the highest place.

A third illusion was common on the salt plains of Mexico.

When the heat was fierce, and the weary soldiers were half fainting with thirst, the cry would suddenly rise, "Water, water," and a beautiful lake would seem to be spread out before us. New life would be infused through the sluggish veins of the sufferers, and they would press forward eagerly, but to see the sparkling water recede and recede until it disappeared in thin air. It was the *mirage*—an illusion, an unreal thing. This is the most common deception awaiting youth. The honor, fame, glory, they chase so eagerly, are unreal phantoms, which look lovely in the distance, but ever elude the grasp; and the pursuit is the most vain as well as the most common.

The pleasures of sense are real, though they loom up in magnified proportions. Riches and power are representatives of real things, though always inverted, the least important claiming the most of your attention, and the reverse. But the chase after popular applause is a very chase after an *ignis fatuus*, a sham, a deception, a shadow, a phantom, a delusion.

Thus youth stands upon the shores of time with three illusions bewildering the mind, deluding the soul, and deceiving the heart. Three active, vigilant, untiring tempters present unceasingly blandishments and seductions. The three mighty temptations of ambition, sensuality, and pride, are ever drawing the immortal spirit from high, noble, and God-like pursuits, to the low, groveling, and selfish, to the earthly, sensual, devilish. How can the poor frail mortal withstand these potent adversaries and these powerful influences? Blessed be God, there are more and mightier for us than against us. With pitying love the Father looks down upon his wandering prodigal, and runs to meet him when yet afar off. With a deeper, tenderer love than that of the mother for her first-born, the Son gave his own life for his people. With groanings that cannot be uttered, the Spirit warns, invites, and pleads with them.

Far above the roar and the dash of the surging waters is heard the gracious invitation: "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come; and let him that is athirst, come; and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." He who yields to the heavenly solicitation and resists the triple

temptation which besets him on every side, has the threefold blessing guaranteed to him by the glorious Trinity—a blessing upon himself, his children, and his children's children. "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever."

ARTICLE V.

THE EUCHARIST.

There must be something in the nature of man, or something belonging to the relations subsisting betwixt man and God, to make ritual modes of worship both necessary and proper. The Scriptures do not even hint at any special form of worship that was employed in Eden, the sacrifices and offerings coming into view later in the history of the race. But it would seem probable, and perhaps logically certain, that God was worshipped by Adam in the garden by the use of established rites, for two reasons: *First*. The fall did not work any change in the constitution of man's nature, though the breach of the covenant necessarily involved the entire defilement of that nature. And just as the physical organism, with its wonderful adaptations, is potentially the same to-day as it was when originally constructed, so the mental and moral organisms are substantially unchanged. The law of truth and the modes of thought control the nature as originally constructed by God. Therefore, if rites and ceremonies are natural methods of intercourse and communion with the Creator, they were undoubtedly in force in Eden. The theory of Calvin, that the tree of life was a sacrament, the token of a promise, used freely while man had the promise, but withdrawn from his use as soon as he forfeited the promise by his fall, is

clearly based upon this logical and theological necessity. But there are certain objections to this idea of the great Reformer. First, the Tree of Life is not mentioned, or even hinted at, before the fall: And the idea that man partook of the tree and lived upon the fruit of it, and was continued in life by its use, will not accord with the fact that he was deprived of its use afterwards, yet still lived. It would seem more probable, because more in accord with God's *method*, to hold the Tree of Life as the reward to be attained by obedience in the trial, and by resistance of the temptation to partake of the other. The analogy seems to require that *both* trees should be forbidden. Not otherwise can the stern and strict prohibition of the life tree, after the fall, be accounted for. Secondly, there are abundant indications in Scripture that some formal acts of worship shall employ the saints in the restored paradise; and while it is true that these shall constantly refer to the great work of Redemption, it is also true that one of the songs that shall be employed in the sublime ritual of the sacramental host, will be the "song of Moses and the Lamb." The inference would appear reasonable, therefore, that a constant recognition of the excellence of the moral law will belong to the worship of the endless ages; and that, in what may be termed a liturgic form, using the word in its primal sense of public and formulated modes of communion with God. There also seems to be a sort of spontaneity predicted, as when the saints shall cast their crowns at the Redeemer's feet, which would indicate the natural impulse of intelligences freed from all taint of sin. The true objection to liturgies, therefore, is that they are usually human inventions, inculcating false doctrines, as in the celebration of the mass, or in the kindred communion service of High-Church Episcopacy, and not that they are naturally wrong. But the saint rebels instinctively, and therefore properly, against any humanly imposed liturgy. Among all the denominations of evangelical Christians, there are none that compare with the Presbyterian in their sturdy and constant resistance of sacerdotal domination. There is a recent example of this determined independence in the proceedings of one of the church courts, where a member avowed his purpose to write and use a

form of prayer, in defiance of authority, if such authority should be asserted; that is, in the way of prohibition. And it will not be doubted that the whole Church would arise in rebellion if an Assembly should adopt and command the use of a stated liturgy, no matter how excellent in itself. Even the quotation of the Lord's Prayer, (as it is incorrectly called,) or the formal use of the words in public services, is objected to by some strait-laced Calvinists. The Lord said, "After this manner pray ye;" but did not command the employment of the same words. But this is carrying the objection to forms a little too far. The apostolic benediction is liturgic. The simplest forms of Christian worship are of this sort. The Lord's Prayer is both ritual and liturgic.

This opening statement is needed, because there are sects that profess the common doctrines of grace, and yet abstain from some of the commanded acts of worship, such as Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The general theory upon which these rites are prohibited, is something of this sort: God being a Spirit, must only be worshipped in spirit, the acts and attitudes of the body being of no importance. The singing of praises must give place to the inaudible songs of thanksgiving going from the heart to the Creator. The effect of this prohibition of forms, of rites, and of sacraments, is to destroy the identity of the Church. And the contest for simplicity of form has carried these sectaries into disobedience of plain commands and disavowal of vital doctrines. In the public worship of God, nothing has been left to human imagination. God has commanded the saints to pray and praise and preach; to submit their bodies to the ordinance of baptism, and to perform certain ceremonies in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. And it behooves the Church to beware how these things are done, and to abstain from human additions on one hand, and to obey the full commandment on the other. A ritual that God has constructed is a proper ritual, not only because he has commanded it, but also proper and significant and valuable in itself; and a ritual that he has not commanded, even if consisting in a liturgy formed of Scripture texts, is *ipso facto* forbidden, and perhaps may be ranked with will-worship, which is idolatry. There are of course many parts of the public service

that are necessary, yet not commanded—such as the *order*, for example. Some ministers uniformly begin the service with the invocation; others uniformly begin with the reading of a passage of Scripture; others uniformly begin with singing a hymn; others adhere to the paraphrases of the Psalms. Some cannot preach without a gown; others think the gown a rag of Popery or Prelacy at least. Some churches have the weekly service on Wednesday nights; others on Thursday; others on Friday. Some ministers always pronounce the benediction, “Grace be unto *you* ;” others always include themselves: “Grace be unto *us*.” But such points have no moral quality in this aspect of the subject. It is when the acts or attitudes are significant or typical, that God challenges the right to prescribe the form.

With this slight introduction, the subject indicated in the title of this article is presented.

The Christian reader need not be told that the services and rites of the Passover, as instituted by Moses, under God’s command, were the types of, and introduction to, the chief sacrament of the Christian Church. And considering both rites, the Passover and the Supper, as typical, they teach substantially the same doctrine, to wit, redemption by blood. Thus, from the date of the Exodus, at least, and down to the present time, the people of God have had, by formulated services, regularly recurring, this one grand lesson presented—that God, justly offended with the children of men, could be placated only by blood. The gospel, which is popularly supposed to abolish the theories of the older dispensation, as well as the various types and ceremonies, does in fact renew this disagreeable doctrine with emphasis: “Without the shedding of blood, there is no remission !” The old rite of the Passover, occurring only once in the year, with its sprinkling of blood upon lintels and door-posts, is supplanted by the Supper, frequently celebrated—a rite that has no possible significance, except it be found in the typified blood.

The scholarly objectors of modern times treat these Christian rites as the natural outgrowth of what they term Judaic superstition, and complacently point out the analogies connecting the new forms with the old. In the light of reason, they say, both

the ceremonies of Christian worship and the doctrines of grace are logical and sensible, only because they cater to unlettered humanity, still in the gyves of superstition. The inexorable demand of this untutored humanity for a system that provides expiation, is only a mental disorder inherited from ancestors, half heathen and half Papist. But these philosophers have not done enough when they get thus far; because the presence of such a proclivity in papist or heathen must needs be explained also. And as far back in the solemn darkness of the past as human annals go, the same system of bloody sacrifices is evermore found. And ever and always, among the relics of extinct heathen races, the sacrificial altars still remain, telling the same story in all ages, of guilt and the consciousness of guilt, and of man's constant effort to appease something, by the blood of sacrifice.

Without discussion, touching the propriety of this instinct, or inherited disorder, as the unbelieving philosopher will term it, notice for a moment another fact. It is notorious that redemption by blood is found in the creeds of all the religious sects of the civilised world to-day. In this enumeration it is not intended to include Unitarian professors, because these do not belong to religious society, in the rigid meaning of the word. They do not profess to have lost allegiance to God. They do not regard themselves as sinners, under the curse of God, and so they do not profess reallegiance. They do not inculcate repentance, having no sin; they do not profess faith, having no Saviour. And the title of Religionist is as really inapplicable to the Unitarian of to-day, as to the Stoic of ancient times. The difference between the two, in the judgment of mere philosophy, consists mainly in the superiority of the older teacher in culture, in logic, and in original mental power. The names of Zeno and Chrysippus have been famous for twenty centuries, and will probably be remembered by the civilised world when the most famous Unitarian teachers of this age will be forgotten. By religious sects, it is meant to designate only those who affirm man's original allegiance to God, the loss of it, and some method of restoration; and in them all, Jewish, Greek Church, Papist, and Protestant, by tran-

substantiation, by consubstantiation, and by every other form of application, blood is evermore the last refuge of the worshipper.

Now, supposing this universal habit of humanity (from the rude peasant of the Steppes to the cultivated scholar of Oxford,) to be an inherited bias, to be accurately defined hereafter in some new "Genesis of Superstition," what will become of the fact that the bias *holds* with the tenacity of death, even among the most refined and cultivated? Surely the philosopher who abhors the bloody side of redemption, will not monopolise all the refinement and education for himself and his congeners. But here are gentle women, many thousands of them, who would recoil with horror from the thought of inflicting needless suffering upon a sparrow, and who, because of their finer organism—acute, sensitive, and swift in recognition—faint at the sight of blood, while colder and slower men maintain their composure—how comes it to pass that these same women dwell with positive rapture upon the story of a human sacrifice, with its details of blood streaming from hands and feet, from head and heart of the victim? Must there not be hidden somewhere in the secret pulses of the soul, a *normal* attribute that calls for the blood of sprinkling?

Because, outside of Revelation, there could be no genesis of so frightful a superstition as this. There is no appeal made to the calm reason of the thinker, beyond the announcement that God the Just becomes the Justifier of sinners, through atoning blood; and the reason is satisfied with the statement that God could not otherwise remain just and justify. The Intelligence, created in the image and likeness of God, had stamped upon his moral nature as distinct a copy of God's original attribute of justice as a creature could bear. And the grandeur of this native uprightness has not all been destroyed by the fall; because conviction of ill-desert, repentance for sin, remorse, and all the chidings of conscience, are evermore based upon the innate uprightness of the human soul, which exercises faith only upon a Saviour who *expiates*. Such was the faith of the Publican, who, smiting his guilty breast, murmured the immortal petition—"God expiate me, the sinner!"

The rites of the Passover, therefore, must have had precisely

this significance to the Jew, as he passed beneath the blood-stained lintel in the haste of the Exodus. It was a night to be much remembered by that vast army of bondmen. The land of their long captivity, from which they were now parting, lay under a curse so universal and appalling, that there was not a house in Egypt wherein there was not one dead. And the blood-mark that had saved Israel from a similar visitation was, necessarily, in the judgment of all the people, the blood of the First-born! The only possible egress from the house of bondage, was through these awful portals; yet from door-post and lintel was the voice of the blood of sprinkling heard, speaking better things than that of Abel.

