

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

Vol. XXXIII.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXXII.

No. 1.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. PROFESSOR W. ROBERTSON SMITH. By the Rev. R. L. DABNEY, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Union Theological Seminary, Va.,	1
II. THE CANONICITY OF SECOND PETER. By the Rev. BENJ. B. WARFIELD, D. D., Professor in Allegheny Theological Seminary, Pa.,	45
III. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON. By the Rev. SAMUEL M. SMITH, Washington, N. C.,	76
IV. REV. DR. F. P. MULLALLY'S REPLY TO THE REV. J. A. QUARLES. By the Rev. F. P. MULLALLY, D. D., Lexington, Va.,	105
V. OUR BROTHER IN BLACK. By the Rev. Professor D. C. RANKIN, Tuscaloosa, Ala.,	114
VI. PRELATIC ASSUMPTIONS. By the Rev. JAMES A. WADDELL, Talleyville, Va.,	126
VII. THE LAW-GIVING AT JERUSALEM. By the Rev. A. W. CLISBY, Macon, Ga.,	146
VIII. THE DIACONATE AGAIN. By the Rev. JOHN L. GIRARDEAU, D. D., LL.D., Professor in Columbia Theological Seminary,	175
VII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	209

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1882.

With the address of each subscriber, we now print the date of the last number for which he has paid. For example, those who have paid in full for the current volume—Vol. XXXIII.—will find after their names, “Oct. '82,” which means that they have paid for the October number of 1882, and of course for all preceding it. If any one has paid for all past volumes, and one dollar on XXXIII., he will find “Jan.” or “Jny, '81 and 25c. ;” which means that he has paid for the January number of 1882, and 25 cents on the April number. And so in other cases.

Those who have not paid for the current volume will confer a favor by forwarding the amount due to JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C.

In compliance with the wishes of many friends, it is announced that hereafter, *as a general rule*, the names of writers for this REVIEW will be attached to their articles, and the initials of each to the critical notices.

The REVIEW will continue to be, as it has always been, an open journal, favoring free discussion within limits. More than ever it is desired to make it a representative of our whole Church, as its name imports, and a faithful exponent of the Calvinistic Theology and the Presbyterian Polity.

Communications for its pages may be addressed to JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C., or to ROBERT L. DABNEY, Hampden Sidney, Virginia, or to JOHN B. ADGER, Pendleton, South Carolina.

A more generous support by Southern Presbyterians would enable the proprietor to make the work more worthy of its name.

[Entered at the Post-Office at Columbia, S. C., as second-class postal matter.]

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

—♦♦♦—
VOLUME XXXIII.
—♦♦♦—

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

1882.

THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Professor W. Robertson Smith. By the Rev. Dr. R. L. Dabney,	1
The Canonicity of Second Peter. By the Rev. Dr. Benjamin B. Warfield,	45
Frederick W. Robertson. By the Rev. Samuel M. Smith,	76
Rev. Dr. F. P. Mullally's Reply to the Rev. J. A. Quarles. By the Rev. Dr. F. P. Mullally,	105
Our Brother in Black. By the Rev. Professor D. C. Rankin,	114
Prelatic Assumptions. By the Rev. James A. Waddell,	126
The Law-giving at Jerusalem. By the Rev. A. W. Clisby,	146
The Diaconate Again. By the Rev. Dr. J. L. Girardeau,	175
Home Missions—how shall they be conducted? By the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson,	219
A Memorial of the Life and Labors of the Rev. Stuart Robinson. By the Rev. Dr. Thomas E. Peck,	237
Presbyterian Government not a Hierarchy, but a Commonwealth. By the late Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge,	258
The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government,	290
The New Theory of the Ministry,	313
The Report of the last Assembly on the Office of Evangelist. By the Rev. D. E. Jordan,	333
The Presbyterian Diaconate Again. By the Rev. Dr. J. A. Lefevre,	346
The Diaconate of Scripture Again. By the Rev. Dr. J. A. Lefevre,	359
Why was Jesus Baptized? By the Rev. Herbert H. Hawes,	369
The Reviewer Reviewed. By the Rev. S. T. Martin,	386
The Christ of John. By the Rev. Dr. L. G. Barbour,	439
Presbyterian Ordination not a Charm, but an act of Government. By the late Rev. Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge,	463
Man's Sympathy with Man, and the Means of Grace. By the Rev. Dr. Francis P. Mullally,	519
Dr. Thornwell and our Church Policy. By the Rev. Dr. J. A. Quarles,	531
A Brief Reply to Dr. Wilson on our Home Missions. By the Rev. Dr. John B. Adger,	545
The General Assembly of 1882. By the Rev. Dr. W. E. Boggs,	553
An Apostolic Missionary in China. By Agnes M. Machar. From the <i>Catholic Presbyterian</i> ,	601
The Lord's Day, and not the Jewish Sabbath. By the late Rev. John Beveridge,	614

MAY 8 1939
 BOARD JUL 13 1939
 The University of Texas

453993

	PAGE
An Inquiry into the Aggressiveness of Presbyterianism, . . .	647
The Power of Woman. By the Rev. Dr. F. P. Mullally, . . .	689
What were the Cherubim? By the Rev. R. K. Moseley, . . .	702
A Call to the Ministry. By the Rev. Dr. Jno. B. Adger, . . .	725
Documentary History of the Assembly of 1837. By the Rev. Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge,	747
CRITICAL NOTICES:	
The Great Baptizer. A Bible History of Baptism, 413. The Truth at Last. History Corrected. Reminiscences of Old John Brown, with full details of the Pottawattamie Massacre, etc., etc., 415. A History of Presbyterianism in New England; its Introduction, Growth, Decay, Revival, and Present Mission, 419. A Scriptural Argument. Infant Baptism in a Nut Shell, 422. The Newer Criticism and the Analogy of the Faith: A Reply to Lectures by W. Robertson Smith, M. A., on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 423. Bible Terminology relative to the Future Life. An Enquiry into the meaning of the principal Scriptural terms touching the Nature and Destiny of Man, 424. The Priest, the Woman, and the Confessional, 425. A History of Rowan County, North Carolina, containing Sketches of Prominent Families and Distinguished Men, with an Appendix, 426. The Parables of Jesus, 426. Mottoes for the New Year, as given in Texts of Sermons Preached in the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, 427.	
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	209, 428, 591, 781

THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXXII.

ARTICLE I.

PROFESSOR W. ROBERTSON SMITH.

The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. Twelve Lectures on Biblical Criticism. By W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M. A., New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1 Vol., 12mo., pp. 300.

Four years ago the author, an Assembly's Professor in the Free Church Theological College at Aberdeen, startled us by contributing to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* an article on the "The Bible," which attacked the validity of the Old Testament canon, as held by the standards of his own Church. Discipline was attempted; but legal quibbles delayed it for three years; until, in May, 1880, the charges against him came to be issued by his General Assembly, through reference from his Presbytery and Synod. Instead of trying the charges judicially, the Assembly, in its forbearance, patched up a compromise with him and his numerous supporters, in which it condoned his past offence, continuing him in his professorship over its candidates for the ministry, and in its honors and emoluments; and he accepted a public admonition and gave a pledge not again to disturb the faith and peace of the Church by such speculations. It is true that his pledge was given in very diplomatic terms, and was meant in a very "Pickwickian" sense. But it was accepted. The members of the Assembly had,

however, hardly reached their homes, when another volume of the *Encyclopædia* appeared, with a critical article from Prof. Smith worse than the first. It had been in the printer's hands at the very time he was giving his pledge of good behavior and receiving the generous forgiveness of his judges. Yet his conscience permitted his suppressing all allusion to it at that juncture! The best excuse stated was, that he bethought himself that it would then be too late to recall the article, without inconvenience to the publisher. Of course this new assault roused the mind of the friends of truth with amazement, grief, and just indignation. The Assembly's commission was called together, the spontaneous attendance of members making it almost as numerous as the body itself, and after another session in autumn, Prof. Smith was deprived of his right to teach the Assembly's students, on a new charge framed against him. It is not our purpose to discuss or defend the regularity of the Assembly's process against him. It should be noted, however, that it did not attempt to usurp his Presbytery's powers of original jurisdiction, by passing any sentence of suspension from the ministry; it only claimed the power to control his teaching-functions in its own theological school, which functions he had derived immediately from the Assembly.

Far more gravity is to be attached to the following which he gained from numerous ministers of the Free Church and more numerous divinity students, than to the case itself. These favorers sustained his errors with heat; and during the discussions of the Assembly, by methods which we should regard as flagrant and indecent outrages on parliamentary order. They chose to adopt Mr. Smith's assumption, that the sacred cause of free thought, scholarship, and free conscience, were assailed in his person. It is the currency of this unsavory delusion which is most ominous. The distinction between the sacred cause of freedom of mind, and the impudent claim to hold a given association's pay and appointment, while attacking the very doctrines that association was formed to uphold, is so broad that only a very deep and inflamed hatred of sound doctrine would seem adequate to blind Presbyterians to so clear a thought. But the charges were hotly hurled at those who were simply unwilling that Mr. Smith should use

the Assembly's own place and money to pull down the Assembly's own principles, that they were Middle Age reactionists, enemies of scholarly progress, repressors of free thought, persecutors. Now, to the honest plain mind, all this appears as though, when Mr. Jefferson Davis was indicted for treason and Mr. Charles O'Connor had voluntarily assumed the place of his counsel, the latter should have chosen to adopt the newly found heresy of the victor's sycophants making his client a traitor, in the teeth of the constitutional and historical doctrine which justified him, and which Mr. O'Connor perfectly knew he was engaged to defend, he still holding fast to Mr. Davis's promised fees and the name and place of his counsel. And it is as though when Mr. Davis and his friends demurred, the lawyer had charged him as a persecutor and as the enemy of the progress of legal science! Now, in the fictitious case supposed, any mind above idiocy would be competent to answer, that, if Mr. O'Connor supposed it due to his liberty of thought, and to the advancement of legal science, to support the heresy newly invented by the courtiers of the triumphant brute-force, his plain course would be first to surrender his place and his fee as Mr. Davis's defender. Our parable is just. No fair man doubts but that the Confession of the Free Church, Chap. I., § 2, means to assert what Mr. Smith distinctly impugned, touching the Old Testament canon. It is no new thing, indeed, in Church History, to find the advocates of latitudinarian views raising this false issue. None the less is it an ominous symptom that Free Church Presbyterians in such numbers should adopt a strategy so perverse in logic, and so marked by moral obliquity.

The author tells us, that, after his removal from his chair, "six hundred prominent Free Churchmen" in Edinburgh and Glasgow requested him to defend his views. This he did in the twelve lectures, delivered in both cities, to audiences averaging, he says, eighteen hundred hearers. These lectures, afterwards prepared for printing, with notes, compose the present volume. It is now republished in this country for popular circulation, by at least two publishers; and its adroit poisons are dished up for "consumption by the million," in a "Seaside Library" edition, at the price of twenty cents.