The first-born of Egypt died; and the first-born of Israel were redeemed. Amid the horrors of the Exodus, God announced the fact that he had sanctified unto himself all the first-born of his people, and commanded the observance of this sacrament throughout all their generations, as "a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth; for with a strong hand hath the Lord brought thee out of Egypt."

The correspondence betwixt the old rite and the new is frequently referred to in the New Testament. "Christ our Pass-over" is the same Christ typified in the elements of the Supper. At the crucifixion, while the bones of the other victims were broken, his bones were not, because it was written "a bone of him shall not be broken." The only possible reference is to the establishment of the ancient ordinance in Exodus xii. 46. In commenting upon John xix. 36, Scott remarks: "It can scarcely be doubted that the only wise God had some special design in commanding that no bone of the Paschal Lamb should be broken, though all must of course be dislocated. This had such a special reference to Christ, that St. John marks it as a matter of importance. Perhaps this may intimate, that as the *natural* body of Christ, after all his tortures, was so preserved by a special providence that no bone was broken, but the whole was found entire at his resurrection; so the members of the *mystical* body of Christ, whatever sufferings and temptations they pass through,

shall be preserved by divine grace from essential detriment; none shall be wanting, but all shall be forthcoming, complete and entire at the resurrection of the just." This is a very pleasing and allowable doctrine, as deduced from the narrative; but this doctrine is so clearly taught in other Scriptures, that it is scarcely probable that it should have the prominent place suggested in this part of the history. It would seem more accordant with the divine method, to give some distinct lesson by the prohibition so distinctly enunciated. And it is safe to assume, that the command to break no bone of the Type, grew out of the foregone decree of God, that no bone of the Christ therein typified should be damaged, when he should come, in the fulness of time, to abolish the Type by the establishment of the Reality; to abolish the sprinkling upon lintel and door-post by the more glorious Type of the "blood of the new covenant" at the Supper. The true question therefore relates to the necessity that preserved the mortal frame of the Redeemer from mutilation.

It will be noted that the various miracles of healing performed by the Lord, did no violence to natural law. The lifeless and withered hand of the man that was healed had all the normal functions in torpidity. The word, "Stretch forth thine hand!" only removed the obstacles. The deaf and dumb man had all the organs of speech entire and perfect, all the organs of hearing; and the Lord made nothing new, when he said, "Ephphatha!" The impotent man at the pool of Bethesda obtained from Jesus no new bones or muscles; but only had his natural powers freed from their unnatural torpor. And the very corpses of the dead whom he raised—even the corpse of Lazarus, who had been four days dead—still retained, no doubt, all the parts of the complex organism intact; and the Almighty word only brought back the vital forces, and restored motion to the *same* organism. And the extreme case of Malchus, whose ear was restored by the touch of Christ, is not without a parallel in human surgery, except that in this, as in all the other miraculous acts of Christ—the power of God directly applied, accomplished cures on the instant, and restored vitality with a word—yet always in accordance with the

natural law which God himself ordained and stamped upon matter.

In this view of the topic, it would seem discordant to fracture the bones of the body that was to rise on the third day. The death of the Lord was a real death, caused by an assault upon a vital organ. Doubtless, the restoration, the healing of these fatal wounds, was perfect and entire, and the resurrection body of the Lord was a real human body, perfect in all its normal functions. "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." What change was wrought upon that body, by death and resurrection, is not revealed; but from some inexorable necessity it was preserved from the common mutilation of the crucified victims of the Roman law. The Supper, therefore, commemorates his broken body and shed blood; but not his broken bones. Perhaps there is a prophecy of this immunity in the 34th Psalm: "He keepeth all his bones; not one of them is broken."

At the institution of the Passover, the salvation of Israel involved a visitation upon the enemies of God that was unique and terrible. In comparison with the destruction of the first-born, all the former plagues seem trivial. From every house in Egypt one wail arose in dismal accord, and the Feast in after ages commemorated this awful infliction as well as the deliverance of the chosen seed. And in the event itself there was a double manifestation of the majestic sovereignty of God, in the formal assertion of the great law of primogeniture in the case of Israel, and the fatal assault upon the same right in the case of the Egyptians. Because God called Israel his first-born, even before his birth, and the Supplanter was transformed into the Prince—Jacob into Israel—before the famine drove him and his progeny into the land of their captivity.

This law of primogeniture seems to be written upon the nature of man. It is not a human invention. Peculiar honors belonged by inheritance to the first-born, and the law has always been in force even among savage and nomadic tribes. The eldest son of the chief becomes the chief at his father's death, and it is not possible to discover the origin of the law in written history or

tradition. It is probably a natural law, and therefore beneficent and righteous. In modern times, the question of the propriety of abolishing this old law has been much discussed; and under strictly popular forms of government, it is not regarded. Still humanity constantly recognises the existence of the law, and the first-born is everywhere regarded the head of the family, whose counsels may not be treated with disrespect, albeit enforced by no legal sanctions. That this original law was in force in Egypt is certain; otherwise the last and culminating plague loses much of its significance. It was not only "one dead" in every house, but the first one—the prince—the inheritor of the lordship, and he upon whom the hopes of the household centred.

Accordingly, when God, in the exercise of his sovereignty, set aside this universal law, and so poured contempt upon the great empire of Pharaoh, he announced to Moses that he took, as his peculiar right, all the first-born of Israel. It was the first command: "Sanctify unto me all the first-born of Israel, man and beast." He announced the reason in Exodus xii. 12: "Because against all the gods," that is, princes or first-born, "of Egypt I will execute judgment—I Jehōvah!" And so in mysterious providence, he makes these numberless dead princes the types of the First-born among many brethren, whose death, later in the world's history, should be counted in lieu of the deaths of the race. "For we thus judge: in that he died for all, then all died." And the type is renewed after the Exodus; when the tribe of Levi—the tribe of the priesthood—was taken *instead* of the first-born of all the tribes.

It is not probable that the new rite which has supplanted the old is less significant; and the suggestions in the foregoing argument are commended to the thought of the Christian reader. The prominent lesson is the central doctrine of all religions—the doctrine of Substitution. And when you succeed in placing clearly before the apprehension of the sinner this inexorable law of substitution, you have opened the way for all the other doctrines of grace. Perhaps you do still more. In proportion to the clearness of the apprehension of Christ the Divine Substitute, it may be there will grow in the soul an abhorrence of those

heresies that proclaim the goodness of humanity, and the consequent uselessness of a Sacrifice for sin. None of the heresies that have issued from Tophet to curse the earth, are as harmful and prolific as Arianism.

The most explicit account of the institution of the rite of the Supper, is perhaps found in 1 Corinthians xi. 23–26. The authority for its observance, is the command of Christ. The mode of administration is accurately described, and the exact significance of the ritual is stated. These three points apparently exhaust the subject, and to them the remainder of this article will be confined.

I. The Apostle distinctly proclaims: "I have received of the Lord that which I deliver unto you." It was not a custom that he found in the Church after his conversion; but it was the plain instruction of the Lord Christ to himself, and given to him for the instruction of the Church, which had gone far astray in the modes of observing this ordinance. And the particular object of the Apostle, in the passage under examination, is to correct these errors; and he does this by revealing to them that which Christ had revealed directly to him, to wit, the true intent and meaning of the rite. It is plain that these semi-heathen Corinthians had no proper conception of the ordinance, as Paul rebukes their frivolity and drunkenness in the immediate context. Three of the Gospels contain accounts of the institution of the Supper, but only Luke contains the command for its after observance. The chief value of the Gospel accounts is to show its connexion with the Passover—and there is very little that may be called didactic in any of the three. But the passage in Corinthians is decided, concise, and instructive.

Concerning the authority, therefore, the first point to notice is the assumption of all rule by the Lord Christ in matters relating to divine worship. The Second Person of the adorable Trinity is not so clearly revealed in the establishment of the Old Testament rites. It is always Jehovah who gives the command. The passage already quoted from Exodus xii. 12, is remarkable, in that it concludes with this majestic announcement—"I Jehovah!" as if to enforce the observance of the Feast in coming ages, by

the power of the awful Name. It was doubtless the same Lord Christ that appeared to Abraham in the plains of Mamre; that revealed himself to Joshua, as the Prince of the Lord's host, under the walls of Jericho; that wrestled with Jacob at Peniel; but in all these places there does not appear the clear announcement of his identity. His Name, Immanuel, was not then known. The government was not formally upon his shoulder as the Prince of the House of David until the Incarnation, when the first evangelist introduces him as "Jesus Christ the Son of David, the Son of Abraham."

In the mediatorial reign, the control of all providence is committed to the Son. He is Lord over his own house, and none may dispute his authority. The active agency of the Spirit, in the great work of regeneration, does not impair this supreme lordship. The Spirit knoweth the mind of Christ, and all his ministrations accord with the purpose of the one King in Zion. The eternal decrees of the Father are not altered; because it is He who saith, "I have set my King upon the holy hill," and who has given this Potentate the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession. There is no conflict of authority in proclaiming Christ the King of kings and Lord of lords.

The observance of the Eucharistic Feast is therefore in obedience to the command of Christ. "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you."

II. The ritual itself is the next thing in order, and the question as to the proper mode of observance claims attention.

Note, first, the whole of this exhortation in 1 Corinthians xi. 23, is drawn out by the flagrant improprieties of the church at Corinth. In the enumeration of these improprieties, the Apostle lays most stress upon their profane conception of the significance of the ordinance. They put it upon the same level with the idolatrous services of their heathen temples. And while Paul, bound in the chains of rigid logic, avows that the idol is nothing, and the meat offered to the idol differs not from any other meat, and that the act of eating this meat has in itself no moral quality, he still announces with startling emphasis, "Ye cannot partake

of the Lord's table, and the table of devils!" That which was totally insignificant *per se*, becomes awfully significant, by the establishment of the new relations. The astounding argument of the Apostle runs thus: All meats and all places are alike—because "the earth is Jehovah's, and the fulness thereof." And secondly, eat *not* of this idolatrous meat, lest you offend a weak brother—because "the earth is Jehovah's, and the fulness thereof!" And this double quotation is from the 24th Psalm, where the King of glory, Jehovah of hosts, is described as entering through the eternal gates into his kingdom—doubtless the song of the angelic host when Christ ascended from Olivet to occupy his throne.

Note, secondly, the exhortation in the immediate context refers to their contemptuous methods of observance. They made a common feast of a rite that had most solemn significance. They were disorderly in its celebration. "One was hungry and another drunken." He warns them that this sort of performance was in no sense "the Lord's Supper," and then he describes simply yet minutely the Lord's own directions for the proper observance of the Feast. It was the partaking of bread and wine, not as the ordinary articles of diet, but as emblems so awfully significant that they included in their references the salvation of a lost race, and the exaltation of the Creator and Redeemer.

The first step towards the profanation of the chief rite in the early Church, was the growth of a sacerdotalism, which lingers like a plague spot on almost all of its branches. So soon as you transform the presbyter into the priest, you open the door for all kinds of idolatrous rites. The priest must enforce his authority by sanctions. He must forgive sins, grant absolution, and even follow his subject beyond the confines of time into the dark domain of purgatorial expiation. And here, also, the heresy is a caricature of the truth. God does verily call his servants into the presbyterial office, and none may assume the functions of that office, save those who, like Aaron, are called of God. It is a vital doctrine, and all the later discussions of the topic, serve to make it more plain, that no man may take this honor upon himself. The preacher of the word is as really "set apart," by God

the Redeemer, for this ministry, as Paul was. And the Papist has been logical in claiming *apostolic* authority for the ungodly men who were divinely commissioned priests. But the point of divergence from the true doctrine is in the addition of *priestly* functions. There is but One Priest, but one altar, but one sacrifice. And, therefore, there is but one form of administration of the Supper: "For that which I received of the Lord, I also delivered unto you," to wit, the *mode* of administration—and *nothing else*.

Note, thirdly, how the Church, recoiling from this horrible profanation, this low estimate of the person and work of Christ, drifted rapidly into the opposite and more fatal error. The rebound from Corinthian license carried the Church through various heresies and by gradual steps, finally into Popish transubstantiation. Not only was this Corinthian custom a flagrant debasement of a glorious rite; but the very elements themselves under sacerdotal manipulations were transformed into the veritable body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ! And this more horrible idolatry has stuck to the Church through the ages, leaving its stain and damage even among the most evangelical sects of the present day. The Reformation found the Church enveloped in a system of doctrines at variance with the revelation of God. From the fourth century of the Christian era, some form of assault upon the essential divinity or the proper manhood of Christ, had occupied the attention of the champions of the truth, and the scars of the early conflicts between Arianism and Truth are still visible throughout Christendom. In denial of this hateful dogma, the Church adopted extravagant heresies, and the Mass grew into its present hideous proportions from small beginnings. Something about the rite appealed to the native instinct of the race, already referred to, which was prompt to recognise the propriety of a bloody sacrifice; and the quick apprehension of sacerdotal rulers utilised the instinct and invented Transubstantiation. It poisoned theology so deeply, that some of the early Reformers brought into the new Church some taint and stain of the vile superstition.

Notice, for example, some of the common modes of administra-

tion. The Methodist has a ritual, part of which is termed "the prayer of consecration." The Directory of Worship instructs the preacher to perform certain manipulations in the midst of this prayer, before the distribution of the emblems. The object of these manipulations is to work some occult change in the *nature* of the emblems. That which was before plain bread, becomes something else by the imposition of sacerdotal hands. And the Directory adds: "If the time will not allow all these observances, any part may be omitted, *except the prayer of consecration!*" It is no marvel that this excellent body of Christians should go astray in doctrine—should invent "love-feasts," "class-meetings," (corresponding with auricular confession,) anxious benches, and altars! This prayer of "consecration" supposes a priest, and the priest necessitates the altar. Whereas, there is but one Priest over the house of God, even Jesus, called of God, and endowed with the power of an endless life. And there is but one altar in God's house, even Jesus, the God, the Altar sanctifying the gift, whereupon the atoning humanity of Christ was offered.

The Lutheran has a ritual of confession—*audible* confession of sin, made before men, to precede the Supper. And among the most evangelical of them, there are still left some rags of consubstantiation, vitiating the rite which Paul received of the Lord.

The semi-idolatrous rites of the Papacy, and the caricature of these rites in the Anglican Church, have already been noted, except the fact that the Papist, more consistent than the Protestant, not only makes holy bread in the Eucharist, but also holy water in the other sacrament of Baptism. What has the Presbyterian Church in her ritual, that Paul did *not* receive of the Lord?

To enumerate some of the objectionable customs, following the drift above indicated, note first: the Presbyterian form of "consecration;" and here a difficulty is encountered at the outset, because the practice is not uniform. The reader, if he has attended communion services in different localities, has observed in some places a very elaborate "setting apart" of the elements, akin to the Methodist manipulation, and not wholly different from the consecration of the wafer. And in other churches he has proba-

bly been surprised to find all form of "setting apart" omitted. There are various forms observed between these two extremes; and the thinker cannot escape the conclusion that some reason must be found for this incongruity. The Popish ceremony is identical in all latitudes. The Episcopal form is also observed with considerable uniformity; but the Presbyterian method appears to vary with the mere whim of the presiding authority. The Confession of Faith, Chap. XXIX., Sec. 3, thus speaks: "The Lord Jesus hath, in this ordinance, appointed his ministers to declare his word of institution to the people, to pray and bless the elements of bread and wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to an holy use." The proof texts which are supposed to support this passage are given in a body, and the reader is requested to "see all the places in which the ordinance is mentioned."

In obedience to this suggestion, the writer has examined all the passages designated, as well as all those in which the ordinance is mentioned, and has failed to find a solitary case in which any apostle, prophet, teacher, or ruler was directed to bless the elements, or set them apart, or where any of these officials did these things *without* direction. There was undoubtedly some form of thanksgiving observed, and perhaps commanded, by implication at least; and the marginal readings sometimes substitute "gave thanks" for the word "bless." It seems probable that this is the meaning of the word in all cases. In Matthew xxvi. 26, it is noted in the margin that "many Greek copies read '*gave thanks*' instead of '*blessed*;' " and in the next verse, where the distribution of the cup is recorded, it is "gave thanks." The same difference is also found in Mark's account of the institution. In Luke, the word "bless" does not occur at all.

The Christian reader will have discovered, if he has followed the argument thus far, that the objection indicated is against sacerdotalism. The old mistake, that "presbyter is only priest writ large," becomes an acute sarcasm in this statement, and it would appear to have its proper application here. There are few things in Christendom more abhorrent than lax theology, or Broad-Churchism, or the erection of human wisdom against the

ordinance of God. But a superstitious and unmeaning travesty of God's holy ordinance is worse than any of these; and there does not appear anywhere in God's word any sufficient authority for "blessing" the bread of the communion table. The Popish custom of benediction—the blessing of cow-bells, of agricultural implements, of weapons in the olden time, of cups and pots and pans—seems to be a more horrible profanation than even New England higher law! How broad is the line that separates these barbarous absurdities from the solemn form of consecration that is used at Presbyterian communion tables!

The preacher proceeds in this wise: After a prayer, in which appears the idea that some change has been wrought in the elements on the table, he says: "Our Lord Jesus, on the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and having blessed it, as has now been done in his name, he brake it, as I, ministering in his name, break this bread," (and here he takes up a fragment or two and breaks them,) "saying, 'Take, eat,'" etc.

Now there is an incongruity here also. The loaf of bread, which was like any other loaf before the prayer of consecration, was cut with a knife, longitudinally and crosswise, before it was placed on the table. It should not have been cut at all; or if cut, only by ministerial hands. Yet it comes to the table so prepared as to make the ministerial manipulation easy. How much of this is according to God's direction, and how much mummery? Paul says, "I have received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you." How much of this ceremony did Paul receive of the Lord? He certainly did not write a word of it to the Corinthians.

The Lord's Supper is a precious ordinance; and on this very account, the Church should be jealous of any changes made in the mode of observance. The simplest form is that indicated by Paul, and no minister can err in following his method. He tells the story of the institution of the feast, and just what the Lord did and said, and that is all. The Lord himself left the command: "This do."

Nothing can be more remote from the present purpose than an attempt to *lower* the estimate of any rite that God has established. Nothing can be more abhorrent to any enlightened Christian,

than Rationalistic theories concerning the sacraments of God's house. They are high mysteries; they are solemn services. But the scope of the present argument may be more accurately discovered by the use of a few postulates.

(1.) In the miracles of the Lord, in all ages, you never find any monstrous innovations. He never turns men into brutes, as is affirmed in the Apocryphal Gospels. He never violates any of the inexorable laws of mind or matter in his works or words. And while the real presence of Christ in the sacrifice of the Mass is a profane fable, the true presence of Christ at his table is an undoubted verity. Hence, the symbols are sacred; but they are still *symbols*, and are not made holy by any sacerdotal interference, but by the direct act of Christ. The bodies of the saints are all temples—not so made by baptism or by the partaking of sacramental symbols, but by the indwelling power of God, the Holy Ghost. And when the feast is spread, in accordance with God's instructions, the elements are already set apart from a common to a holy use. There is no text in Scripture that warrants the *quasi*-sacerdotal consecration.

(2.) Therefore, the bread and wine are *only* bread and wine; just as the paschal lamb was still a lamb, and the blood sprinkled on lintel and door-post, was still lamb's blood, and potent only because it said to the destroyer, "Pass over this house, for I have found a ransom!" It was not the *real* blood shed on Calvary; but because it typified that blood which purchased redemption, the Israelite was redeemed by its power. The eating and drinking of the sacramental elements avail nothing to the worshipper, unless he, being *previously* enlightened, discerns the Lord plainly crucified for *him*. All the setting apart counts for nothing, in the case of the unenlightened partaker. And as God only knows the hearts of men, the officiating minister cannot withhold the consecration from the portions unworthily received. The Popish theory, consistent in its profane absurdity, makes the mass efficacious by its inherent divinity; and therefore the body of the executed murderer, who has partaken of the sacrament a moment before he dies, is holy, and his soul secure in the paradise of God.

(3.) The "giving of thanks" before the distribution of the ele-

VOL. XXVI., NO. 4—21.

ments is eminently proper. But the addition of the consecrating clause is on a par with the addition of salt in Popish and Prelatical baptism. Baptismal regeneration is perhaps no more really at variance with God's revealed ritual than the consecration of half or three-quarters of a loaf. Evangelical sects do not consecrate baptismal water, and thus far in the history of the Church they have not added salt. The rite is understood to be significant of the washing of regeneration, which is as indispensable a part of salvation as the sacrifice on Calvary; yet the water does not cleanse the soul, or become, under sacerdotal touches, the true Spirit of grace.

(4.) The Supper is a *feast* in God's house; yet the rite is invested with so mournful a solemnity that the inexperienced partaker approaches the table with awe and trepidation. He comes, not to meet with and commune with his gracious King; not to prefer some special petition which fills his longing soul, but to go through an occult ceremony, in which the primary suggestion is the personal guilt and misery that made the horrors of Gethsemane! Is it not rather the gracious desire of the Lord that the guest at his table should dwell with joyful anticipations upon the Marriage Supper, of which this sacrament is the type? The consciousness of sin and of ill-desert is proper always; but in the King's reception room, the throne room, the guests should wear the white robes of righteousness, and forget the guilt and defilement which they hide; or if not forgotten, the memory of them should only add to the glory of that robe the gift of grace.

(5.) The communion is betwixt Christ and the saint. It is *personal*. Therefore, there should not be any interruptions of this intercourse while it lasts. The most chaste, pious, orthodox exhortation that can be addressed to the communicant by the minister, has the disadvantage of keeping him from telling his own *secret* story to the King, *specially* present and listening.

Every word of the foregoing argument has been written in the interest of Calvinistic truth. The Socinian heresy which, three centuries ago, began to curse the Church, was really the old Arian heresy under new forms, and with more pronounced profaneness. And some form of assault upon the essential divinity

of the Lord Christ has seemed to underlie all the flagrant lapses of the past fifteen centuries. It is not "slack Calvinism" that has damaged the Church in later times, but slack Christism. It is the doubt or denial of the Godhead of the man Jesus, and the non-recognition of the divinity in his triple office work. He is a divine Prophet, a divine Priest, and a divine King. And the functions of these offices cannot be performed or imitated by men, even when these men are presbyters. It is becoming in his ministers to say, "The Lord Jesus, on the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and blessed and brake, saying, Take, eat." But it is not so clear that they may add, "Even as I—ministering in his name—do so and so." And the reason why this is questionable, is, that the Supper is a rite established by Christ, with carefully announced form, in which these words do not appear. As for the prayer of consecration, the blessing, or the setting apart, there is just this one cogent objection: The Lord himself has *already* set the elements apart. And although no change has been wrought upon the nature of the elements, they sustain new relations and are *holy*, because used in the Christ-appointed rite. A man, transformed by the divine Spirit from sinnerhood to saintship, is the same man, yet in the latter state has "Holiness to the Lord" written upon his whole complex organism. It is a new creation in a true sense in body and soul; yet it is the same body, made a temple of the Holy Ghost, and the same soul, redeemed from the curse of the law—both new, in that both are vitalised by a new life principle, and both made immortal. For even this mortal shall put on immortality.

Therefore, let the minister "give thanks," and pray for grace to celebrate the feast; but let him not, *ex officio*, make that "uncommon" which Christ has *already* sanctified. The service of the Supper is a mysterious service. Indeed, it is perhaps the most awful of the mysteries connected with man's communion with God. And, *therefore*, let not the minister attempt to add humanly invented mystery to Christ's sign and seal and sacrament. In the majestic simplicity of the ordinance, as set down in Corinthians, there is enough to deter any man from careless or profane observance. Human additions are always *failures*. The

attempt to add solemnity to this august rite by *any* bodily exercise is never successful.