The object of the Lectures is, to disparage as much as possible the genuineness, antiquity, and authority of extensive parts of our Old Testament. To do this, the loose and rash methods of the most sceptical school of criticism are freely employed. But a worse trait is, that the sounder criticism is usually disregarded, and treated as non-existent. In the language of Mr. Smith, to oppose his perverse and groundless methods is to condemn "biblical science" and biblical criticism. Reluctance to follow the rash leadership of his virtually infidel guides is either indolence or ignorance. As a specimen of this arrogance, let the reader take his last paragraph: "*To the indolent theologian*, the necessity of distinguishing . . . is unwelcome." The failure to adopt Mr. Smith's groundless distinctions condemns as "indolent," a Calvin, a Bengel, a Michaelis, a Lowth, a J. A. Alexander! Well! All the mental activity and scholarship are tacitly assumed to be on his side; on the side of those who dissent, are only stolid and lazy reliance on prescription, and obstinate prejudice. The reader will find this quiet but intensified insolence pervading the whole. Of course, every scholar knows that this saucy strain is not the trait of true learning. Nor is the mode of tactics ingenuous. Unless Mr. Smith is a very shallow young man indeed, he knows that there is more than one school of criticism and that those schools which disallow his critical conclusions on the most thorough and learned grounds, have able and well-informed supporters. He knows that the divines in his own Church who condemn him, are not opposed to "biblical science," or to the "historical study" of the canon, and do not hold its authority on mere tradition. He knows that they fully hold that man is not bound to accept a book as a rule of faith, with the Papist's implicit faith; that the valid claims of the canonical books are to be established by an honest critical process; that they employ and value this criticism. Only they will not follow his criticism, because it is uncritical. His trick of attack is no more respectable than that of the quack, who declaims against sensible people declining to poison their families with his *nostrums*, that they oppose the science of medicine. They oppose his empiricism, because it is not science.

A second general criticism which we urge is, that Mr. Smith, turning his back on a sounder and more learned school of critics, gives his almost exclusive allegiance to that European school whose foundation maxim is, that the true critic must admit neither the possibility of the supernatural nor of inspiration—taken in the Church's sense. The names oftenest in his mouth are of such men as Graf, and Wellhausen, of Germany, and Kuenen, of Holland, these recent and extreme advocates of this infidel theory. But any one can see, that if God has indeed given his Church a true inspiration and supernatural helps, and has meant his Bible to record such gifts, then the expositor who sets out to explain the Bible from the prime assumption that such gifts cannot possibly exist, must infallibly go amiss. Now, if Mr. Smith will announce himself openly an unbeliever, he can consistently adopt the system of these unbelievers. But he tries to use their system, while still professing to recognise inspiration and the supernatural. With such a method, confusion and error are inevitable.

A third general objection to his work is, that the author utters at least an "uncertain sound" as to the nature of inspiration itself. He says many handsome things about it. But in many places he seems to hold that conception of what inspiration is, known in Scotland and America as "the Morell Theory." That inspiration is only such views of truth as the soul attains by the exaltation of its religious consciousness; so that the difference between the declarations of an Isaiah and a Whitefield is not generic, but only a difference of degree. It is true, that in Lecture X., when speaking of the Hebrew prophets, he defines their inspiration correctly. But he then betrays the sound doctrine by saying that under the "new covenant the prophetic consecration is extended to all Israel, and the function of the teacher ceases because all Israel shall stand in the circle of Jehovah's intimates." (He had just described the prophets, as under the old, constituting that "circle.") That is to say: the reason why the Church has no prophets or apostles now, is, that all regenerate people are inspired generically as Isaiah and Paul were. So, in Lecture I., near the end, the same extreme and vicious system of exposition is asserted, which we briefly showed, at the close of Article IV. of our April

No., 1881, to be virtually exclusive of real inspiration. This theory claims, not only that the Holy Ghost, in moving holy men of old to speak, employed their human faculties and knowledge as instruments; not only that we should throw all the light archæology can derive from the human use of language in their days, on the exegesis of their words; but also, that the inspired man's propositions are to be construed in accordance with the inspired code of opinions, which, archæology tells us, he presumably found in and imbibed from his contemporaries. Says Mr. Smith: We are "always to keep our eye fixed on his historical position, realising the fact that he wrote out of the experience of his own life, and from the standpoint of his own time."

Now we object, first, that this travesty of the enlightened theory of archæologic exegesis is false to the facts. It is usually the grand characteristic of prophets and apostles, that they did not teach divine truth "from the standpoint of their own times," but exactly opposite thereto. Paul was a Pharisee by rearing, and wrote among and for Pharisees. But his whole doctrine of the law and justification is precisely contra-Pharisaic. We object, secondly, that this theory might, at any stage in the function, make it impossible for the man to be the channel of divine truth. Only let the "standpoint" of him and his contemporaries be contradictory to that of the Holy Ghost, as all human "standpoints" have usually been, on vital subjects, then on this scheme, he *could not* write the mind of the Spirit. It could not be transmitted to his readers through such a *medium*, without fatal discoloration. And lastly, a system of doctrines thus transmitted, could never enable us to discriminate the fallible human coloring from the infallible divine light—the very result which Mr. Smith's rationalistic friends are seeking.

This book may be justly described as *thoroughly untrustworthy*. The careful reader can hardly trust the author in a single paragraph. Citations are warped, history misrepresented, other theologians' views adroitly travestied, half truths advanced for whole ones. All is dogmatic assertion. In the construing of Scripture statements, the author, as if he were the critical Pope, discards expositions which do not suit his purpose, however well

supported by critical learning and the greatest names, without giving reasons for his decrees. His readers have not a hint that the soundest biblical learning has rejected his views, and that on conclusive grounds. Everything which does not please him is absolutely uncritical; so much so as, in the majority of cases, to deserve no refutation, nor even mention. Must the well-informed reader explain this as a disingenuous and wilful *suppressio veri*, or as ignorance? It is more charitable to him to surmise that, with all his affectation of mastery of modern critical science, his knowledge is really shallow and one-sided, and that he has fallen under the blinding influence of his leaders. The charitable reader may think this judgment severe. If he afflicts himself, as we have done, with a careful study of his book, he will conclude that the verdict is just, and even forbearing. He will reach the same conclusion if he will ponder our specific criticisms.

The erroneous points made by the book are so multitudinous that, if all were thoroughly handled, a still larger book must be written. Our aim will be to give a general outline of the main *theses* advanced, so as to put our readers in possession of the drift of the work; and to test these *theses* in some of the points supporting them, so as to give fair specimens of the author's method.

The positions taken seem to aim at three leading ends:

1. To disparage the antiquity and accuracy of that established text of the Hebrew Scriptures, known as the Masoretic Text, from which all our Bibles are printed.

2. To throw as much uncertainty as possible over the authorship of the Psalms, to assign a recent date to as many of them as possible, and to bring down their compilation below the ages of Old Testament inspiration.

3. To convict the Pentateuch of manifold and extensive interpolations, many centuries after its professed date, and to deny the Mosaic authorship of nearly the whole law.

1. Mr. Smith concedes to the great Reformers a correct conception of the task of biblical criticism, taking good care to travesty their view, in part, as he delineates it; but he thinks that

their almost exclusive dependence, unavoidable in their case, on Rabbinical scholars for a Hebrew text, led them to confide entirely too much in the Masoretic recension. He does not believe that the valuable series of critics and editors (beginning with Ezra), called by the Rabbins the "Great Synagogue," ever had a particle of existence as such. Nor does he seem to be certain whether Ezra himself ever did anything important for the correction and preservation of the Hebrew text. Noting the fact that the oldest known MSS. of the Masoretic text date several centuries after the Christian era, he regards the admirable and accurate correspondence of nearly all their readings as ground of suspicion. Dr. Kennicott, for instance, after many collations, found the variations very trifling and few. Mr. Smith wishes to know why they are not as numerous as between Greek MSS. of the New Testament. He concludes from this very sign of accuracy, that there has been foul play; that the Masorites, when making their recension and affixing their points (vowel and accent), arbitrarily selected a *codex* from among many varying ones, which suited their own ritualistic views, published that, and burned up all the others! And for this marvellous *hypothesis* he thinks he has historical evidence—that of the Septuagint translation!—for it varies very much, in some places, from the Masoretic text. When he examines a number of these variations, he is convinced that there are internal critical marks that the copy followed by the Seventy was the correct one. Their omissions, he thinks, make the narrative much more coherent. Their transpositions, which are in some places extensive, leave the contents of the prophet in a far more natural order. We cite the instance which Mr. Smith seems to regard as most conclusive, from 1 Samuel, xvii. to xviii. 5. The reader is requested to place the passage before him. He will see that the narrative represents David as a favored resident of Saul's court, and his honorary armor-bearer; that still, when the war with Philistia comes on, David is not a soldier; that when he comes to the camp as a shepherd-youth, his elder brother, Eliab, treats him with disdainful petulance, notwithstanding David's favorable standing at court; that when he appears before Saul as Goliath's victor, neither Saul nor Abner recognise his

parentage. This story, says Mr. Smith, "presents inextricable difficulties." "Every one has been puzzled by these apparent contradictions." But when we turn to the Septuagint, we find that it omits verses 12 to 31, and verses 55 to xviii. 5. This omission leaves the narrative clear of the difficulties. It is therefore the true original text; and the Hebrew text is largely corrupted. So would Mr. Smith conclude.

Now, we begin our reply by saying, that "every one" has not been puzzled, or "found an inextricable difficulty" in the narrative of the Hebrew text. Not to mention such sound old expositors as Gill, Henry, Scott, who see no contradiction whatever, the following, including learned Germans, concur; Chandler, Wordsworth, Houbigant, Keil, Hävernicks, Saurin, Toy, Broadus. And the great mass of intelligent readers doubtless have concurred with them in thinking that the narrative is perfectly authentic, and all its parts consistent with the facts and with each other, whether they had the exact clue to their explanation or not. *Next*, the reader must be advertised that *other old codices of the Septuagint do not omit the parts* which Mr. Smith dislikes. The Vatican Codex does; which, it seems, he chooses to follow. The Alexandrine Codex corresponds exactly with the Hebrew throughout the passage. The Tischendorf and the other uncial MSS. bear no witness in the case, because they lack the books of Samuel. The Complutensian edition, printed from Spanish MSS., also contains all that the Hebrew contains. So that Mr. Smith has the authority of only one MS. even of the Septuagint for omitting the verses. Is it not a little singular that *he suppresses this material fact?* Nor do all good critics concur with him in preferring the Vatican MS. as the most accurate. Vossius condemned it as the worst of all; Prideaux, with many others, preferred the Alexandrine MS. *Thirdly*. Mr. Smith, with his preferred "higher" critics, forgets a very obvious reflection, that were there glaring discrepancies, the sacred writer would have been fully as able to see and appreciate them as the rationalists are. Hence, on the theory that the difficulties are there, the most reasonable supposition is that the writer, being strictly honest, felt constrained to tell his story as he has, not-

withstanding the foresight of readers' difficulties about it, simply because such were the facts; that the reason why he did not pare and trim his narrative, as one codex of the Septuagint does, was, that Saul and Abner really did express, or else feign, an ignorance of David's parentage, whether we can explain why they did so, or cannot. *Fourthly.* Josephus, a Greek-speaking and Septuagint-reading Jew, still gives the narrative as the Hebrew text does. *Fifthly.* The fact that David was not recognised by Saul, either when he presented himself—verses 32 to 39—to ask leave to take up Goliath's challenge (where the narrative does not decide whether he was recognised), or when, verses 58, etc., he returned with the giant's head in his hand, would involve no serious difficulty, when compared with xvi. 19, etc. For either one of several natural and reasonable hypotheses removes the difficulty. It may have been that Saul's ignorance of David was wholly affected; because the king's capricious and insanely jealous temper makes it wholly probable that David's triumph had already roused the envy, of which we read a few hours later; and that it took, at first, the disdainful form of this ironical affectation. "What obscure stripling is this, who presumes thus to outshine us all?" This irony, Abner, courtier-like, would be prone to imitate with a shrug equally disdainful. Or, it is easy to believe that Saul honestly did not recognise David. When he ministered at court, we may be sure that the proud mother had arrayed her darling in his best "Sunday-clothes"; now, he appeared travel-soiled and unkempt, in his coarse shepherd's coat. His ministry had been very irregular and short at court; and his enrolment among Saul's numerous honorary or titular armor-bearers implied by no means any intimate or long service; for the relations of his forces to the king were those of a mere militia. It must be remembered that, for all the history teaches us, many months, or even two or more years, may have elapsed between David's return from court and this war. When, in addition, we remember that, during the time of David's residence with Saul, he was of unsound mind, there appears nothing difficult in the fact that Saul failed to recognise the young volunteer. Another hypothesis is tenable: that David was recognised, but that his parentage was forgotten. What

more natural than that Saul, after he saw that he stood pledged to marry his daughter (verse 25) to the young victor, should desire to know all about his lineage? But it must be noticed that Saul's language does not imply forgetfulness or ignorance of David, but only of his parentage: "Whose son is this youth"?

Mr. Smith also deems that Eliab's irritable taunts of David are very inconsistent with his previous court-favor! What is this species of guessing-criticism worth? It may raise a difficulty in any series of facts. What more natural and probable, than that the court-preference for David occasioned this very irritation in the stalwart elder brother, handsome, but vain and selfish? Authentic histories present many surprising features; but this feeling of Eliab is not even surprising.

In fine, one is strongly impelled to ask Mr. Smith why it is, that, supposing the narrative of the Hebrew text, so difficult of reconciliation, as compared with that of his edition of the Septuagint; he does not here apply the pet canon of the critics, "*Praestat ardua lectio*"? "The more difficult reading is to be preferred." The surmise, that the Seventy, influenced by these imaginary difficulties, tampered with the original in order to smooth the narrative, is precisely such as Mr. Smith's school of critics is wont to apply for rejecting the easier reading, when it suits their purpose. This specimen-case has been fully considered, in order that the reader may have a fair sample of the way in which our author endeavors to exalt the Septuagint over its original, by inventing imaginary objections, and advancing groundless assertions.

But now, let us address ourselves to the general merits of the assertion, that the Septuagint is to be preferred to the Masoretic text for giving us the original state of the autographs of the Prophets. The author confesses, what Keil asserts correctly, that the Protestant critics have usually been against him. And here, let the reader's attention be called to that way which Mr. Smith practises, of intimating that only the recent criticism is "scientific." One would think, from the coolness with which he sets aside the established conclusions of earlier biblical scholars, that somehow, he and his party have formed a whole world of new

critical *data*, and that they alone know how to use them scientifically. But we beg their pardon. *There are no new archæological data* to be found in this particular field. The rationalistic school have, at this point, no other materials, of which to construct a new theory, than those possessed by scholars for the last hundred and fifty years. The only difference is, that while the old critics made a sober, honest, logical use of this common stock of *data*, the "destructive" school shuffles them over and rearranges them capriciously, wilfully, illogically, to strain them into correspondence with a foregone, sceptical resolve that the Bible shall speak their philosophy. Let us take, for instance, the learning embodied in the *Prolegomena* of Bishop Walton's great Polyglot, of Prideaux, and of that illustrious school of biblical scholars in England. They surveyed the whole field of testimony as to the Septuagint. They reason from the facts gathered, in the spirit of the soundest criticism. To them, the theory that an original is to yield to a version, in the sense claimed by Mr. Smith, appeared, as it does to us, just as absurd, as that the quality of a stream should determine that of its spring.

Our author, as we have seen, thinks the very accuracy with which all known *codices* of the Masoretic text agree, is ground of the condemnation of all. He actually complains because they do not vary as much as our New Testament *codices* in Greek. Now, when a number of witnesses, testifying separately, concur with great exactness in the same story, one of two hypotheses is reasonably taken: either, they are truly well-informed and honest witnesses, and their testimony is valuable according to its harmony; or they are dishonest witnesses, whose too close harmony betrays previous collusion. But no fair mind adopts the harsher judgment without some ground of confirmation. Now, we have this undisputed fact: that the Jewish copyists and critics of their text, since the Christian era, have a great reverence for the accuracy of their holy Book; that they have adopted an exact system for ensuring accuracy of transcription; and that the faithful use of this system has actually given us, for the last thousand years, a set of *codices* almost without various readings. *Why may not the same reverence, and the same method of copying, have pro-*

duced the same happy result in the previous thousand years? History assures us that the same reverence for Scripture, and the same exact system of transcribing, prevailed before Christ. Surely modern Jews are not more trustworthy than the Jews of the ages of Malachi, Judas Maccabec, and Simon the Just. Oh, it is insinuated, the intense fondness of the scribes for their traditional *Halacha* must have tempted them to take liberties in transcribing, and to foist some of their traditions into the text. But the Rabbins of the post-Masoretic ages have been still fonder of their ritual and tradition, and yet they have not touched a letter of the text they received from the Masorites!

Again: whether the Septuagint *codices*, taken together, present a more accurate view of the autographs of the inspired men than the Masoretic *codices*, the plain reader may judge from these indisputable facts: that the Septuagint was the work of a series of Alexandrine Jews, some more than one hundred years before the others; that the origin of the versions is involved in a fog of ridiculous myths; that the versions of different books are of exceedingly various quality—some, as that of the Pentateuch, the earliest made, being very good, and others wretchedly bad; that the critics have clearly detected purposed corruptions of the text in some places: as Isaiah xix. 18, 19, was evidently twisted to support the enterprise of Onias (149 years before Christ) in building his temple at Heliopolis in Egypt, which fixes the late date of the translation of this prophet; that parts of the translations are so bad that such critics as Horne have concluded that the translators were not acquainted with the Hebrew language, and others, as Lyschen, that the *codices* used by the translators must have been the Hebrew Scriptures approximately spelled in Greek letters. The last two conclusions are not mentioned for the purpose of endorsing them, but to show how sorry the credibility of this Septuagint version appears in the eyes of men skilled in critical investigations. It is still more to the purpose to remind the reader that the state of the text of the Septuagint copies is itself too variant and corrupt, granting that the original version may have been perfect, to rely on any edition we now have, for correcting the Hebrew text. A glaring example of the uncertainty of the

Septuagint text we now have the reader has seen above. Every student of its history knows that the scrupulous care which the Hebrew scribes employed in their transcriptions, was not employed by the copyists of the Greek. Hence, by the end of the second century of our era, the state of the Septuagint text was so intolerably bad that Origen undertook to correct it by collations. His amended text he published in his "Hexapla." He was a learned, but a fanciful and untrustworthy critic. None of his copy has been extant for 1,200 years, except a few fragments copied by others. They tell us that Origen's copy was destroyed; a Pampylilian, a Lucian, and a Hesychian edition were prepared by these three editors, with the aid of Origen's emendations. And our (very clashing) *codices* of the Septuagint may be the descendants of one or another of these recensions, or some of them may be the progeny of the worthless copies which Origen condemned. And this is the standard by which our new school of critics propose to carve and expunge our Hebrew text.

The critical licentiousness of this proposal appears from other facts. The Samaritan sect had their own Pentateuch, written in characters older than the Masoretic. Between this old text and ours there are few various readings, and almost the only important one is the substitution of Gerizim for Ebal in Deut. xxvii. 4; Josh. viii. 30. But the Samaritan Pentateuch dates probably from 2 Kings xvii. 23, and, at latest, from the times of Ezra. This witness to our Hebrew Pentateuch makes it probable that the rest of our Hebrew text is equally ancient and trustworthy. The text followed by the Peschito Syriac version is unquestionably the Masoretic, and not the Septuagint. But the Syriac, if not translated in the first century, as some foremost scholars judge, was unquestionably made early in the second. This was *before the Masorites had done* that work of collation, which is so suspected by Mr. Smith. The accuracy of the old Syriac version is impregnable; all who have examined it testify to it. It is also nearly literal, rendering the Hebrew word for word, which the close idiomatic likeness of the language, the West Aramaic, enabled the writers to do, as the heterogeneous idiom of the Greek did not permit. Again, we have every reason to believe that the *Vetus Itala*,

the Latin version made before the Masoretic revisal, followed our Hebrew text, and not the Septuagint; as does also Jerome's Latin version, the Vulgate. Once more: the version of Aquila, also made before the completion of the Masoretic revisals, is almost perfectly literal; and this also follows our Hebrew, as against the Septuagint text. The reader will find a characteristic specimen of the logic of the "higher criticism" in the modes by which Mr. Smith tries to break the fatal force of this witness. First, he assumes, without proof, that the literary demand among learned Jews of the second century for another Greek version than that of the Seventy arose, not out of the great corruptions of their Septuagint copies—its obvious cause—but that it arose out of a purpose to change and shape an Old Testament text to suit the new and growing Rabbinical traditions. Hence, he suggests, Aquila was put forth to publish his pretended literal version. Our answer is, to challenge Mr. Smith to adduce one single *clear instance* in which Aquila has changed a Septuagint translation in the interests of Rabbinism. Apparently mistrusting this plea, he then intimates another, which is, that the resemblance of the names *Onkelos*, *Aquilas*, betrays that this pretended work of Aquila is but a pious fraud, being really a Greek presentation of the Targum of Onkelos so far as the Pentateuch goes. And yet, the birth, history, work of Aquila of Pontus are expressly given in our most authentic Church history. "The force of nature can no farther go."

Let this trait of the Septuagint be added, which Mr. Smith himself adduces (Lecture V.) for a sinister purpose: that it makes no distinction between the canonical and apocryphal books, mingling them together on its pages. But the Hebrew text always kept this distinction between the divine and the human, as clear as a sunbeam. This difference may teach us how low and poor the authority of any Septuagint *codex* ought to be, for deciding particular readings, as against our Hebrew text. One of Mr. Smith's particular cases on which he attempts to ground a preference for the Seventy (1 Sam. xvii.) has been examined, that the reader *ex uno discat omnes*. His other cases, when strictly tested, are equally invalid.

The last point we make for the correctness of the Masoretic copies of the Pentateuch, is peculiarly fatal to Mr. Smith and his critical comrades. He has vaunted the authority of the Septuagint, as containing the most accurate extant representation of the Old Testament text. He wishes us to correct the Prophets by it. But now, it turns out that this Septuagint *follows our Hebrew text in the Pentateuch*, with peculiar, and almost entire, exactness. We pointedly ask, why this Greek witness, so credible elsewhere, is not equally credible here? Is the "New Criticism" wilfully inconsistent with itself? And how came our learned critic to overlook this fact?

And now, after this review of the authentic facts of antiquity which demonstrate the inferior value of the Septuagint, it may be seen what ground the new critics have for reversing the impregnable verdict of all the great Protestant scholars, from the Reformation to the nineteenth century.