Among the mysteries of the Supper, one may be suggested. And here the appeal is rather to the consciousness of the Christian partaker than to positive revelation. It seems that the Lord, who makes the Feast, who invites and welcomes the guests, is present in some such peculiar, positive propinquity, as he is nowhere else; except, perhaps, at the death-bed. At the table there is a specific, *special* gathering together in his name; and there is a special promise attached to such a gathering. And if he is actually at the table, there is special access accorded to the guest. And each partaker has some special, secret plea to present to the King, while he is actually *touching the sceptre*. If this suggestion finds no response in the heart of the reader, further argument would avail nothing. But if it is *true*, then all addresses, during the partaking of the elements, are interruptions and hindrances. There are some simple-minded worshippers, who, four times in the year, fancy they get this close access, and who are busy with some urgent supplication while the Lord is so near; who stop their ears while the address, supplementing the sermon, is delivered; not lest the King should fail to hear them; but lest their own thoughts should be distracted during the few fleeting moments while Christ is near and listening. That half hour of *silent* communion with the Lord is very precious; and Presbyterian authority allows it only once in three months.

III. Thus brought to the final question, look for a moment at the significance of the rite. It is intended to do two things. It shows forth the Lord's death. The emblems employed are an ever recurring presentation to the eye of the worshippers of the scene on Calvary. The ordinance is for a remembrancer: And while the Church employs this rite, the Lord's death is shown according to his command: "As oft as ye do this, *show ye* the Lord's death."

The other object of the Supper, is to remind the Church that he will come again. The commission reads: "Show ye the Lord's death *till he come*." And on this account the ordinance should be a joyful ordinance. It is a feast; and it constantly

prefigures the great Marriage Feast. Let not the children of the bride-chamber be of sad countenance as they who *fast*, when they partake of this typical supper. And let them remember, when they sit at this table, that they are trying on their crowns—for they are a royal seed—and that they have very peculiar access to the presence chamber while so adorned.

EDITORIAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE FOREGOING ARTICLE.

We readily admit to our pages this contribution from a highly esteemed correspondent, partly because it contains so much that is true and important and well said, and partly because whereinssoever what is said by our friend appears to us not to be true, it affords us the opportunity to set forth the Calvinistic and the Presbyterian doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as we understand it. Not in the way of controversy then, but of friendly criticism or rather conference, there are a few preliminary remarks to be made before entering on the main topic.

1. Our correspondent is unquestionably correct in what he says (page 748) of the foundation there is in our very nature for some kind of established rites in worship, and he will of course agree in this observation which we append to his remark, viz., that God who framed our nature has revealed such rites of worship as best suit that nature, and as he will himself accept us in using. As soon as man sinned and fell, it became a thing improper, unsuitable, and impossible for him to draw nigh to God; and had not God revealed to man how he might be approached, man could not have got to God, and there had been no greater presumption conceivable than for the sinner to attempt to venture into his presence and pollute it. This is the reason why "will worship"—worship devised and offered by man, of his own wisdom and will—is abominable to God. The sovereign God will be approached only in the way which he has revealed. Moreover, our friend must certainly be warranted in saying (page 748) that God

was worshipped in Eden by the use of established rites, and we add, that the rites established there were established by the Almighty himself. Our correspondent's two reasons seem conclusive. But if Calvin be right, as we believe, and the tree of life was a *sacrament* then, there is not only a *hint* in Scripture, but plain mention of worship in Eden by a rite. It is a mistake, moreover, to say (page 749) the tree of life is not spoken of before the fall. (See Gen. ii. 9.) Nor is the Genevese Reformer correctly represented when it is stated to be his idea (page 749) that man "lived on the fruit of that tree," and was "continued in life by its use." Its use was not for food, but as a sacrament. Let us quote from the *Institutes*, Chap. XIV., § 18: The term *sacrament*, in the view we have hitherto taken of it, includes generally all the signs which God ever commanded men to use that he might make them sure and confident of the truth of his promises. These he was pleased sometimes to place in natural objects, sometimes to exhibit in miracles. Of the former class, we have an example in his giving the tree of life to Adam and Eve as an earnest of immortality, that they might feel confident of the promise as often as they ate of the fruit. Another example was, when he gave the bow in the cloud to Noah and his posterity as a memorial that he would not again destroy the earth by a flood. These were to Adam and Noah as sacraments: not that the tree could give Adam and Eve the immortality which it could not give to itself; or the bow (which is only a reflection of the solar rays on the opposite clouds) could have the effect of confining the waters; but they had a mark engraven on them by the word of God to be proofs and seals of his covenant. The tree was previously a tree, and the bow a bow; but when they were inscribed with the word of God, a new form was given to them: they began to be what formerly they were not. Lest any one suppose that these things were said in vain, the bow is even in the present day a witness to us of the covenant God made with Noah. As often as we look upon it, we read this promise from God that the earth will never be destroyed by a flood." Calvin goes on to say that Abraham's smoking furnace and Gideon's fleece and Hezekiah's shadow on the dial, as well as circumcision,

and the purifications, sacrifices, and other rites of the Mosaic law, were all of them sacraments as truly as Baptism and the Lord's Supper—all being seals of the promises of God, and all exhibiting Christ, since there has been no promise except in Christ.

2. Our friend cannot mean to say, (pages 750-1) in the strict use of language, that "many *parts* of the public service are necessary, yet not commanded." The specifications he makes are all of them such as come under the head of order and decency, time and place. They are not *parts* of the worship, but "circumstances to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence according to the general rules of the word." There can be no necessary *part* of the worship uncommanded. Any new uncommanded part is will-worship.

3. It will not answer to represent (page 761) Transubstantiation as the recoil from the Corinthian abuses of the Lord's Supper—the rebound from that horribly profane license into the extreme of Romish superstition. The interval is too long—eight centuries; and there were too many other well known influences directly operative. One of these certainly was, as our correspondent points out, the idea of the priesthood of ministers, leading necessarily to a sacrifice in the Supper.

Nor will it answer, as we suppose, to say that it was in denial of the hateful dogma of Arianism that the Church invented the Mass. Not through any felt necessity for maintaining or confirming the truth of either the essential divinity or the proper humanity of Christ did Transubstantiation come in. The Sacrament is a mystery and holds up a mystery to view—this, rather, was the idea which when abused led to Transubstantiation. Not Arianism nor any one of its kindred falsities, but the Ritualism that is in human nature is the door by which this monstrous error entered.

Nor can it be maintained that this error "poisoned theology so deeply" that "some taint and stain of the vile superstition" must needs come into the new Church or Churches of the Reformation. Luther, we admit, held to some of it. But Zwingli surely went very far towards the other extreme, so that he has

always been charged with making the sacraments mere signs. Dr. Cunningham, we think, has successfully vindicated him from this charge, at least so far as concerns his later views. It is more just, therefore, to speak of that idea of the sacraments as the Socinian. But, alas! many better Christians than they are, hold that same view. The Independents commonly, and even such Presbyterians as are of the *slack order*, are addicted to this notion. These are given to the depreciation of the Church, and the sacraments, and the word, and the ministry, and the Spirit's call and work, and every thing else that is sacred and venerable. There is a taint of Rationalism amongst too many Protestants and too many Presbyterians.

4. An example of the prevalent laxity amongst us in practice as well as in principle is given on pages 762-4. The Confession of Faith which all our ministers have adopted prescribes a "setting apart" of the elements. The Directory of our Worship does the same. But as our correspondent states, our practice "appears to vary with the mere whim of the presiding authority." But take the "setting apart" in the most "elaborate" form that is witnessed amongst Presbyterians, and does it ever constitute any thing more than a "setting apart from a common to a holy use?" Is it ever pretended in any Presbyterian prayer of consecration, that any change is wrought in the nature of the bread or of the wine? If not, can it be an objectionable custom to consecrate the elements simply to a holy use? What says our Lord of the bread? "This is my body." And of the wine? "This cup is the new testament in my blood." Then adds the Apostle, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." And now because of the Popish error which regards the consecrated wafer as the body, soul, and divinity of Christ, shall we run to the opposite extreme and think and speak of the bread as "plain bread," or "common bread?" It remains of course as truly bread as the tree of life remained a tree, or the bow in the cloud a mere reflection of the sun's rays; yet, like that tree and that bow, after God's word of promise was inscribed upon them, has not this bread begun to assume a new form and to be what it was not before? It remains

bread, but not common bread—it is bread which is *made a token and a seal* of all the blessings of the new covenant, bread which was truly said, by the Lord himself, in a most real and living sense, to be *the body of Christ*.

5. Our Confession says, “The Lord Jesus hath in this ordinance appointed his ministers to *bless* the elements, and thereby set them apart.” But our friend has “failed to find a solitary case in which any apostle or prophet, teacher or ruler, was directed to bless the elements or set them apart.” He ought to have looked into 1 Cor. x. 16. But he allows himself to refer to the popish custom of blessing cow-bells and pots and pans, and ask, How broad is the line which separates these barbarous absurdities from the solemn form of consecration that is used at a Presbyterian communion table? If now we tell him that the Lord Jesus blessed the bread, his reply is twofold: *first*, that “*blessed*” there means “gave thanks,”—which may or may not be correct; and *secondly*, that the Lord Jesus has himself already blessed or consecrated the elements, and it is superfluous or unseemly that they be blessed by men. But what will he do with the Apostle, who, writing long after the Lord had blessed, says, in the passage just now referred to, “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” Surely he will not deny that Paul spoke there for all other ministers of the word as well as for himself. Condemning the profane behavior of the Corinthians, he declares what instructions the Lord gave him about the Eucharist, not for himself alone, but for all his successors in the ministry. He received of the Lord and he delivers unto us in what manner the Supper is to be administered: Jesus took bread, blessed it, brake it, gave it to the disciples, saying these words, (wherein Calvin says the chief force of the ordinance lies,) “Take, eat; this is my body broken for you;” and then the cup, after the same manner, and with the same mighty words. All this precisely are we to do, showing the Lord’s death in each successive generation till He come. If we are not to “bless” or “set apart” because the Lord hath already blessed, then on like grounds we are not to break

because he hath already broken ; and we are not to say, "Take; eat," because he said the same. And, then, it is not a proper idea which Christians have ever maintained, that the more nearly we can discover and the more fully we can conform the manner of our celebrating the Lord's Supper to Christ's manner, the better. Then the old Presbyterian custom of coming to a table were better abolished every where, as it is already in too many places. And, then, it becomes quite a matter of indifference, whether wine, the juice of the grape, be employed rather than milk or honey or water—whether bread be used, or flesh, fruit, or vegetables. Then, further, the monstrous crime of Rome in presuming to administer the communion only in one kind, shutting the people out from all use of the cup, is no sacrilegious impiety. But, contrariwise, we have been taught, and our correspondent is careful to declare the same view, (page 766,) that any substitution or change by man in the manner of the administration is wicked. Admit now the principle that the Supper is a positive institute by Christ, or as our friend expresses it, "a rite established by Christ with carefully announced form," and then his "blessing," so far from being a reason why we are not to "bless," constitutes the ground of an absolute and imperious necessity for our doing that very thing. And, then, the table with its bread and wine are of divine appointment ; and so is a particular order of men exclusively authorised to dispense these elements. And these men *must* bless and set apart and break and give to the people the tokens or seals of the covenant ; and they must say to them those effective words ; "Take, eat, drink, my body broken, my blood shed for you," because Christ said them. And then, moreover, because Christ addressed his disciples at the Supper in most tender, affectionate, and comforting strains, therefore his commissioned representatives *must* do the same. No doubt, however, as our correspondent alleges, these addresses are often too wordy. The communicant should be left for a portion of the time—and let it be a large portion, too—to uninterrupted communion with his Lord. And yet, seeing that it is a season of communion not only of the members each with the Head, but a communion of all the members with one another, who shall say

that there is no propriety in some words of address by the minister at the table?

6. Our correspondent, we are pained to say it, seems to be a little tinctured with the Rationalistic dislike, or rather contempt, for *consecrations*. But do we not consecrate or set apart a pair to each other when we perform a Christian marriage? And do we not consecrate or set apart a house to God's worship at its dedication? And do we not consecrate or set apart a man from secular pursuits to the ministry? It is just as easy to ridicule these consecrations as the "setting apart" of the bread from a common to a holy use, or the "blessing" of it. In our horror of Romish excesses, we must not run to the other extreme.