2. The second topic of Mr. Smith's criticism, which we mention, is the Book of Psalms. In his 7th Lecture, he crowds together the largest mass possible of assumptions and rash assertions, touching the date and authorship of the Psalms, derived from the wilful, frivolous, and reckless speculations of his favorite teachers, the rationalistic (which means infidel) scholars of Germany. There, as is well-known, is a class of scholars, who although holding the seats and drawing the salaries of theological professors, avowedly disbelieve all inspiration and all supernatural agencies; who regard all the Psalms as on the same level with a Vedic hymn or a saga; who discuss them merely as antique literary curiosities; who use them thus only to occupy their literary leisure and whet their inventive ingenuity, ventilating any plausible guess about them which may be made a string to connect specimens of their learning, and probably laughing in their sleeves at the British and Americans who are simple enough to take them seriously; or, who only trouble themselves about the Scriptures because *they get their salaries* by lecturing on them, and therefore must say something; where otherwise, they would concern themselves with these books no more than with Uncle Remus's fables. Such is the attitude of the guides whom our author selects, while

teaching biblical criticism in the orthodox Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland; a Church whose very corner-stone is belief in the genuineness and inspiration of these books! Mr. Smith's object is, to unsettle our belief in the authorship of as many of the Psalms as possible, to make it appear an immethodical bundle of several earlier Temple-Psalms books, put together by nobody knows whom. Especially does he labor to show that several Psalms must have been written after the days of Malachi, and even as late as the Maccabees; and that, therefore, the compilation dates long after the ceasing of the Old Testament inspiration. The inference obviously is not stated, but hinted, that the collection is therefore not of authority, and may contain much uninspired matter. First he recommends, and then amends, the fanciful division into *five* collections, for which his pleas are three: that some are Jehovistic and some Elohist; that in the Hebrew text, each book "has a separate heading not translated in our English Bible;" that each book ends with a significant doxology. The first ends with Ps. xli.; the second with Ps. lxxii.; the third with Ps. lxxxix.; the fourth with Ps. cvi.; the fifth with Ps. cl. This imaginary partition Dr. J. A. Alexander on Psalms rightly discards. How flimsy its first ground is, may be seen from the fact which Mr. Smith admits, that both the names Elohim and Jehovah appear in all the five parts, only the one is more frequent than the other in certain parts. Now who can say what impulse of faith and piety may have moved a Psalmist, at any given time, to address his God by the one title or the other? The inference is baseless. Of the second point, it is enough to say, that our closest search of the Hebrew text utterly fails to detect any "separate heading" not translated in our English Bible, for the imaginary "five books." As to the grounding of a partition on the recurrence of a doxology at the end of certain Psalms, how worthless this is appears from the fact that distinct doxologies occur in a large number of other Psalms, at their end, and in the body of them, as in Psalm xxviii. 6, and xxxi. 21, and lxvi. 8 and 20, and lxviii. 19, and xevi. 2, etc., and ciii. 1, and cxiv. 6, and cxxxv. 19, and cxliv. 1, and cxlv. 21; and Psalm cxvii. is nothing but a doxology. Why do not the critics make a "book" end with Psalm cxvii.? Why not

VOL. XXXIII., NO. 1.—2.

with each of these doxologies, or at least with each terminal one? The feebleness of this fancy is also betrayed by this: that Mr. Smith and his guides themselves say, that the sequence of the several Psalms in each "book" was not made systematic by the unknown collectors, but is immethodical. Then, the Psalms with the terminal doxologies might just as likely have fallen elsewhere; and their place, being accidental, gives no basis for any partition. Epiphanius and Jerome mention, that in their days some Jews maintained this fancy about five books. Their object was to make the Psalms resemble the Pentateuch in its partitions; this craving for arithmetical symmetry is a motive just suitable for a cabalistic rabbi.

Now, of course, every Bible reader knows that all the Psalms were not written by David, nor in David's age; that several, especially of the Asaph-Psalms, were written during the seventy years' captivity, as, for instance, the 137th. But the faith of the Church has always embraced these two points: that all were composed by inspired poets; that the authorised compilation was settled by inspired authority, and therefore not later than Malachi. There is no difficulty about the question of authorship; for after Nathan and David, there were twenty-four prophets and prophetesses at least; and every prophet was a poet. As to the compilation, the Church doctrine is: that this was attended to continuously by the authorised prophets, as piece after piece was given to the Church by the Holy Ghost; and that the whole compilation was verified, and the latest poems added by Ezra and his inspired successors. So say the authentic uninspired Jewish writers. 2 Macc. ii. 13; Josephus against Apion, I. 8; Philo, II. 475. So teach the inspired writers of the later ages of the Old Testament. 2 Chron. xxix. 30; Zech. vii. 10 (quoting Ps. xxxvi. 4), 1 Chron. xvi. 7 to end (with Psalms cv., cxvi., cvi.), Ezra iii. 10. But, especially, so teaches Christ in Luke xx. 42, and xxiv. 44, and Peter in Acts i. 20. In the first and last of these places the Lord and his Apostle speak expressly of "the Book of Psalms," while quoting it as infallible Scripture. There was, then, in the Church of that day a book—*one book*—received by all as "*the book*" of lyrical worship. There are also thirty-one

quotations from the Psalms in the New Testament, all treating them, either expressly or by clear implication, as God's word. And these quotations are from nearly all parts of the book of Psalms, from the second to the 140th; and eleven of them are from Psalms which have no author named, which shows that the inspired apostles had just the same confidence in these as in the others. When we couple the allusions from Chronicles and Ezra, the testimony of Josephus and Philo, the fact that the Septuagint presented just the one book of one hundred and fifty pieces; that Heb. iv. 7 quotes the same book as *David's* ("saying in David"), yet ascribing it to God; it is impossible to doubt the conclusion that our present Psalter, as one collection, was of divine authority to the Church from the days Old Testament inspiration.

We may add, also, that our Saviour bears his testimony in Luke xxiv. 44, with equal decisiveness, to the whole Old Testament canon. He cites them as an infallible rule of faith under the well-known division of Law, Prophets, and Psalms—the very classification under which Josephus has been cited as including all the books in our Old Testament, and no others; the very classification which we know from the testimony of the Hebrew and Christian writers nearest our Saviour, was generally adopted by all. Mr. Smith does, indeed, (Lecture 6th,) with equal weakness and bad faith, attempt to break the force of this fatal testimony, by the sneer that it is but "rationalism" in us to take the terms in our Saviour's mouth in the historical sense. And in Lecture 6th he attempts to sustain this charge, against the whole current of Christian and Jewish learning of all ages, by intimating that Josephus' evidence is not near enough in time to our Saviour to define his meaning. Now, Josephus ended his career as a public man A. D. 70, soon after which he wrote his books. Several years before, he had been wholly engrossed by the civil and Roman wars. Hence, as it is out of the question to suppose him pursuing any new Biblical studies while in the very vortex of these convulsions, we must conclude that his statements touching the Old Testament canon reflect what he was taught in his earlier years. But the words cited from Christ above were uttered A. D.

33 or 34. Hence Josephus was *virtually* his contemporary, as a witness to this point of belief.

Mr. Smith's method is, to support the modern assault upon the genuineness of the Hebrew superscriptions of the Psalms, by impugning as many of those which name David as their author, as he can; and to date as many of them as possible after the cessation of inspiration. A few average specimens must suffice to possess the reader with his spirit. Psalms xx. and xxi., ascribed to David, "are not spoken *by* a king, but addressed *to* the king by his people." Mr. Smith cannot believe "that David wrote for the people the words in which they should express their feelings for his throne," etc. But was not David a prophet? and is it not *the very business* of a prophet to teach the people the sentiments God wishes them to cherish? It was as the defence of the Church that the believers then prized David's throne. Again, how does Mr. Smith know but that it was *Messiah's throne* David wished them to value and uphold?

He pronounces, with disdainful levity, that the title of Psalm xxxiv. must be false, because it "speaks of Abimelech as king of Gath in the time of David. In reality, Abimelech was a contemporary of Abraham, and the king in David's time was named Achish." Now, is it possible Mr. Smith does not know that every previous expositor has noted and explained this, by the simple remark that Achish was this ruler's *individual* name, and Abimelech (My father-king) his *regal* title, as *Pharaoh* was of the Egyptian kings? So not only do all the wise, learned, and sober British expositors say (of whom our author seems to have no opinion at all), but also a plenty of learned Germans, as Gesenius, Lange, etc. But he treats this obvious and sufficient solution, supported by so many of the best scholars, as unworthy of mention to his readers, or of refutation! His papal word must suffice.

Psalm xxvii., he thinks, cannot have been written by David, because it speaks of inquiring in "his temple" (*viz.*, God's). But in David's time there was "not a temple, but a tent." Will not the reader be shocked with the disingenuousness of this, when he turns to the Hebrew with us, and finds that the word for "his

temple" is הַיְרֵבֶלֶן? This, Gesenius tells us, means, when spoken in connection with God, simply *his sanctuary*, and is applied to the sanctuary when it was a tent. Again, he argues that the 10th verse, "When my father and mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up," are quite inappropriate to David. Why? He attempts to invent a reason by prefacing his cavils with the suggestion, that the Psalm must have been written after all David's triumphs, because he would only speak of "Zion as God's holy mountain," and of the "house of God at Zion," "after he had brought the ark to Jerusalem." Again, will the reader be shocked by the author's disingenuousness when he reads the Psalm, and finds that *there is neither word nor allusion in it about Zion*; nor a single trait to prevent our dating the Psalm from the days where David was a young man, deprived for the first time of a father's counsels and a mother's love, by Saul's persecutions.

"Ps. lii. is said to refer to Doeg." (See in the title the reference to the slander of that Edomite herdsman of Saul against the priests who had succoured David at Nob.) "Now David had *nothing to fear* from Doeg." "The *danger was all* for the priests at Nob. How could the Psalmist" . . . "not express in a single word his sympathy with the unhappy priests who perished for the aid they gave him?" Therefore, he concludes, David did not write it. But if the reader will examine 1 Samuel xxii. and xxiii. chapters, he will see for himself whether the lies of Doeg portended danger to David. The case meant just this: That Saul, wholly deluded by the vile delator, was now with Doeg pursuing David's life with all the fury which was expressed in his ferocious murders at Nob. And we presume that no one except Prof. Smith ever failed to see in verses 1-5 the most ardent sympathetic indignation for the wrongs done the priests.

Our author does not even believe that David wrote the 51st Psalm, or that it ever had any reference to his sin towards Bathsheba and Uriah. On what argument does he rest? "The prayer (verse 18) that God will 'build the walls of Jerusalem' refer so manifestly to the period of the captivity." He assumes that at this prosperous stage of David's reign, Jerusalem needed

no more wall-building. (Borrowed from the ultra-rationalist, De Wette.) How wretched does this trifling appear, when we remember simply that David *was writing poetry*, and hence, uses an appropriate and natural image? The parallelism of the verse is enough to guide every reader: "Do good unto Zion." This shows that the figure of the defending walls up-built expresses the same thought—edification to the Church, so exposed to reproach and attack by David's own crimes (see 2 Sam. xii. 14). David, as a military captain, had literally fortified his city with stone walls. But his shocking sins had now laid the Church of God open and defenceless against the reproaches of infidels. God alone, by his grace, could repair this ruin. Hence David prays: "Do thou build up what my sin prostrated." This gives a perfectly logical connection with verse xix. For God's acceptance of holocausts does result from such spiritual restoration of professed worshippers; but no success in fortifying a town with literal ramparts has any relevancy whatever to making animal sacrifices more pleasing to a spiritual God.

One more of these far-fetched difficulties must suffice. Mr. Smith does not believe the title of the famous 139th Psalm, when it says David wrote it; because he thinks he finds four Aramaic words in it; which proves it must have been written during, or after, the captivity in Chaldea. Now, there are but three words to debate: as one recurs twice, חָשַׁב—thought, in verses 2 and 17; שָׁבַע—lying down, in verse 3; and עָרַץ—energy, in verse 20. He thinks the classic Hebrew must have spelt them with the rougher צ, instead of ע. But it turns out that the softer forms in each case are derivable from appropriate 'Ayin-roots; and that the spelling appears with the ע in the earlier books of the Bible. So that the one is as much old classic Hebrew as the other! But how slender a basis would this matter of Aramaisms not be, on which to deny David's authorship, when we remember that Chaldea and Syria with their closely cognate dialects bounded his kingdom on the north and east, and had constant intercourse with it?