Having thus accompanied our friend through his article, looking at the points which he makes, accepting some and rejecting others, we must now invite him and our other readers to notice a few things which we have to suggest on the interesting and important subject of the sacraments.

The celebrated James Fisher, one of the four great original founders of the Secession Kirk of Scotland, and one of the three eminent ministers of that secession, who began to write the admirable explanation of the Shorter Catechism in the way of question and answer, which generally bears his name because in fact he was its chief author, points out how there are certain internal means of salvation—as faith, repentance, (that is, regeneration,) and the other graces which accompany or flow from these; and how there are also certain external or outward means of salvation, ordinances divinely appointed for that purpose—such as the word, the sacraments, and prayer.

Now, all these and other like ordinances have a natural and moral efficacy to the end of the edification of believers in whom has been commenced the inward work of faith. But besides this natural and moral efficacy, there is also a *spiritual* efficacy of these ordinances derived from their being the positive appointment of Christ. There is also a positive and special promise of the Spirit to make them effectual. It may be properly and truly said, as Dr. Bannerman suggests, that prayer and praise, and the reading, hearing, and meditating upon the word, have naturally

and morally a tendency to enlighten the mind and improve the heart; but that apart from this, and in addition to this, there is also a spiritual efficacy derived from the special grace of Christ, and the peculiar power and influences of his Spirit. Now, we might explain the natural and moral efficacy of these divine ordinances, but it is not possible for us to comprehend or set forth the spiritual and supernatural force and power of them. Because in the region of the supernatural, there is always a mystery it is not given us to understand.

But if all this is true of every divine ordinance or outward means whereby Christ communicates to us the benefits of redemption, it is especially true of the sacraments. Supernatural grace is not peculiar to them, but it may be said to prevail in them in peculiarly large measure.

The term Sacrament, in its classic use, signifies the oath by which a soldier bound himself to obey. But in its ecclesiastical use, it is the translation of the Greek word Mystery. It is thus employed in the oldest Latin versions of the Bible. And thus the term, which is not found in Scripture, came early to be applied to those special solemnities of the primitive Christian faith, which, although made up of outward and sensible signs and actions, bore in them a secret and spiritual meaning—to those outward ordinances of the gospel which signify and seal its most precious and momentous truths.* And well indeed it was thus applied, seeing that the sacraments do especially border on the supernatural and do especially present to us something mysterious.

As to the nature of the sacraments, the opinions of men have run to two opposite extremes, whilst the truth lies as usual in the middle.

Let us look, *first*, at the Socinian view. This makes the sacrament only a sign, a commemoration, an exhibition of certain facts and truths, a profession of discipleship. Many Independents and even some Presbyterians hold this low view. The seal idea of the sacrament is denied; its character as a token is repu-

*See Bannerman's Church of Christ, Vol. II., p. 4.

diated, for no covenant is ratified in these ordinances; there is no giving of himself to us by Christ; there is no special and peculiar relation into which we are brought; there are no unusual communications of grace; there is no ineffable communion of our souls with the Lord—no close, intimate, extraordinary intercourse and fellowship between us and him, between us and all the members of Christ our Head; there is, in fine, nothing whatever that is supernatural in Baptism or the Lord's Supper, but simply a dramatic representation and a profession by disciples.

And now behold at the other extreme the Romish theory of the sacraments. They are effectual in themselves, and independently of any faith on our part, or any agency of the Holy Ghost, who seems to be allowed but little place in the theology of Rome. They communicate grace by their own innate power and force. They are not simply means, but causes of grace. Only two obstacles can hinder their necessary operation: (1) The want of intention on the part of the administering priest; (2) Mortal sin by the receiver, which had not been absolved. In every sacrament grace is communicated (these two hindrances not opposing,) from and by the very act, and that neither through the Spirit nor by his agency, but immediately and directly from the sacrament itself.

There are parties in the Church of England who hold some such views as these, though greatly modified. They would not accept all that Rome says of *opus operatum* and priestly intention, but they do maintain that there is in the sacraments a virtue of their own, and that they operate immediately on the soul, and not instrumentally by the Spirit and through faith.*

And so, too, some Lutherans, perhaps, sympathise in a degree, through their high consubstantiation views, with the Romish theory. And is it too much to say that there is an opinion held and practised by some of our Methodist brethren, which has some Romewards tendency, if we correctly apprehend it? Our reference is to the notion that the Supper is a converting ordinance, instead of being merely a seal of grace already received. The

* Bannerman, Vol. II., p. 31.

table is not spread for the unregenerate, and they ought never to be encouraged to sit down to it. But wherever faith is already in exercise, the Lord's Supper is a means in the Spirit's hand for its increase.

Here, then, are the two extremes—the Socinian and the Romish. And in the middle between them stands the Bible doctrine, first brought out fully and completely in these latter ages by John Calvin, and admirably set forth in the answer to the 92d question of our Shorter Catechism: "A sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed, and applied to believers." It is an "appendage" to the word, and belongs, therefore, to the minister's office exclusively. It is *a form of the word*, which sets forth the truth to the ear, while this speaks to the eye.

1. A sacrament is a *holy* ordinance, not only because appointed for holy ends and uses, (which all the ordinances and means of grace are,) but because also it is appointed exclusively for holy persons. Of course we do not mean to say that the Supper is for those only who have no sin. But it is only for those who have been already delivered from bondage to sin—Christ's freemen, Christ's disciples, Christ's redeemed and consecrated ones, those who are alive from the dead, are federally holy, and in them is already begun the life of God in the soul of man.

2. A sacrament is a holy ordinance *instituted by Christ*. But all the ordinances and means of grace, to be lawful ones, must be of our Lord's own instituting. Nothing can be legitimately or without offence to God invented by man, either in doctrine or discipline or worship. The Confession of Faith, however, more fully than the Catechism, sets forth the point, by introducing the word *immediately*. Sacraments are instituted immediately by the Lord himself. The apostles were all present at the time, save he who was made the substitute of Judas, and the apostle Paul, who tells us accordingly: "I received of the Lord," etc. See 1 Cor. xi. 23. There are, therefore, in the Christian Church, two ordinances which Christ himself immediately established, and not by the hands of his ministers. Here, again, the sacra-

ment differs from the word; for that was not delivered to us in full by the Lord himself, but holy men of God spake and wrote it as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

3. In the sacraments, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are *represented* to believers. All the blessings contained in the promises of the new covenant—grace here, glory hereafter—all these, and Christ himself, who is not separable from the blessings he has purchased, all these are signified and set forth to believers in these sacraments by sensible signs. The Holy Ghost uses sensible signs to set before us with especial impressiveness these great and delightful truths. These truths are addressed to our understanding, but it is through the special medium of three of our senses. Sight, touch, taste, are all employed. This is through the great condescension of the Lord, who remembers that we are of the dust—weak, grovelling, creeping, as Calvin expresses it, “creeping on the ground, and cleaving to the flesh, having no thought of the spiritual, and indeed with difficulty conceiving of it.” Because he knows and remembers that we are such, he brings down his heavenly truth to us through our very senses. And here, again, then, the sacrament differs from the word. It addresses our understanding very directly through our hearing, but the sacraments speak to us indirectly, through three of our senses at once, and two of these our grosser senses.

4. In the sacraments, Christ and his benefits are *sealed* by these signs. Here is the main idea of the sacrament, left out both by the Socinian and the Romish theories. The sacrament assures us of the promise. It is a token given to us—a token received as such by us. It is the token of a covenant personally made betwixt Christ and each believer. Thus the sacraments accord with the practice of mankind in all ages, and with the customs of human law in every country. The written contract often gets its whole force from the seal affixed to it through a mere bit of wax. A little earth and stone put into a man's hand at random, signifies nothing; but done in regular form, according to law, they give to a proprietor *seisin* and *infeoffment* of his lands.*

* See Fisher's Catechism on the Sacraments.

The sacraments, then, are not mere signs, but also seals and tokens of a covenant. This idea is exhibited in at least four places of the Scripture. *One* is Luke xxii. 20: "This cup is the new testament in my blood." Manifestly this means that the wine is for a witness of the testament—"a visible seal or security to ratify and vouch for it." *Another* is 1 Cor. xi. 27: "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." See in these words, and in the whole context, how intimate and how sacred is the connexion betwixt the bread and wine and the body and blood. Whoever misuses and profanes these symbols, misuses and profanes the Christ they set forth. And so when Christ gives us these symbols, he gives and makes over himself to us. They are not mere signs, but tokens of his covenant with us, wherein he gives and we take him for ours, and we give and he takes us to be his, in a most solemn and tender and endearing exchange. This is the idea conveyed in the passage under consideration—if the bread and wine are profaned, Christ and the awful league we make with him are profaned. A *third* passage is that wondrous discourse of our Lord in the sixth chapter of John, where he calls himself "the bread of life which came down from heaven," and says his "flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed;" and "except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you;" and that "he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him." These words clearly point to a spiritual eating and drinking, by faith, of the flesh and blood of the Son of God—a spiritual participation in his life far beyond any mere fellowship in an outward and empty symbol. It is this communion of life with Christ, this fellowship in his human nature, this sharing in Christ and the benefits of the new covenant, which the bread and wine not only signify, but seal and assure to us. And the *fourth* passage is 1 Cor. x. 16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Here is a communion assured to us betwixt Christ and ourselves—a communion of his body

and blood given for us; here is a participation and an interchange where Christ and his people give themselves to one another; here is true fellowship and unity testified and assured as well as represented. So, then, here is sealed to us a federal transaction—a solemn, saving, lasting covenant, called the “new covenant.” because it is always to remain in its prime and vigor, without the least alteration or change—a covenant that shall never be broken and never forgotten.

Here, then, is another difference between the word and the sacraments. The word is for all: “Go preach to all nations and to every creature.” “And let him that heareth say, Come.” But the sacraments are only for the believer; only to him the promise pertains, or can be sealed. Unbelievers, alas! often get a seat at the table, and receive the elements, but they get no token from Christ. All they partake of is a morsel of bread and a sup of wine, and then the condemnation of profaning Christ’s body, and the guilt of trampling under foot his blood. What is to the believer the token of a covenant—a precious assurance, a pledge unspeakably valuable of the divine and saving friendship which Jesus bears to his soul—all this to the unbeliever is just *a piece of bread*.

Yes! the sacrament differs from the word in that it presupposes a covenant which the word does not, and then it seals again and afresh that covenant betwixt the believing sinner and his Lord. At the Supper there is a visible, tangible token given him by his Saviour. It does, therefore, as an old Scotch writer says, “give us a better grip of Christ.” The method at the Supper which the Lord pursues, is something very peculiar. Each particular believer is singled out as an individual, and individually and singly gets a token from the hand of his Saviour. True, Christ is not visibly present, and the token is not directly from his hand, but indirectly it comes from him. He sends it by his commissioned minister to us individually, and individually he says to us, Take, eat; this is my body broken and my blood shed for you. Bidding us *take*, he intimates that his body is ours; bidding us *eat*, he intimates that it becomes of one substance with us; affirming that his body was broken and his blood shed *for*

us, he shows that both were not so much his as ours—he took them and he laid them down, not for his own advantage, but for our salvation. Thus the chief energy of the sacrament (as Calvin says,) consists in the words “broken for you,” “shed for you,” “for it would not be of much importance to us that the body and blood of the Lord are now distributed, had they not once been set forth for our redemption and salvation.” There is therefore an unspeakable value in such a token from the very hand of Jesus Christ! It is as if our Lord should give to us a lock of his hair for a memento and an assurance of his love. Suppose he should come into his banqueting hall and do anything of that sort to each disciple seated at the communion table! Suppose that he were actually to appear in the body and give to each his picture to wear! There would be in such an explicit and individual manifestation of his favor something inexpressibly affecting to our hearts and confirmatory of our faith. Could we ever doubt any more after that concerning our being his and he ours? And if ever a doubt concerning this point should for a moment enter our minds, would not a single glance at the Lord’s picture suffice to banish it immediately and leave us in the possession and enjoyment of the most lively and triumphant hopes? Now it is this very same thing which the Saviour does on every sacramental occasion—he gives us each a special, private, individual token of his love. Of course the preciousness of it is in its coming thus as a token from his hand; and so this common bread and this simple wine is more to us than jewels of gold. They constitute our Saviour’s seal to us, assuring us of the covenant between himself and us; that it is standing still, and that it shall forever stand. And we, poor sinners, eat and drink, and our faith grows stronger and our love is drawn out.

Now this is the reason why we want to know, whenever we go to the table of the Lord, that it is indeed his table; the Church which spreads it a true Church of his; the minister who dispenses it one of his true ministers. We cannot and will not commune with any but a true Church of Christ, but we always must and will hold fellowship with all whom we believe that He holds fellowship. It is for this reason that marks are given to us

in the Scriptures, by which we may judge whether any Church is indeed a true Church. And these marks are just two, viz., the Word held in its integrity, and the sacraments administered in their integrity; or we may reduce both these to one, and say the one mark of a true Church is that she holds the Word of God in its integrity—for the sacraments are just a form of the word. The preaching of the Word presents the truth to the ear—the administration of the sacraments presents exactly the same truth to the eye. We want to know, then, whether the Church which spreads the table is a true Church of God or not. And it is our right and our duty to judge for ourselves on this point. And we are responsible to God for the manner in which we perform this duty and exercise this right. We are to hold fellowship with all those Churches, and only those Churches, which we believe he owns as his. And their ministers all, but only their ministers, we are to acknowledge as ministers of Christ. And one reason why it much concerns us to know that the minister who gives us the elements is no intruder into the sacred vocation, and no false minister of a false and apostate Church, is just because the whole value of the token depends on its truly and really coming to us by the hand of one whom Christ hath commissioned to bring and dispense it to us.

5. In the sacraments, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are *applied* to believers; that is to say, they are “communicated, conveyed, and made over” to the believer, and are so employed by the Holy Spirit as to be most effectual means of grace to him. The Lord Jesus is brought very nigh to us in the sacraments. In the Supper we enjoy peculiarly close fellowship and very intimate communion with him. How, then, can this ordinance, as the Holy Spirit shall apply it to our understanding and conscience, fail of being a most blessed and efficacious means of grace? As often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we do shew the Lord’s death till he come—shew it to our heart, to our faith, to our love, to our zeal. We see his glory as he hangs on the cross, and are attracted by that wondrous spectacle—attracted by it more and more every time that we look. We get a clearer view of Christ, our need of salvation, and his suit-

ableness to be our Saviour. The way of salvation becomes plainer to us every time that we see his body broken and his blood shed for us. We get a firmer hold of the promises; for he gives us the token of the new covenant, and we are enabled to roll our burdens of care as well as of guilt on him. Our Lord seems nearer and dearer to us, more loving and gracious, more condescending and tender, more able and willing, and better suited to save us, as often as we meet him in the Supper. Thus we are strengthened, comforted, and refreshed whenever we enjoy this blessed privilege—this table spread for us in the wilderness; and so we set up our Ebenezer, our Stone of Remembrance, afresh, and we say, Hitherto the Lord hath helped us, and so we go on our way rejoicing. There is indeed no place on earth so much like heaven as the communion table; for there the Lord sits at the head of his own board, and the brethren all commune together, and his banner over us is love, and he says, Eat, O friends, drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved. And so we feel that the time must be near at hand when we shall meet the whole family in our Father's house on high, sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb, and have a part and a place at that table which never shall be withdrawn, and in that assembly which never shall break up.

6. Once more, let it be noticed that the sacrament is only *for believers*—only to them are Christ and the benefits of the new covenant by sensible signs represented, sealed, and applied. Accordingly, they are not a means of begetting faith, but presuppose it, and are a chief means of increasing it. The Supper is not, then, a converting ordinance, but designed to edify and comfort the Church. In the Spirit's hand, it is employed for the spiritual nourishment of those who are already living members of Christ, that they may grow in grace. And the language of our Confession of Faith is very strong, but not a whit stronger than that of Scripture, on this point. But it is a great deal stronger than the Rationalistic spirit of this age can listen to with any sort of respect. It is quite too strong, also, for the semi-Rationalism which, to a greater or less degree, infects so many of our Protestant churches. The language is: "Worthy receivers,

[that is, humble, sincere believers,] outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death; the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses:" (Chap. XXIX., § 7.) The reader will observe how this section pointedly denies consubstantiation, as the one preceding it does transubstantiation. It is still bread and wine, with their nature and properties all unchanged, of which the believer partakes, but it is bread and wine solemnly and by divine authority set apart to a holy use; that is, the use of being signs and seals or tokens of the body and blood. They are no longer then "*common*" bread and wine, but bread and wine set apart and used sacramentally, and in a certain just and proper sense, according to Scripture, *holy*. We are here and now in the region of the supernatural, where faith is able to breathe freely, but where the Rationalistic spirit cannot endure to abide. Here there is a real presence of Christ, but a spiritual and not a carnal or corporal presence. The believer really and indeed receives Christ crucified, and all the benefits of his death, when he eats the bread and drinks the wine; and he then feeds on Christ's body and blood; but it is not a corporal feeding by the mouth, but a spiritual feeding by faith. And as truly and really as the elements of bread and wine are there present to his senses, so truly and really are the body and blood of Christ present to his faith. Our correspondent may perhaps regard this language with dissatisfaction, but he cannot say that it is any more strange or hard to be understood than the four places of Scripture referred to on a preceding page. In particular, that wonderful discourse of our Lord in the sixth chapter of John, distinctly warrants, as we conceive, all that John Calvin and the Presbyterian Confession have ever said on this mysterious subject.

Having the highest confidence in the candor and sincerity of our friend, we fully expect him to admit that nothing which he

has said about "sacerdotal touches" and "humanly invested mystery" can fairly apply to the statements of our creed as it has been here set forth. If the assertion were that when we set apart the elements, some change in their nature is effected, then our creed would be amenable to the implied charge of superstition and unreasonableness. Rome makes the bread to lose its natural properties and become the actual flesh of Christ with the blood in it, so that the cup may be dispensed with. But we only *set apart* the bread and wine to the holy use of being tokens of the covenant in which Christ's flesh and blood are given for our salvation. So Rome makes water holy and uses that water in her baptisms, exorcisms, etc. Well, we do not pretend to make the water with which we baptize to be any holier in its nature than any other; but we do employ it for a holy use as the sign and seal of the most sacred and precious promises. And he would be no Presbyterian who would talk of the water of baptism as common or profane. All this we understand our friend to admit. (See page 767.) And we must suppose that his objection is not to the idea of the elements being set apart, but to their being set apart by men. "The Lord himself has *already* set the elements apart. And although no change has been wrought upon the nature of the elements, they sustain new relations and are *holy*, because used in the Christ-appointed rite." But it is the minister who must not "*ex officio* make that 'uncommon' which Christ has already sanctified." We crave then to be informed, why Paul should speak of "the cup of blessing which we bless," and why, finding fault with the manner in which the Supper was celebrated at Corinth, he should tell that church that he had received of the Lord and delivered unto them the details of the worthy or suitable administration of the Supper, all of them being modelled precisely after the method of our Saviour in his original administration.

Our correspondent says Presbyterian authority allows the Supper to be administered only once in three months. This is certainly the *custom* amongst Presbyterians, and so far the statement is correct. But our Directory of Worship (Chap. VIII., §1,) says "it is to be celebrated frequently, but how often may

be determined by the minister and eldership of each congregation as they may judge most for edification." Some imagine that familiarity would grow necessarily out of frequency, and so the efficacy of the ordinance be destroyed. There can be no doubt that this effect would follow, wherever the ordinance is misunderstood, whether in a superstitious or in a rationalistic sense. But it seems hard to conceive of any reason why this ordinance, properly conceived of and intelligibly explained in a scriptural sense, should be found any more liable to be worn out in the right use of it than prayer or praise or the reading and hearing of the word. If all is true which has been said in this paper, and which our Confession and the Scriptures teach, as to the efficaciousness of this means of grace for believers as employed by the Holy Spirit, then would it not appear that we could profitably enjoy it more frequently than four times in the year? How can the great and glorious promises which it seals to us become trite by frequent consideration of them? If we do, in the Supper, by faith feed on Christ, and are nourished and grow up into him, and have all the benefits of the new covenant applied to our hearts by the Holy Ghost for our comfort and edification, must not the celebration really be profitable to us, with God's blessing, just in proportion to the frequency of our use of it? John Calvin says, broadly, that the Romish custom which prescribes the *annual* observance of this ordinance is "an invention of the devil."* It is quite certain that in the Apostolic Church it was observed very frequently and perhaps every day, and this custom continued to prevail for ages. And Calvin holds that no meeting of the church should ever be held without the word, prayer, the supper, and alms; but that it ought to be observed once every week at least.† And the eminent James Fisher, referred to before, declares it should be often celebrated, and appeals in proof to that expression, "For as often as ye eat this bread," etc. Still further, we have heard Spurgeon (who with the open communion liberality of the English Baptists, generally invites all Christians

*Inst., Book IV., Chap. xvii, § 46.

†Inst., Book IV., Chap. xvii, § 44, § 46.

present at his Sunday services to come apart into the basement of his church after the preaching is over and partake with him of the Supper)—we have heard this eminent minister of the gospel say that, in his opinion, no church which ever adopts the plan of weekly celebrations of the ordinance and intelligently practises it, will ever abandon the custom.

We have said the Supper is not a converting ordinance, nor to be used by unbelievers. Yet unquestionably it is held up in Scripture as having claims on their respectful attendance and attention, and as being intended for their benefit likewise. "As often as ye eat this bread, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." We do certainly show it to our own conscience, but we do likewise show it to all who look on as spectators. There is a blessing in it for those who fear to turn their backs upon it, and who therefore reverently sit and look at Jesus Christ evidently set forth crucified amongst them.

Providence permitting, we shall resume this general subject in our next issue, in order to attempt an articulate statement of what really is Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, with an examination of what Drs. Cunningham and Hodge have published about it.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

History and Significance of the Sacred Tabernacle of the Hebrews. By EDWARD E. ATWATER. New York: Dodd & Mead, Publishers, 762 Broadway. 1875. Pp. 448, 8vo.

It is stated in the preface, that the author's attention was called by an instructor to the Hebrew Sanctuaries before he had completed his first year of theological study, and "thereby was determined" his "specialty." "After thirty years of work in the ministry, I retired from the pulpit to give myself wholly to a subject which a pastor can study only at intervals, and for the purpose of imparting rudimentary instruction." The fruits of the studies thus absorbing all the time and all the strength are seen in this learned, judicious, and very useful work.

Here there rises up a grave question: When a man has been ordained to preach the gospel, and has been doing it for many years, can he lawfully abandon it and go to writing a book? We answer this grave question unhesitatingly, Yes, if the Lord calls him. The Lord has often called men from the pastorate to the theological chair, or to the Foreign Missionary work, which necessitates and involves very many different kinds of ministerial labor, and frequently affords no opportunity of formal preaching in public. Who can show any right on the part of men to say that the Lord may not call a man to write and publish a book like this? Paul was serving his Master as truly and perhaps as efficiently when writing epistles as when preaching sermons. And very manifest it does appear that for this Southland Church of ours, the time has fully come when her prosperity demands the consecration of a larger portion of the time and strength and learning of her ministers to the use of the press on her behalf. It is not easy to say whether has been mightier in human history, the sword or the pen. Would that the Southern Presbyterian pen were a thousand times more active and more fruitful!

"The book is intended (says the author) especially for *clergymen*." That is a word we never like to employ, nor even to en-

counter—being both Popish and Prelatic. But taking the author's meaning, it may be asked whether it is not very proper ministerial work to instruct ministers in the history and significance of the Hebrew Sanctuaries? The Church of God is and has ever been one. The Old Testament and the New are one. Ministers might enrich their pulpit teachings greatly by lessons drawn from such a book as this. The author might serve the Church well in teaching theological students these lessons, and ministers are only such students of an older class.