When the attack on the genuineness of the titles is made on grounds as flimsy and uncandid as these, the sound biblical scholar

can well afford to rest in the old conclusion which accepts them as valid, along with the modern Keil and the great body of the older critics. The titles are now, and so far as we can decide, always were, a part of the Hebrew text. There is no valid canon of textual criticism authorizing their excision, that would not equally expunge any verse from the body of the Psalms. Even the Septuagint, Mr. Smith's great authority, recognises all the titles of David's Psalms, except a very few.

One other point remains to be briefly mentioned affecting the Psalms. This is Mr. Smith's attempt to bring the date of as many Psalms as possible down to a time subsequent to the cessation of Old Testament inspiration. The critic's motive is obvious. Malachi is believed to be the last of the inspired Old Testament prophets. If the book of Psalms can be proved to contain pieces later than him, the point so dear to the sceptics is made out: that the Scriptures contain spurious materials.

But the grounds presented for this late date of some Psalms are as wretchedly flimsy as the aim is mischievous. One argument is, that the "musical titles are discontinued" (Lect. 7th) in the Psalms of the fourth and fifth "books." The proposed inference is, that the prevalence of the Greek art, after the Macedonian conquests, had caused the ancient Hebrew melodies to be so forgotten by the people, that the old musical terms were useless and meaningless. Therefore many of these Psalms, after Psalm xc., were written after the Macedonian era. But we object, *first*, the distribution of the Psalms into five "books," is imaginary. *Secondly*, the musical titles are lacking in Psalms which are unquestionably David's, as in Ps. cviii. and cx. Hence their absence proves nothing as to date. *Thirdly*, if Mr. Smith's surmise were worth anything whatever, it would be better satisfied by supposing that it was the Babylonian captivity, and the total interruption of temple-worship for seventy years, which made the old temple-tunes to be forgotten; not pagan Greek art, which never could have influenced Jews abhorring all pagan worship and speaking the Aramaic tongue. Hence, the argument, were it not wholly worthless, would only suggest a possibility that some of these Psalms were written after the captivity began. The other

pretended argument is, that the "Pilgrimage-Psalms" ("Songs of Degrees") "are plainly, in part, later than the exile; for they speak of captivity and deliverance." Ps. cxxii. is later than Ezra and Nehemiah; for it speaks of "Jerusalem the rebuilt." Such is Mr. Smith's translation; but it is not that of other Hebraists fully as good as he. Again: Jerusalem might just as well have been spoken of as "rebuilt," after David's storm and sack of Jebus, 2 Sam. v. 9, and his restoration and enlargement, as after Nehemiah's work; and the tone of pride and confidence the spectator is made to express in view of the royal city and bulwarks, suits far better to the prosperous city of David, than to the poor, half-populated, scrambling town as restored by Nehemiah. As to the allusions to captivity and deliverance in the "Songs of Degrees," these contain nothing more than was applicable to previous disasters before the Babylonish captivity. The proof is, that Hosea vi. 11, and Joel iii. 1, both celebrate a similar joy; and both are indisputably prior to the great carrying away. When these Psalms are examined, they clearly describe national dangers which threatened but did not destroy the state and city; as the invasion of Sennacherib. Ps. cxxiv, "The Lord *hath* not given us as a prey to their teeth." Ps. cxxv, "The rod of the wicked *shall not rest upon* the lot of the righteous," etc. These Psalms point much more probably to the times from David to Hezekiah, and to the approaching dangers and deliverances of those reigns. *Lastly*, the utmost that could be inferred, granting the validity of the points made, would be, that sundry of these Psalms were composed by inspired men of the era of Ezra, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. That any of them were written during or after the Maccabean era, there is not a particle of proof. So much for the attack on the divine authority of the Psalms.

3. But Mr. Smith's main and final effort, pursued through five lectures, is to prove the larger parts of the Pentateuch forgeries. The position he has adopted, from his infidel teachers, Graf, Wellhausen, etc., is: That the Levitical details of sacrifice and ritual were never legislated until at or after the days of Ezekiel; that throughout all the ages from his day up to Samuel

and the Judges, these laws, now written in the Pentateuch, were never observed, and had never been heard of; that especially was this true of the statute now found in Deut. xii. 11 to 14, enjoining the maintenance of only one altar of sacrifice, at only one place, and prohibiting all others; that the priestly caste at the end of the Babylonian captivity devised this restriction as a means to restrain the disastrous tendency of the people to idolatrous worship; and to give more authority to their device, inserted it in their new recensions of the Pentateuch, and claimed Mosaic authority for it; that Ezekiel's last chapters, xl., etc., gave the key-note for this new legislation, and indeed sufficient divine authority for it; whence he does not regard this ritual, after its late introduction, as lacking in inspired sanction, according to his low conception of inspiration. He thinks he knows just how much Moses actually legislated, viz.: Exod., chap. xxi. to xxiii. inclusive, and Deut., chap. i. to xi. Deut., chap. xii. to xxxvi. forms a later code, ascribed indeed to Moses by the Jews, but in reality first enacted and published by some prophet, or prophets, of the times of Josiah. The largest code is what he calls the Levitical. It embraces Exod., chap. xxiv. to end, and most of the legislative parts of Leviticus and Numbers. This code, with its multiplied and exact details, was utterly unknown until the days of Ezekiel and Ezra, and was introduced by the priests subsequent to the former, and probably upon the hints he gives in his picture of the new sanctuary, chap. xl.-xlviii.

The pretended evidences for this division are numerous, embracing a multitude of points, all either frivolous or sophistical; of hardy assertions having no other ground than wild dogmatism; of ingenious wrestings of history; of exaggerations of facts; and of misinterpreted texts. The text most relied on is Jer. vii. 22 and 23: "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices. But this thing commanded I them, saying: Obey my voice, and I will be your God," etc. On the evidence of these verses, Mr. Smith roundly asserts, again and again, that Jeremiah knew nothing of a Levitical code of sacrifices, and that none such existed in his day.

Similar passages from Isaiah, Hosea, etc., are quoted, in which God rebukes the Jews for *insincere* offerings followed by impenitence; and all these are wrested to teach, that the Levitical offerings had never yet been enjoined. Especially is the argument pressed, that the Levitical code could not have had existence during all the ages from Joshua to Zedekiah, because the history in Samuel and Kings does not exhibit Israel as living up to that code. And to exaggerate this argument, the history is in many cases falsified to make the contradictions between the code and the conduct more salient. But the chief plea of all is, that whereas the "second or Deuteronomic code," chap. xii. 3 to 14, expressly enjoined that there must be but one altar for the twelve tribes, to which every bloody sacrifice must be brought, at a single place of divine selection, the historic Israel down to Josiah always had many altars of sacrifice and high places, which even an orthodox Asa or Hezekiah did not abolish, and worse yet, inspired prophets, as Samuel and Elijah, offered on them. See, *e. g.*, 1 Sam. xvi. 5; ix. 12, etc.; 1 Kings xviii. 32, etc.

It would be unmerciful to the reader, as unnecessary, to detain him for an exposure of the multitude of points sophistically made. A few of them will be mentioned and refuted, in order to sustain our assertion as to the uncandid spirit of the reasoning, and the worthlessness of the conclusion. This reprehensible temper is well instanced in the text cited from Jeremiah. The author, of course, knows perfectly well, that the great current of learned expositors explain it as a rhetorical hyperbole. The prophet wishes to emphasise the truth, that in Jehovah's eyes sincere heart-religion is far more important than ritual: so much more essential, that the precepts about the ritual are as nothing compared with the requirement of sincere obedience. He knows that all this class of passages receives the same obvious explanation. But all this he disdains either to mention, or look at, or reply to. For all he tells his readers, they would remain ignorant that any body attempted to explain the passages thus! Yet this explanation is clear and satisfactory; and these very prophets themselves shut us up to it, by other clear declarations, which Mr. Smith takes especial pains not to mention. Says Lange, on Jer. vii. 22:

“But to find in this passage a proof that Jeremiah was ignorant of any legal enactment with respect to sacrifices at the time of the exodus, as Graf does, following Hitzig and others, is a proceeding *for which there is no ground*, either in the historical books, or in the writings of the pre-exilic prophets generally.” (See Amos iv. 5, compared with Levit. vii. 13; Hos. iv. 10, with Levit. xxvi. 26; Amos v. 25, compare Hosea vi. 6; 1 Sam. xv. 22, Ps. li. 16.) These passages make unquestionable allusions to the Levitical code, which Mr. Smith would have non-existent when these prophets wrote. “So also,” adds Lange, “in this passage the negation has a rhetorical, not a logical significance.” So, in substance, Gill and Calvin. One fact is fatal to Mr. Smith’s exposition of Jeremiah. The exodus from Egypt was indisputably attended by the divine appointment of the Passover. But the *paschal lamb was a sacrifice*. Mr. Smith’s version as to this is puerile and uncandid. It is therefore impossible that Jeremiah could have meant that the exodus was literally unattended by any ordinance of sacrifice. But let the reader consult the following places in the pre-exilic prophets, and especially in Jeremiah himself, and he will feel how amazing is the audacity which can assert (as Lecture 10) that these prophets “say Jehovah has not enjoined sacrifice”; and, “It is simple matter of fact that the prophets do not refer to a written Torah as the basis of their teaching” . . . and “absolutely deny the existence of a binding ritual law.” Jer. ii. 8; vi. 19, 20; xvii. 26; xviii. 15; xix. 4; xxxiii. 11 and 18; Isaiah viii. 20; xxxiv. 16; xliii. 22, 23; lvi. 3 and 7; lxvi. 3; Ps. xix. 8; xxvi. 6; xliii. 4; l. 8; li. 19; lxvi. 13; Hosea viii. 12; ix. 4; Ezek. xx. 28; 2 Kings, xxii. 8, etc.

The coolness with which the book of Joshua is excluded from witnessing to these facts is as refreshing as our author’s hardihood of assertion is astounding. Lecture 8th says: “I exclude the book of Joshua, because it in all its parts hangs closely together with the Pentateuch.” The logic of this exclusion is the following: We assume without proof that A is a false witness. Then, since B agrees with him, he must be a false witness. And hence, again, since A agrees with B, he must be a false witness. A pretty circle, truly! But the real reason why Joshua is not per-

mitted to testify, will appear in the following fatal passages, chap. xviii. 1: "And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled at Shiloh, and set up the tabernacle of the congregation there;" thus explicitly carrying out the law of Deuteronomy xii., which Mr. Smith says was never heard of until Josiah's days. Chap. xx. 2, "Appoint out for you cities of refuge, whereof I spake unto you by the hand of Moses." Deut. xix. 3. But this part of Deuteronomy, says Mr. Smith, was never published until Josiah's day! Chap. xxi. 2, the Levites at Shiloh say: "The Lord commanded by the hand of Moses" (see Num. xxxv. 2) "to give us cities to dwell in, with the suburbs," etc. But the most significant place of all is the 22d chapter. The two and a half tribes whose cantons were east of Jordan, in returning to their homes after the war of conquest, build an altar at the river. They meant it not for an altar of sacrifice, but of witness, designed merely to attest their and their children's rights in the national altar at Shiloh. But the remaining Hebrews, supposing that these were preparing to break the law of Deuteronomy xii. against a plurality of altars of sacrifice, are so determined to enforce that Mosaic statute that they prepare for war against their own brethren. Yet Mr. Smith says no such statute existed until Josiah! See verses 10, 16, 22-29. The high priest decides, vs. 32, 33, that such an altar of witness is no breach of that statute. Now, the genuineness of this book is indisputable for every sound critic. Not only does every codex and every version, including Mr. Smith's special favorite the Septuagint, sustain its integrity, but the internal evidences of it are peculiarly clear. The lines of the cantons, and the references to topography alone, when tested by the subsequent Hebrew history, and by modern explorations, prove the perfect accuracy of Joshua.