The book is divided into *nine* chapters on the History of the Tabernacle, and *eighteen* on its Significance. In the former are discussed: The edifice of the Tabernacle; its furniture; its erection; its attendants; its sacrifices; its lustrations; its calendar; its migrations; its expenses. In the latter, there is a chapter on the evidence that the Tabernacle was significant, of which we shall only say that it appears full and satisfactory. Two chapters follow, setting forth how it symbolised the truths of the Mosaic revelation, and how it typified the truths of Christianity. Then comes an extremely interesting and instructive chapter on the means of interpretation. Five chapters discuss soberly and satisfactorily the symbolism of number and form; of color; of minerals [to which ought to have been added, *and of metals*]; of vegetable substances; and of animals and composite animal forms. Six chapters more set forth, by application of the principles set forth, the interpretation of the edifice, the furniture, the priesthood, the sacrifices, the lustrations, and the calendar. Then come chapter sixteen, on the prophetic symbols or types, chapter seventeen, on the extent to which the Hebrews comprehended these things, and a concluding chapter on the importance to Christians of the study of the Tabernacle.

Our author, speaking (pp. 33 and 310,) of the covering of the ark and the two cherubs on its ends, takes no notice of what Moses so expressly mentions in both the twenty-fifth and thirty-seventh chapters of Exodus, viz., that the cherubs were beaten out of the same piece which made the covering. The author says they were "of the same material" as the covering; that is, they were of gold. But Moses expressly says that they

were not only of beaten work, in distinction from being molten, but were beaten (by Egyptian or inspired skill,) out of the very same piece which made the lid. (See chap. xxxvii. 7, 8.)

On pages 84, 85, and 108-110, we have a very graphic account of the introduction by David, no doubt with divine authority, of instrumental music into the worship of the Tabernacle, thence passing into that of the Temple. Belonging to a symbolic and typical system, it would seem plain that it must be abolished, with all the other parts of that system, unless continued in use, which it was not, by the inspired apostles when they set up the Christian Church, and its more simple and spiritual ritual. In the Tabernacle and Temple worship, the instruments had an appointed place, but never in the Synagogue worship, which evidently ran back to the primal age of the Church's history, and upon which Christ and the apostles modelled Christian worship.

Four Years in Ashantee, by the Missionaries Ramseyer and Kuehne. Edited by Mrs. WEITBRECHT, with an Introduction by Rev. Dr. GRUNDERT, and Preface by Professor CHRISTLIEB, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1875. Pp. 320, 12mo.

This book tells "a wondrous story of Christian martyrdom," says Dr. Christlieb, "although the story does not end with the death of the sufferers." The Missionary Society of Basle, in Switzerland, commenced their missions in Western Africa in 1828. In 1846, a missionary station had been founded near Anum, on the river Volta, which is the eastern boundary of what is known as the Gold Coast. This portion of Africa is represented, in the excellent work of Dr. Leighton Wilson on Western Africa, as possessing as much richness and variety of natural scenery as can be found in the same compass in any other portion of the world whatever. This coast of rather more than two hundred miles in length, was almost lined with European forts, there having been as many as twenty-five in number built by the Portuguese, Danes, Dutch, Prussians, and English, mostly in the seventeenth century, for protecting the trade both in slaves and gold dust. Eleven of these are still kept up by the Dutch

and English, for the purposes of trade in palm oil, ivory, and gold dust. In the interior is the wealthy, warlike, powerful, and cruel people of the Ashantees. There were two mission stations under the Basle Society, at no great distance apart, Anum and Ho. The Ashantees invaded this region in 1869. The missionaries at Ho, Hornberger and Müller, made their escape in good time; but at Anum, Frederick Augustus Ramseyer, who had been at that station since December 29, 1868, with his wife and infant son, were made prisoners. This missionary had been on the Gold Coast since 1864, and was a native of Switzerland. Johannes Kühne, of Silesia, who had been in Africa since 1866, and had joined Ramseyer as a merchant only two weeks before, was a sharer in his captivity. They were hurried away, first to the main body of the Ashantee army, and then onward to Coomassie, the Ashantee capital, urged on by day, by their cruel keepers, through the broiling sun, travelling always on foot, Ramseyer carrying the babe, his wife and Kühne, whose health could ill endure such hardships, following on. At night they were put in chains, lest they should escape. They were captured on the 10th of June; they were inadequately supplied with food; and on the 31st of July their leader died for want of nourishment on their wretched journey. It was not till April 22d, 1870, that they reached the neighborhood of Coomassie, where two miserable grass huts were assigned them as their habitation. On the 5th of December they were removed to the mission house in Coomassie, which was occupied by Mr. Watts, a catechist, who had been nine years at that post, in the service of the Wesleyan Missionary Society. It was at this city that he came in contact with Prince Ansa, who had been educated in England, and had embraced the religion of Christ, and was an ordained missionary of the Wesleyan Methodists, who befriended the captives to the utmost of his power. But their hardships were terrible, their hopes and fears alternating; now looking for deliverance, and now filled with disappointment; at the mercy of an absolute and tyrannical king, in the midst of dreadful superstitions and shocking cruelties; when, at the death of any distinguished man, human sacrifices were offered, the executioners seizing upon men in

the street, driving a knife through their cheeks, binding their hands behind them, and urging them off to slaughter. On these occasions, at their Yam and Aday feasts, and at the annual celebrations in commemoration of the deceased ancestors of the royal family, the blood of human victims was freely shed. At the funeral festivities of Kokofu, more than two hundred human beings were sacrificed, the king beheading several with his own hand, who were held up before him, that he might not be obliged to stoop. The journal kept by these men, exhibit in a most striking manner the abominations of African paganism, and of the social and religious life of the Ashantee people. Verily, "the dark places of the earth are filled with the habitations of cruelty." We have read the book with great interest, and were exceedingly glad that when £6,480 were demanded for the ransom of the missionaries, and £1,000 had been offered by De Haes, the Dutch commander of the frigate *Wassenar*, lying before *Elmina*, which sum the king had agreed to take, the defeat of the Ashantee army, and the threatened movement of the English on *Coomassie*, induced him to send them away without ransom.

Conditions of Success in Preaching without Notes. Three Lectures delivered before the Students of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, January 13, 20, 27, 1875; with an Appendix. By RICHARD S. STORRS, D. D., LL.D., of Brooklyn, N. Y. Dodd & Mead, 762 Broadway, N. Y. Pp. 233.

These Lectures do not claim to be a systematic and elaborate treatise on the subject discussed, but were designed simply to comply with the invitation to furnish the students of Union Theological Seminary with the results of the author's own experience as to the most effective mode of preaching. The experience of such a man, extending over half a century, though expressed in free and familiar discourse, is of more value to a student than a library of elaborate theories.

It is not the author's purpose to discourage the use of manuscript sermons altogether, but rather to encourage preaching without notes, and to signalise the conditions of success in that kind

of preaching. Acknowledging that the obvious difference of temperament, habit, and mental aptitude are so great as to make the experience of one no rule for another, he says, "I have never believed it the best plan for all ministers to preach without notes. I only think it better for some." Yet he advocates it with the zeal of one who believes that among divine instrumentalities, spoken has a mightier power than written language, and therefore this method of preaching is the ideal toward which every student should patiently and earnestly struggle.

Educated for the law, at a period when the splendid eloquence of such men as Webster, Choate, and Curtis, crowded the courtroom, our author was led to observe their habit of constantly speaking without notes, and he "could not see why a minister should not do that before his congregation which lawyers were doing all the time in the Court;" and after devoting himself to the ministry, he deliberately resolved to adopt that mode of preaching. But it deserves reflection, that this bold determination was not fully carried out until he had used a manuscript for twenty years. The fetters were broken, link by link, by long and laborious practice, in the lecture-room, on the platform, in the revival meeting, and by preaching one sermon every Sabbath without notes, in the preparation of which he expended the greater part of his time and strength. The chains were not entirely cast off until, during the repairs of his church, he was driven to a public hall, where he was favored with the inspiration of large and crowded assemblies. One who has tested the methods of preaching by so long an experience ought to be qualified to speak wisely of their relative advantages, and of the conditions of success in preaching without reading a manuscript, or committing it to memory.

In the First Lecture, the author offers some general suggestions growing out of his experience. He cautions the student not to indulge the hope of saving hard work by preaching without notes. If he escapes the fatigue and confinement of writing, he incurs the equally exhausting labor of intense, concentrated mental activity required to gain a thorough mastery of his theme, and the expenditure of nerve and vital force arising from the

excitement of delivery. But this is the labor that is most abundantly rewarded. "It is," says Dr. Storrs, "under God, the converting force which quickens, sways, inspires, as thought alone can never do." To make this impression, it must be evident to the hearer that the sermon is the product of careful and thorough preparation.

Nor does this method discard the use of the pen. On the contrary, no one can preach successfully without notes, who does not write habitually, if not sermons, then essays, lectures, newspaper articles. This is essential to systematic and accurate thinking, to a discriminating use of language, to give fulness and richness to the vocabulary. "The pen is the great educator. Better give up half the library, than let the pen fall into disuse. In fact, the library will lose more than half its value unless the pen is used to represent and preserve the results of reading." The student is also reminded that, to give freedom and self-possession, it will be necessary that he should gain the entire confidence and sympathy of his hearers, by a clear understanding that he has adopted this mode of preaching, thereby removing all grounds for indifference or distrust when he appears before them without a manuscript.

Again, to avoid repetition of old trains of thought and monotony of method, the minister is advised to discharge his mind of the sermon as soon as it is preached, and take up an entirely new theme—to pass abruptly from a doctrinal to a practical, from a preceptive to a narrative discourse.

We apprehend that this counsel will not accord with the experience of many others, who, like Dr. Hall, have found great advantage, both to minister and people, in "vigorous consecutive teaching," in a connected series of discourses.

The lecture concludes with encouragements to young preachers to persevere in spite of repeated and mortifying failures. The poorest efforts of this kind often prove more fruitful than the reading of carefully prepared manuscripts. But if, after faithful trial, one finds that he can be more useful by reading his sermons, "it would be a wanton waste of time, if not a sin

against his nature, for such a man to give up his notes in the pulpit."

In the Second Lecture, the author considers the specific conditions of success. The essential prerequisite to all such success, is a deep, heartfelt conviction of the divine authority of the gospel, and its infinite importance to man—that the preacher is the herald of God's word, not a teacher of human philosophy. This will inspire him in his study, and kindle his enthusiasm in the pulpit. With this preliminary consideration, the lecturer proceeds to indicate the physical and mental, moral and spiritual elements of success. His remarks on sound, vigorous health, are deserving of serious thought by the ministers of Christ. The effect of morbid physical conditions on the mental processes is fearfully deranging and deadening, and probably one-half the bodily weaknesses and diseases under which the minister labors, are generally due to a violation of the primary laws of health with which every school-boy ought to be familiar. Surely, for the sake of Christ and immortal souls, a minister ought to use all available means to preserve the health and vigor of the body—the instrument through which the mental and moral nature work. He is responsible for all physical debility and incapacity for work which results from inattention to diet and exercise, rest and relaxation. A sound, vigorous body prepares the way for a buoyant, elastic, energetic mind, the second condition of successful preaching without a manuscript. To keep the mind up to the highest point of activity, by which it can grasp a subject strongly, and handle it easily and effectually, Dr. Storrs recommends reading and conversation. He lays great stress on rapid, attentive, studious reading, as opposed to an indolent, self-indulgent habit. And the minister who would preach effectively must "read widely: history, science, philosophy, poetry, works on law, works on art, as well as discussions in metaphysics; in fiction, read only the masters—Thackeray, Dickens, Bulwer, and Scott." Conversation will be found of great service in refreshing the mind and training it to facility in thought and expression, and as a means of acquiring ease and self-possession. Combining this habit of conversation, this

wide and rapid reading, with variety of work, the mind will be kept in such a high state of freshness and vigor as to render its action almost automatic. The fulness and intensity of the mind imparts fluency and energy to the utterance, and commands the interested attention of the audience.