So, in the book of Judges, while we have frequent relapses from the laws, and while we see the roots of all the subsequent abuses planted, yet the worship at Shiloh goes on with an approximate regularity in the better days, which constitutes a constant reference to the existence of the whole Levitical law.

Before proceeding to the remaining arguments, let us notice, as specimens of the bad faith with which the criticism is conduct-

ed, some of the attempts to exaggerate differences, and to make imaginary ones between the historical Hebrew usage and the Levitical law. Mr. Smith says (Lecture 8th) that the statute about the daily sacrifice found, for one place, in Numbers xxviii. 8-5, is of later date than the return from Babylon. His proof is, that whereas that statute required two lambs, one for the evening, as well as one for the morning, the usage was only to present a "meat-offering" in the evening, without any living victim, because in several places, as 1 Kings xviii. 36, it is called the *מִנְחָה*. But this noun, while we admit that it came frequently to mean the unbloody "meat-offering," is also the generic name for any offering, as its root signifies. It may mean a living offering. Thus say the best lexicons. Buxtorf defines it as meaning generically a sacrifice, specifically an oblation. Gesenius says it means, 1. A gift (its etymologic primary sense); 2. Tribute; 3. An offering to God, a sacrifice, spoken especially of one unbloody. Fürst renders it, *Donum, munus, sacrificium, προσφορά. φυσία*. In Gen. iv. 4, it is used especially for a bloody offering: The Lord had respect unto Abel and his *מִנְחָתוֹ*. Thus the argument is exploded.

Mr. Smith says (Lecture 8th), that the Levitical ritual always represents itself as "the necessary forms *in which alone* the inner side of religion, love to God and man, can find acceptable expression." Again: "Accordingly, sacrifice, atonement, and forgiveness of sin, are absolutely dependent on the hierarchy and its service." "Its aim is, to *provide everything* that man requires to live acceptably with God," etc. The argument he suggests is: that as we see in the history of the Hebrews a good deal of religion which was not hierarchical, this proves the Levitical code was invented after the exile. But his assertion is simply false. Israel had its moral, sabbatical, domestic, and social worship, inherited from of old, which quietly held its way alongside of the sacrificial worship of the Tabernacle. This was so exactly provided for at the one chosen place, as the standing type of Christ's expiation. That the moral worship should go on in every town and family, as it always had done, is taken for granted as a matter of course. The main object of the Levitical code is to provide

for the typical observances, which were largely new. Hence, had the Levitical books said not one word about the general moral worship, Mr. Smith's assertions would remain groundless. But those books expressly contradict him. In Deut. vi. 7, etc., the daily duty of religious instruction in the family is enjoined. The Hebrew's religion was connected with every event of his daily life, verses 9 and 13. So in ch. xi. 18, 19. No priest intervenes here. Israel is repeatedly urged to love and serve his God in the heart, and not in the form only, and to regulate his daily life by this principle of piety. Lev. xix. 18; Deut. xiii. 4; xxx. 16. Solomon, in the very act of reëstablishing this ritual in his temple, in his dedicatory prayer again and again refutes Mr. Smith's assertion, by expressly praying that God would open communion between himself and his believing people, not only through the priest and at the altar, but without any priest and away from the altar, in their homes, in foreign lands, in captivity, in drought, in pestilence and in the sick room, in the battle field, on the journey. Even the foreigner turning to God is to enjoy like communion. This daily access to God from every heart and from every place, is grounded on God's omnipresence, which no temple can limit. See 1 Kings, viii. 27 to 52. The Psalms, which describe the very same state of religion depicted in the Levitical code, represent the godly man as meditating in God's law day and night; as praying to God when far away from priest and temple; as performing his individual devotions thrice, or seven times daily. Psalms i. 2; iv. 4; v. 3; xxxiv. 1; liv. 1; lvi. 1; lvii. 1; lv. 17; cxix. 164. See also Zech. xii. 12. Thus do the Scriptures themselves utterly deny that view of the Levitical religion which is reasserted through pages of this 8th Lecture, with a wearisome monotony of false assertion.

In the same Lecture it is roundly asserted, that the Levitical code, Lev. xvii., makes it "a perpetual statute that no animal can be slain for food unless it be presented as a peace-offering before the central sanctuary, and its blood sprinkled on the altar." Again, he makes Hosea teach that "all animal food not presented at the altar is unclean." His object, of course, is to argue hence that, in so large a country as Palestine, containing so many peo-

ple, many altars must have been made essential by this law; and that hence the restriction to one altar could not have been enacted or known. The least examination of Lev. xvii. 3 to 6, shows that to call this a "perpetual statute" is false. It had only a temporary force, so long as the people were gathered conveniently around the Tabernacle in one encampment. The thing which was made a perpetual statute was, that when flesh was eaten, the blood must not be eaten with it, but must be poured out and covered with dust. Even while the encampment continued, the Hebrews were allowed to dispose thus of the blood of the clean beast taken in hunting (v. 13), without bringing it to the altar. And in Deut. xii. 15, 16, in immediate connection with the absolute restriction of *all sacrifice* to one altar, express permission is given to butcher any clean animal for food anywhere, at any man's home, provided only the blood is not eaten. This shows that the restriction of Lev. xvii. was meant to be temporary, and was now removed, in view of the approaching separation of the people to their homes in Palestine.

It is argued that in the days of Eli and Samuel, the supposed law for keeping the ark in a holy *Tabernacle* was not observed, (and therefore had not been yet heard of,) because (1 Sam. iii. 15) the sanctuary at Shiloh *had doors to it*; and therefore must have been a timber or stone house, and not a tent! This beautiful point is unluckily ruined by observing that the word דלתות suggests by its very etymology, a curtain-door; for it means, says Gesenius, something "hanging and swinging," and that in David's time (2 Sam. vii. 2) the ark of God still "dwelt within curtains."

Mr. Smith argues that the Levitical code was not observed by good Eli, (and therefore had never been heard of as yet,) because he let the child Samuel, who was not of the Aaronic family, sleep in the holy of holies; a place which the high priest himself only entered once a year, according to that code, and then "not without blood." The shocking dishonesty of this statement is exposed, when we note that all the passage says is, that Samuel lay down to sleep in the הַיְקוֹל. This word, says Gesenius, "*never stands for the holy of holies.*"

Mr. Smith says that both David and Solomon "officiated in

person" before the altar; the latter frequently. Hence he would infer that the Levitical code restricting this privilege exclusively to the sons of Aaron had never yet been legislated. But his only proof that David and Solomon ever intruded into the priest's office is the places where it is said that they "offered" so many or such sacrifices. The same sort of argument would prove that David built with his own hands all his palace and bulwarks at Jerusalem, and that the Temple was all erected by Solomon's personal labor. Who does not see that, as they builded by the hands of the professional mechanics, so they sacrificed through the agency of the appointed priests? Let the reader compare 2 Chron. xxvi. 16-18.

He asserts that the Jewish kings habitually carried their pagan body-guards with them into the sanctuary; which shows that the Levitical code forbidding all but Hebrews to enter even its court had not yet been enacted. He finds these pagan retainers in the Cherethites and Pelethites of David, and the "guards," כָּרִי of Jehoiada's day, who guarded the child-king, Jehoash, in the temple. These, he is certain, were Cretans, Philistines, and Carians! Now, in the first place, if the orthodox kings had any such retainers of pagan blood, we may be very sure they had become Jews by proselytism and circumcision (as the history shows so many of David's had,) before they ever entered the sanctuary. But, in the second place, Mr. Smith ought to know that the best Hebraists regard the terms, not as names of nationality at all, but as names of calling. The Cherethites were armed guards and executioners, so called from כָּרַת —to cut. The Pelethites were couriers, from a root signifying to run swiftly. The כָּרִי of Jehoiada were executioners, "cutters," and were unquestionably the armed Levites mentioned in 2 Chronicles, xxiii. 2 and 7. How preposterous the dream that Jehoiada, hitherto a purely religious officer, holding his place by sufferance under the pagan Athaliah, in the little dwarfed inland kingdom of Judea, either could or would get pagan Cretans and Carians into his temple-guard! Such dreams are the chief staples of our critic's arguments. But the reader will cry, *Ohe! jam satis*; the recital of these points has become wearisome. Let these, then, and their exposure, suffice

as specimens of the multitude of such quibbles, industriously heaped together to travesty the actual state of the Hebrew religion under the orthodox judges and kings.

But while we object to these unjust exaggerations of the departures of Israel from the Levitical code, we expressly admit that there were, during a large part of his chequered history, wide departures. Rarely, after Joshua, did even the best judges and kings return exactly to the perfect pattern of the Law. Let us see now, how far we should, in candor, carry this admission. *First.* The history of the "altar of Ed," under Joshua's rule, while it perfectly demonstrates the existence and currency at that day of the very law of a single altar of sacrifice, which Mr. Smith so strives to date after the exile, also proves that memorial structures simply, in the form of altar or pillar, for the exclusive purpose of witness, were not against that statute. The prohibitions of them were designed to prevent their building under circumstances which tended to corrupt worship and idolatry. *Secondly.* It is expressly admitted that other altars for sacrifice were from time to time erected and used by inspired prophets, besides the one at the Sanctuary. Samuel sacrificed once and again at Ramah, and at Bethlehem once. David, while the Sanctuary and altar were still at Gibeon, sacrificed on the threshing-floor of Ornan once, and stately on an altar before the temporary tent on Mt. Zion, where he had ensconced the recovered ark. Elijah built an altar and sacrificed on Mt. Carmel, in 1 Kings xviii., and there can be no question of God's allowance of this act at least, for he sanctioned it by miracle. On this class of facts Mr. Smith glories over us exceedingly. He would conclude from them that the statute of the single altar could not have been in existence in all these ages, because here it is not a fickle backsliding populace that breaks it, but apparently inspired men directed by God.

The obvious reply is, that Mr. Smith wholly misconceives the statute. It must be construed in the spirit of its design. This design was, to secure accuracy of typical teaching and purity of worship, by keeping the sacrificial ritual under the immediate eye and control of the responsible officers. The only ground for not

having a plurality of altars of sacrifice was, that it would open the door for religious schism, for departures from the authorised ritual, and for will-worship, and thus ultimately for idolatry. Where the Church was sufficiently guarded against such abuse by the presence of an infallible, because inspired, officer, these grounds ceased to exist. Hence, it is obvious that the force of the statutes was to inhibit the erection and use of a second altar *by mere human authority*. God never designed to intimate that he, by this command, inhibited himself from giving his people several altars. *He* might and would do it on suitable occasion; *they* must never presume to do so. When Joshua and Phinehas supposed the eastern tribes had raised an altar for sacrifice on their own motion, they correctly adjudged it a breach of the well known statute. On learning that it was only a memorial monument, these orthodox rulers approved it as entirely consistent with the law. When Micah (Judges xvii. 18) set up a local worship, and the corrupted Danites removed it to Laish, and all by mere human authority; when Jeroboam set up altars of separation at Bethel and Dan for a mere political motive, these were breaches of the statute, and they were clearly denounced as such by the inspired teachers. So was the erection of every "high place," if made by human authority. But when Samuel, David, or Elijah, acting by inspired warrant, reared an altar for sacrifice, the explanation is, that they were as truly prophets as Moses. Their act was as much God's act as the passing of Moses' statute was. How thoroughly thoughtless is this criticism, which mistakes a rule God *imposed on his creatures*, as though he had thereby forever tied his own hands! It is to be noted also that at each season when this additional altar of sacrifice was authorised by God, there was a special reason for its utility, and even necessity. In all Samuel's day the arrangements at Shiloh were disorganised by the loss of the ark and its stay at Kiriath Jearim. Many districts were also in Philistine hands, and many Israelites could not safely make journeys to Shiloh, across these districts occupied by the enemy. When David made the additional altar, the ark was still out of place, Shiloh was in ruins, the tabernacle and brazen altar were at Gibeon; and the project to which David

was, by divine direction, bending his energies, was the transfer of all to Jerusalem, and their rearrangement there under strict Levitical law, which Solomon completed. David's day was one of transition. Once more: When Elijah built his altar on Carmel for a special purpose, Jerusalem was practically inaccessible to most of Ahab's subjects. Hence, rather than let pious people worship at the unlawful altars of Jeroboam, God authorised Elijah, and perhaps several other inspired men, to rear an altar for temporary use, under safe, orthodox, and inspired regulations, at another point than Jerusalem.

But again, we admit that during most of the ages between Joshua and Ezra there was a large difference between the Levitical code and the usages actually prevailing in Israel. Mr. Smith urges that the difference is so wide as to imply that the stricter points of that code must have been all unknown during all these ages, and must have been introduced into the Pentateuch after the captivity. This inference we deny. Our grounds of denial are the following: *First.* The history itself recognises this departure from the code, in all its breadth and excess. The inspired writers of Israel also predict it and its calamitous consequences. (See the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy.) Joshua, even in the act of calling Israel to strict observance of the code, tells them that he knows they will violate it. (Chapter xxiv. 19.) In chapter xxiv. 31, the era of observance is expressly limited to life of Joshua and his contemporaries. (See also Judges ii. 7 and 10.) So, chapter ii. 11-19, gives us, as a prevalent picture of the state of Israel from age to age, this alternation: a wide apostasy from the Mosaic code, uniformly followed by the threatened calamities, and the pity of God excited by their sufferings, raising up some reformer; then a deliverance through the efforts of this reformer, with a partial, but only a partial (v. 17), return to conformity, and another speedy relapse into almost total departure, with another catastrophe. Such is the actual picture of the sinful cycle, around which Israel moved during the whole prophetic era. Whereas Mr. Smith thinks it incredible that the actual historical departures from a known Levitical code could have been so wide, the history itself tells us that the departure

was just such, always partial at the best epochs, usually great and lamentable. And such is the account of the history given by the prophets near, or at, its close—that Israel *had been* capable of disregarding *all the points* of the code given them at the beginning. (See Ps. xiv. 3; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16; Jer. v. 5; Ezek. xx. 13; Amos ii. 4; Nehemiah ix. 29; 2 Kings xvii. 8 and 16.) “And they left ALL the commandments of the Lord their God,” etc.

Secondly. It is not at all incredible that a Church should possess a revealed code from its foundation, and yet live in habitual violation of its plainest rules, because we see precisely the same thing before our eyes in the case of the Papacy. This body has had both Old and New Testaments from the beginning, and yet has been for hundreds of years living in most flagrant violation of their plainest precepts. The Papist’s professed rule of faith, the Bible, expressly forbids the worship of any but God; Rome worships God, men, women, angels, bones, pictures, statues, and a piece of bread. The Bible forbids persecution; Rome persecuted every dissentient, no matter how holy. The Bible knows no priest but Christ in the new dispensation; Rome is full of human priests. The Bible says none can forgive sin but God only; the Romish priest undertakes every week to forgive sins. The Bible says marriage is honorable in all; Rome forbids her priests to marry. With this picture before our eyes, it is but silly to say that it is incredible the Hebrew Church could have departed so widely from a known Levitical code. And especially is the parallel instructive because in both cases the departures have been occasioned by the intrusion of the same human theories into the church—that of “tradition” and that of ritual righteousness. It was these errors, working, of course, upon and with human depravity, which made Israel’s revolt against a revealed code he professed to hold, a possible thing. It is the same in Rome. Hence, were all Mr. Smith’s claims of fact granted, his laborious conclusion, from the discrepancies of the code and the practice, would be worthless. It is contradicted by what we see every day.

Thirdly. While Mr. Smith supposes that this Levitical code

was first introduced after the captivity by Ezekiel and the prophets succeeding him, the fact is, that these prophets themselves refer to the code in many particulars, as already binding. Jeremiah, a little before the captivity, ch. xxxiv. 8, while citing the law of release for Hebrew servants, first given in Ex. xxi. 2, also makes an unmistakable reference to Lev. xxv. 10, and 39-46, borrowing its very words. In Nehemiah v. 1-12, there is an unquestionable reference to the release of debtors and lands, enacted in Lev. xxv. 9-13. But, according to Mr. Smith, this part of the Pentateuch was not written until after the captivity! Both 2 Kings xv. 5 and 2 Chron. xxvi. 20-21, in relating Uzziah's leprosy, make obvious reference to the law of leprosy in Lev. xiii. 46 and in Num. v. 2. But these books, Mr. Smith says, are, except their thread of history, not a part of Moses' Pentateuch. The same history, v. 18, makes equally obvious reference to the law forbidding any but a son of Aaron to offer incense, contained in Ex. xxx. 7 and 8, and Num. xvi. 40, and xviii. 7. But these also, Mr. Smith thinks, did not belong to the Law at that date. Nehemiah, chap. ix. 14, speaks of detailed "precepts, statutes, and laws," given from God by the hand of Moses, in terms plainly allusive to the Levitical particulars. Joshua, as the very first thing he did on his return from the captivity, resumed the offering of the "daily burnt-offerings by number, and the new moon continual burnt-offering, and of all the set feasts, according to the custom." These details are all contained in the Levitical code, and that code is here obviously referred to as having ordained them long before, not as now first invented.

The very places in the historical books which teach Mr. Smith that the law of a single place of sacrifice was so habitually broken, also imply that it was in existence and known. For example, 1 Kings xii. 29 to end, tells us how Jeroboam extended this unlawful usage; but it also plainly implies that the law of a single altar, and the law against worshipping Jehovah through images, and the law confining priestly functions to the sons of Aaron, and the law fixing the annual atonement on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, were all enacted, and known before Jeroboam. So of Rehoboam's sins (1 Kings xiv. 23). So, in recording that Asa

(1 Kings xv. 14), Jehoash (2 Kings xii. 3), Amaziah (2 Kings xiv. 3, 4), while in the main reformers, left the altars still in use, the historian clearly intimates that in doing so they came short of the existing law. They did right; "but not as David their father did." With Hezekiah it was otherwise (2 Kings xviii. 3, 4). Mr. Smith does not dispute but that good Josiah made an end of all "high places." Well; the narrative of his reform not only plainly implies that the recovered "book of the law," which guided him in doing so, was the Pentateuch itself; but every word and act of Josiah shows that he considered the abuses he removed, as every one violations of old law, which Israel was bound to know. He apprehended great wrath for its neglect. Did he suppose that God would punish Judah so fearfully *for not keeping a law before it was enacted?* Mr. Smith's hypothesis as to Ezra's first introduction of the Levitical code is most unlucky. In his history, (chap. ii. 63, and iii. 1 to 6) we find Joshua and Zerubbabel enforcing all the distinctive ritual of that code. Does the reader note how long this was before the appearance of Ezra as a teacher in Judea? According to Prideaux's chronology, which scholars now follow usually, about ninety years!

But especially is Ezekiel's testimony unfortunate for Mr. Smith. His theory is, that the ritualistic descriptions of Ezek. xl. to end, gave the first impulse to the introduction of this Levitical code. But the prophecies of Ezekiel teem with references or allusions to that very code as preëxistent and old. The emblematic temple which he describes in his last chapters certainly was not a model for the second temple or its ritual. It had the Shekinah, which the second temple never claimed. The land-allotments to the priests do not correspond to actual usage. There was nothing to correspond to the River of Life, which Ezekiel describes as flowing from his east gate. In his vision the "whole limit" of the top of the mountain is "most holy." In the second temple the court of the Gentiles was admitted within that circuit. Worse yet, this very vision refers unmistakably to the "law" and a "covenant," as preëxisting, which Mr. Smith would have first to be suggested by it. We read in ch. xliii. 8, "shall no

more defile" the house. This implies that they had defiled it before; which they could not have done had there been no ceremonial law. So ch. xliv. 7 speaks of a ceremonial covenant as already broken, but to be now renewed.

The most marvellous thing about Mr. Smith's critical conclusion is, that this foisting in of the Levitical code into the Pentateuch, nearly a thousand years after it claimed to be written, does not seem to him at all to impair its divine authority. He thinks that such a pious fraud is, for all practical purposes, just as good Scripture as though it had been all written by inspired Moses. "That the law was a divine institution, that it formed an actual part in the gracious scheme of guidance which preserved the religion of Jehovah as a living power in Israel until shadow became substance in the manifestation of Christ, is no theory, but an historical fact, which no criticism as to the origin of the books of Moses can in the least degree invalidate." "If it could be proved that Moses wrote the law, what would that add to the proof that its origin is from God?" Lecture 11. The answer patent to the plain mind is, This is what would be added: a source for the Levitical code in Moses' inspiration, instead of in a literary forgery perpetrated a thousand years after Moses by unknown authors. One fact Mr. Smith either conceals, or else in one place feebly evades: that as the Levitical code now stands in the parts of the Pentateuch which Mr. Smith dates after the captivity, *the text claims Moses' authorship for it all*. All through the suspected passages, from Exod. xxiv. to the end of Numbers, and from Deut. xii. onward, the matter is continually ascribed to Moses at the introduction of each new section or topic. "And he said unto Moses." "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord." "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, And thou shalt make," etc. These introductions, and such like ones, containing a distinct assertion of Moses' authorship or utterance of the code, recur not less than *one hundred and thirty-five times*, interspersed all through the matter which he says Moses did not write! Mr. Smith suspects many parts of the Pentateuch, because Moses speaks of himself in them in the third person. Well; in Deut. xiii., etc., and a number of subsequent chapters, Moses speaks

continually in the first person. But this does not please him any better; he rejects these chapters also!

Now the "higher criticism" may be able to believe that men who forged the name of one who had been dead a thousand years, one hundred and thirty-five times in seventy-six chapters, and then usurped his personality all through some twenty more chapters, were not only honest and truthful, but inspired of God. But Mr. Smith may be assured that all men of common sense will obstinately demur. To teach them that these chapters were written after the captivity is to convince them that they are spurious. There will be no help for it. And they will also conclude that this profession of respect for such impudent forgeries as of divine authority still, is a very thin mask. Such criticism cannot save itself from infidelity.