In the next place, the arrangement of the sermon must be simple, natural, self-suggestive. The parts must be so articulated and connected that one point naturally suggests another. To quote the author's experience: "If there is any secret in regard to speaking without notes which I have learned, it is simply this: that the recollective forces of the mind are to be kept strictly in abeyance—not to be called on for any service—so that the spontaneous, suggestive, creative powers may have continual and unhindered play. Nothing, if possible, should be left to be recalled, at the time of speaking, by a distinct act of memory." The necessity for looking backward may be avoided by a methodical and progressive plan, securing a forward and unimpeded movement of the mind. Let the strength of preparation concentrate here in laying a sure foundation, and let there be less concern for minor details of expression and illustration. Yet the mind must "have command of sufficient subordinate trains of thought to aid it in unfolding and impressing the subject." The author here, upon this last point of the second Lecture, draws a very important distinction between voluntary and involuntary recollection. Names, dates, localities, and technicalities, are recalled only by a positive exercise of memory. But "passages in literature, historical examples, scriptural analogies, scenes in nature, or startling passages in personal experience," are readily recalled by a self-suggesting recollection. It is possible to discipline the mind to master these collateral and subordinate trains of thought and illustrations without being commanded by them. In the heat and glow of extemporaneous discourse, they will come up in their proper place without being summoned.

In the last Lecture, our author considers the moral and spiritual conditions of success.

The first is a distinct, inspiring impression of the "importance

of the particular subject on which he is to preach at that time." Every theme is not only a part of the gospel, but an important part, as having its own peculiar office to perform in quickening and renewing the soul—the very truth which God designs to use for the conversion and edification of some souls in the congregation. The minister whose mind is thus charged and absorbed with one idea, will present it with an enthusiasm and force that will impress it upon the mind of others.

And having one idea, he must have a definite end. The intellect may be aroused and excited by a doctrine or a precept presented in the form of propositions or arguments, but it requires the power and impulse of a practical aim to kindle the enthusiasm of the moral nature. Moreover, this moral purpose, as the centre of all the converging lines of argument and illustration, gives unity and steadiness to the sermon; it is an effectual antidote to a discursive habit, "the easily besetting sin of full minds," and to diffuseness of style, "a debilitating fluency." It also leads to prayer. The preacher whose soul is fired with this great moral purpose will be often in his closet.

Next, he must have in view individual hearers of his congregation. "I remember perfectly," says Dr. Storrs, "the first time I ever had any thorough sense of freedom, facility, self-forgetfulness in preaching, was when a gentleman of my parish told me that he was practically a fatalist." "When I came to preach with that concentrated aim, that intense desire and continuing purpose to reach, if possible, the one mind for which the whole sermon had been arranged, preaching was as easy as flight to the bird, or swimming to the fish." When themes are thus made the means of reaching men, the heart of the preacher is drawn out in tender, loving interest towards personal souls. And the contemplation of persons instead of mere subjects, will impart an endless variety to preaching, for his hearers are composed of individuals of all classes, in all sorts of relations.

If space permitted, we would be glad to quote the eloquent paragraphs in which the author sets forth the "immense consequences which may depend on a full and faithful presentation of the truth." The preacher draws his lessons and motives not

from history or law, ethics or philosophy, but from infinite and eternal realities. He works under circumstances the most favorable, in the sanctuary, and upon the Sabbath day. He often addresses men who have reached critical moments in their moral history which may never return again. The thought is as inspiring and ennobling, as it is solemn and awful. It is fitted to make one ashamed of sensational tricks, and studied eccentricities, as well to excite a wholesome fear of offending God, or imperilling the souls of his hearers. It would also rouse the preacher from indolence and sloth. He dares not trifle with God's word and perishing souls by careless and hasty utterances.

Another essential element of success is "a sense of the personal presence of the Master." He is always one of our hearers. The thought of his presence is enough to make the preacher fearless of the opinions of men; to keep him from secularising the pulpit by literary and scientific discussions; to inspire him with genuine enthusiasm, and fill him with exceeding joy in his work.

And, finally, having done his best, let the minister be careless of criticism and expect success. If criticism be unjust, he ought to disregard it; if just, to profit by it, and correct his faults.

Success is certain in the end, and should be the object of a bright and glowing hope. Without this confident expectation, little success will be achieved. They are "always abounding in the work of the Lord," who believe and expect that "their labor will not be in vain in the Lord."

The Lectures are themselves fine specimens of preaching without writing and without notes. Few, perhaps, can hope to attain equal success with this master-spirit. But it is encouraging to hear him saying, "Whatever I have done in this direction has been only the result of continuous effort, and anybody else who wishes to do it, and is willing to *work for it*, can do as much."

The Appendix is a series of elegant and pithy extracts from great authors, illustrating and confirming some of the points discussed in the Lectures.

The Case of Tilton vs. Beecher. AUSTIN ABBOT, Editor. Published by Geo. W. Smith & Co., New York. 4 Vols., 8vo. Legal calf, pp. 829 each.

The Yankees boast of being the greatest people in the world. They not only have great cities, great prairies, great mountains, and great rivers; but they have had the greatest humbugs, the biggest defalcations, and the "biggest rebellion." To complete the measure of their greatness, it was necessary now to have the biggest scandal in the world. Not satisfied with flooding the country with the odious details of the suit named, by their newspapers, they now offer us an exhaustive report of the whole testimony and argument in the case in four or five ponderous volumes; which aim to veil the loathsomeness of the whole subject under the respectability of "legal calf."

The fact that this tedious mass of infamy has found so many readers, is one of the most mournful symptoms of the tendency of American morals towards final putrescence. Were the public pulse healthy, this species of reading would be as completely banished from the current literature, as its topic is from the social intercourse of decent society. But, under shallow pretences, the publishers present it as a department of intelligence legitimately demanding circulation at their hands; and decent persons, and even Christians, profess to think that they are acquiring information, or "studying law," by defiling their minds with the narrative. Against all this we can but protest with a mournful earnestness. There appears not a particle of doubt, that the mischief wrought upon the morals of the American people by the circulation of this history will be greater than all the good Mr. Beecher could accomplish, were he the man of God his blindest admirers think him. It has been his destiny, after doing more than any other man to debauch the theology and the piety of his people, to become equally potent as an occasion, at least, to debauch their social morals. If the people were wise, they would hurl every newspaper containing such materials from their houses as a nuisance; and would leave resting upon the heads of this editor and these publishers, what we suppose would be

the penalty at once most appropriate to their natures and severe to their apprehension—the whole mass of an unsold and unsaleable edition.

Douglass Series of Christian Greek and Latin Writers.

1. *Latin Hymns with English Notes. For use in Schools and Colleges.* By F. A. MARCH, LL.D., Professor of Comparative Philology in Lafayette College. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1874. Pp. 333, 12mo.
2. *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius. The First Book and Selections. Edited for Schools and Colleges by F. A. MARCH, LL.D.* With an introduction by A. BALLARD, D. D., Professor of Christian Greek and Latin in Lafayette College, and Explanatory Notes by W. B. OWEN, A. M., Adjunct Professor of Christian Greek. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1874. Pp. 279, 12mo.

This series owes its origin to an endowment by Mr. Benjamin Douglass for the study of these authors in Lafayette College. The idea seems to be to substitute such writings for the heathen classics. Tertullian and Athenagoras will follow Eusebius; and should the series find welcome, Augustine, Cyprian, Lactantius, Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, and others, will be published. Dr. Ballard's estimate of Eusebius is far higher than ours; but we are glad to have the taste for Christian Greek and Latin cultivated and encouraged.

We think the "Latin Hymns" especially will be heartily welcomed by our readers. The collection here presented contains many of the finest of the ancient and mediæval hymns, whose influence can be traced through all modern hymnology. Mr. Douglass has performed a thankworthy service in causing the collection to be made, and presented to the American public; so that in a single small volume may be found those grand productions which Christian scholars wish to have in convenient form in their libraries, but which it has hitherto cost much research and labor in ransacking the pages of rare books to enjoy.

As to the main design of the series—that it may be used in schools and colleges instead of the heathen classics—we do not hesitate to express the opinion that it will not be accomplished to any great extent. The volumes now employed in training and cultivating the minds of our youth, have been selected by the taste and experience of ages, as best adapted to the end in view, and cannot be easily set aside. And just as the Latin and Greek languages, as instruments of culture, cannot be replaced by French and German, so the polished productions of ancient heathen classical writers cannot be replaced by the ruder works of a later age, even though they are superior in moral qualities.

But while we do not expect—and indeed do not desire—to see Mr. Douglass's main design accomplished, we hope he may feel encouraged to go forward in causing the publication of the other Christian classics belonging to the proposed series; that they may thus become more accessible to Christian scholars throughout the land.

Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, while engaged in preparing their Directory for Church Government, Confession of Faith, and Catechisms. (November, 1644, to March, 1649.) *From Transcripts of the originals procured by a Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.* Edited for the Committee by the Rev. ALEXANDER F. MITCHELL, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of St. Andrew's, and the Rev. JOHN STRUTHERS, LL. D., Minister of Prestonpans. William Blackwood & Sons. Edinburgh and London. 1874. Pp. 556, 8vo.

The manuscript Minutes of the Assembly of Divines (of which the present volume is a portion) have been transcribed for the Church of Scotland, and it is by the desire of their Assembly that this portion of them has been printed and published. The originals are in the custody of the Trustees of Dr. Williams's Library, lately removed to Grafton Street, Fitzroy Square, London. They are supposed to have been included in the rare and valuable collection of Dr. William Bates, which was purchased by Dr. Williams for his Library. They consist of three

volumes of not quite equal sized foolscap folio, plainly bound in a style which was common in the latter half of the last century. Competent judges pronounce these Minutes to be almost entirely in the handwriting of Adoniram Byfield, one of the Scribes of the Assembly.

The Westminster Assembly was opened with a sermon by the prolocutor, Dr. Twisse, on Saturday, the 1st of July, 1643. Down to the 18th November, 1644, they had held 323 Sessions. It is with the 324th Session this printed volume begins, and it runs to the close of the Sessions proper, namely, to the 1163rd Session, Feb. 22nd, 1648-9. Thus these Minutes, given now to the public, are chiefly occupied with the Doctrinal Standards of the Assembly. Their main discussions respecting the polity and worship of the Church yet remain to be published, and are to be found in the first two of the three manuscript volumes spoken of above. Whether the Church of Scotland will have these earlier Minutes also published, remains to be seen. Professor Mitchell himself proposes to give to the public, "along with other documents relating to the Westminster Assembly," the Act calling the Assembly, brief biographical notices of the members, and a careful collection of the earlier editions of the Confession.

It is well known that the Westminster Assembly was a body of Divines entitled to far more weight on questions of doctrine than of order. A few of them were Episcopalians who early ceased their attendance; a small number of them, but very able and learned and zealous, were Independents; the mass of them were nominally Presbyterians, but they had been prelatically educated and prelatically ordained, and they were not very thoroughly impregnated with the Scotch or Genevan ideas of church polity. It was left for the Commissioners present from the Church of Scotland—Henderson, Rutherford, Gillespie, and Baillie—to maintain the true doctrine of Church Government, as they did, the Independents disputing inch by inch with them for all the ground passed over. The result was that the standards were a *compromise* as to Church Government. But on the other hand, all the members of the body were not only strongly Calvinistic in their views of theology, but many of them prover-

bially learned divines, so that the doctrinal standards give forth no uncertain sound. Nevertheless we should be happy to see the earlier Minutes in print. They would probably shed some light on the points in dispute between the Independents and ourselves.

Gillespie's Notes and Lightfoot's Journal of the Westminster Assembly are in print, and known to all students. Dr. Thomas Goodwin wrote fourteen or fifteen octavo volumes of notes on this famous body of divines, which have never been published. These Minutes proceeding from an official person ought to possess the very highest value.

A learned, able, and very modest introduction, by Professor Mitchell, occupies the first seventy pages of this volume. He discusses the Westminster Theology with special reference to a paper on "The Westminster Confession of Faith, and Scotch Theology," by the Rev. A. M. Fairbairn, which appeared in the *Contemporary Review* some two years ago. Professor Mitchell defends the Assembly against a variety of disparaging criticisms by this writer. It is a matter of regret that we have not space to give a full account of the defence. One quotation must be made: "Still more does it become us to decline all tampering with it. It will be time enough to think of change when a school of theologians of riper scholarship and more patient study, of higher culture and deeper piety, shall arise among us—not content to pick up their opinions even on minor matters at second hand, but qualified by acquaintance with the writings of these old divines and their true-hearted successors to do them full justice."