Our last objection is against the manner in which the book discounts the testimony of our Saviour and his apostles to the validity of the Old Testament canon, and of the passages impugned. The critic claims to be a thoroughly reverent Christian. But he virtually arrays himself against Christ's veracity, and he leaves his readers in ignorance of this irreverent and fatal feature of his reasonings. Let the reader, then, notice the following, in which the New Testament not only refers to this Levitical code as appointed of God, but *names Moses* as the inspired legislator of it. In Matt. viii. 4, Christ says to the healed leper: "Offer the gift that *Moses* commanded." This is in Levit. xiv. 3, etc., a part of the Pentateuch which Mr. Smith refers to Ezra's day or later! In Matt. xix. 7, "Why did *MOSES* then command to give a writing of divorcement?" This law is in Deut. xxiv. 1, one of the passages Mr. Smith says was never known until Josiah's day. So in Mark x. 3, "What did *MOSES* command you?" (on this same subject.) In Matt. xxiii. 2: "The scribes and Pharisees sit in *MOSES'* seat. *All therefore* whatsoever they bid you, that observe and do." This plainly implies that all the observances for which they quoted Scripture were quoted from Moses. In Mark xii. 19, "*Moses wrote*" (the law of Levirate marriage). This is in Deut. xxv. 5 again. So says Luke xx. 28. Luke xvi, 29: "They have *Moses* and the prophets," &c. In John i.

17: "The law was given by *Moses*." In John iii. 14: "*Moses* lifted up the serpent in the wilderness." (Numb. xxi. 9.) In John vii. 14: "Did not *Moses* give you the law?" Now, according to Mr. Smith's own theory, the "law" which the scribes of that day ascribed to Moses certainly included the whole Levitical code. In Acts iii. 22: "Moses truly said unto the fathers, a prophet like unto me," etc. This is said in Deuteronomy xviii. 15. So in Acts vii. 37 and Rom. x. 5: "*Moses* describeth the righteousness of the law." (See Levit. viii. 5.) In 2 Cor. iii. 15: "When *Moses* is read," meaning unquestionably, when the Pentateuch, as we now have it, is read. In Hebrews ix. 19: "When *Moses* had spoken every precept." This was in Exod. xxiv. 5, at the earliest, if not in Levit. xiv. Mr. Smith thinks Moses spoke very few Levitical precepts. Now, in view of these inspired assertions, can it be that all these men, when they called the Levitical law "*Moses*' law," only meant that it was a law which for four hundred years had gone by Moses' name, though really invented a thousand years after him? Again, Paul says expressly (Gal. iii. 17) that "the law," meaning unquestionably this Levitical code, was added "four hundred and thirty years after" Abraham. Mr. Smith thinks the larger part was added fourteen hundred years after Abraham. And Luke ii. 23, 24, refers to the law of the first-born male and the mother's cleansing as the "law of the Lord," but a part of it is found in Exod. xxxiv. 19, and Numb. iii. 13.

The intelligent reader of the Epistle to the Hebrews will especially remember how fatal its testimony is as to Mr. Smith's theory. The inspired author is beyond doubt (see chapter ix. 1-7) describing a tabernacle made at the time of the covenant of the Exodus. In this he places (chapters viii. and ix.) nearly every feature of what Mr. Smith calls the Ezdrine ritual. And then he ascribes the whole to Moses (chapter ix. 19-22) with an unmistakable reference to Exod. xxiv. 5. If the Epistle to the Hebrews is inspired, Mr. Smith must be wrong.

No better place than this offers to direct the reader's attention also to the theological tendencies of his criticism. He says that before the exile the prophets enjoined on Israel *no sacrificial*

ritual; that their teachings constantly depreciate the value of such a ritual, and point the people, as Micah vi. 8, to acts of justice and mercy, as what God requires of believers. But he admits that, after the exile, a sacrificial ritual was enjoined by divine authority. But the old dispensation was typical of the new, and foreshadowed the way of salvation. God, therefore, has taught *two opposite ways of salvation*. First, for a thousand years, the Socinian theology, which discards the necessity of expiation; and then, from Ezra's day to ours, the Calvinistic theology! Is the Christian reader ready for this conclusion?

Another class of attestations is found in the mode of the citation of the Old Testament as "the Scriptures," *ἡ γραφή*, or *αἱ γραφαί*, the "oracles of God," the "Sacred Scriptures," "the law and the prophets," and in one case, (Luke xxiv. 44,) "the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms." Now, the force of this attestation is contained in these facts: *First*, these "Scriptures" are usually quoted by Christ and his apostles as authentic and infallible as a standard of unquestionable appeal, as given from the Spirit of God. *Secondly*. The text and canon referred to were certainly those we now have, as is proved by particular citations from nearly every book, and by the testimony of the Septuagint, from which the quotations are usually made, not to say by the Hebrew codices extant, and represented in our copies. Hence, *thirdly*, the words "scripture" and "law, prophets, psalms," were certainly used by our Saviour and his apostles as distinctive of that canon of the inspired Old Testament which we now have. This conclusion is resisted, indeed, and the attempt is made to persuade us that our Saviour did not mean to state the threefold division of the Old Testament in the sense of the customary Jewish division, and that the word *γραφαί* may mean not only the inspired but any other religious writings of the ante-Christian times current among the Jews, as, for instance, the *apocrypha*. We have seen the disingenuous attempt to rob us of Josephus' witness, and that of the Targum of Onkelos as to what a Jew of the Christian era meant by "law of Moses." That attempt is futile. It is unquestionable that in Christ's day the terms *law, prophet, psalms*, had a perfectly definite meaning as

the three grand divisions of our present Hebrew canon. Hence, it is the plainest rule of hermeneutics that He shall be held to use the terms in their recognised sense, inasmuch as He gives us no *caveat* against it. Josephus, in his testimony, shows clearly that a broad separating line existed in every Hebrew mind between the books of the canon, and all others, however pious and popular.

That neither Christ nor the Jews of his day ever confounded these inspired books with any *midrash* or *halacha* appears again thus: in every place where authority is claimed for a rabbinical law, its inferiority to the inspired law is admitted on both sides. See, for instance, Matt. xv. 2 and 9. The scribes do not dare to call their rule of handwashing more than a "tradition of the elders," even when they claim obedience to it. Christ contrasts it with *God's* *δύματα*, as a "commandment of men." So Mark vii. 3, 8, 9.

Lastly. The words "Scripture," "Scriptures," and "Sacred Writings," are together used fifty-two times in the New Testament, and in every case the context makes it plain that the meaning attached is that which we give them—inspired writings. "The Scripture cannot be broken." "The Scripture must be fulfilled." "No Scripture is of private interpretation, but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." "What saith the Scripture?" (evidently appealing to it as an infallible arbiter.) Such is the tone of this New Testament usage. Since the intensest Rabbinit did not dare to claim that his "tradition" was "Scripture," and since Christ so clearly distinguishes them, it is beyond debate that the words designated only the inspired canon. But since the very parts of Leviticus and Numbers, which Mr. Smith suspects, are quoted as "Law of the Lord," as "Scripture," as "God's teaching by Moses," his suspicions are contradicted by Christ and his apostles.

In concluding this review, we can add very little as a summing up. We can safely appeal to the attentive reader to decide whether our exceptions to Mr. Smith's conclusions are not deci-

sive. We can equally leave it to him to decide, after the exposure of his uncandid methods, whether our disapprobation of his work, though plainly expressed, is not just and deserved. Our word of condemnation was not too hard; and the safety of the Church and the truth requires from faithful defenders no less. Finally: while we do not presume to question the personal sincerity of Mr. Smith's protestations of his own confidence in the substance of the Bible as containing a divine religion, we warn him that few who adopt his principles of criticism will think that they can consistently stop where he stops. The Germans whom he follows do not think so. Their first principle is, that the supernatural is incredible. The very aim of their policy in adopting a method so rash is, to be able thereby to eliminate this supernatural out of the Scriptures. And such will be the tendency, wherever such methods are used. The result towards which they incline is virtual infidelity.

R. L. DABNEY.

ARTICLE II.

THE CANONICITY OF SECOND PETER.

The question which we propose is a purely historical one. The Canon of the New Testament is a definite collection of books; 2 Peter is found to occupy a place in it. The question is, Was it always there, or has it been foisted unrighteously into a place to which it has no claim? This is a historical question, and is to be settled on appropriate historical evidence. It is a question, however, of vast dogmatic interest. Perhaps it may be said that the settlement of it means the settlement of the Canon. It is admitted on all hands that the evidence for the canonicity of 2 Peter is less cogent than that for any other New Testament book,—not, perhaps, less in amount (2 John and Philemon have less), but less proportionately to its length and importance. If the evidence for 2 Peter can be shown to be sufficient and convincing, therefore, the greater evidence capable of being adduced for the other books will be readily seen to be of overwhelming power. It is thus of especial importance that we examine with particular care the testimony for it, both that we may hold correct opinions as to its own authority, and that we may obtain a practical standard by which to estimate the strength of the evidence for the other books.

It is essential to the canonicity of a New Testament book that it should have been given to the Church by the apostles as of divine authority. But we cannot at this day hear the apostolic voice in its authorisation. Beyond what witness one apostolic book was to bear to another—as Paul in 1 Tim. v. 18 authenticates Luke—and what witness an apostolic book may bear to itself, we cannot appeal at this day to immediate apostolic authorisation. In the case of 2 Peter the first of these testimonies fails, and the second is not of itself and by itself sufficient to satisfy doubt, but only when connected with some external presumption that the Epistle may be what it asserts. We have no resource, then, but to seek to resolve the question of its apostolic gift to the church indirectly. To do this we must make two queries: Is

the letter old enough to have been written by an apostle? Has the Church from its beginning held it as a part of the authoritative rule of faith? If these two questions are answered in the affirmative, the presumption is overwhelming that the Church thus from the apostolic age held it to be divine only because it had received it from the apostles as divine. If the internal evidence is found to corroborate this, and no adequate rebutting evidence is produced, the position of the Epistle in the Canon will be seen to be so secure that it will amount to self-stultification to oppose it.

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE EARLY DATE OF II. PETER.

It is admitted on all hands that the veritable 2 Peter which we now have, was, at the opening of the third century, in the hands of ORIGEN. This, indeed, is reiteratedly plain. He not only quotes its words, but he quotes them as Peter's,¹ and as Scripture,² he distinguishes it from 1 Peter³ and combines it as equally Peter's with the first Epistle;⁴ he clearly and distinctly names both together.⁵ Although, therefore, he mentions the fact that there were some doubts abroad with reference to the Epistle's genuineness, the way in which Origen speaks of the letter and uses it clearly indicates this fact—that it was generally received at this time as Peter's and Scripture. Now, it is not possible to believe that a book so dealt with by Origen was manufactured or first became widely known in his own day. We would *a priori* expect his older contemporary and preceptor, CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, to have also known it. We are consequently not surprised to find that this was the fact. Eusebius⁶ tells us that "Clement, in his 'Out-

¹Comm. in Ep. Ro. (Migne, IV., 1179): "*Et Petrus in epistola sua dicit* (2 P. i. 2)."

²In Numer. Hom. (II., 676): "*Et ut ait quodam in loco scriptura* (2 P. ii. 16)."

³Comm. in Matt., T. 15 (III., 1333): "*Ἀπο τε τῆς πρώτης ἐπιστολῆς* (1 P. i. 8).

⁴Add to ² above: "*Et iterum alibi* (1 P. iv. 10)."

⁵Eus. H. E., VI., 25: "Peter left behind one Epistle that is *ὁμολογημένη*· ἴστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν· ἀραβάζεται γαρ. So also in *Lib. Jesu*, Nov. Hom., 8 (Migne II., 857).

⁶H. E., VI., 14.

lines,' has given, to speak generally, concise explanations of all the Canonical Scriptures without omitting the disputed books—I mean the Epistle of Jude, and the other catholic Epistles; as well as the Epistle of Barnabas and the so-called Revelation of Peter." This testimony is supported by Cassiodorus¹ and Photius.² It may, therefore, be accepted as indubitable and the conclusion drawn confidently that Clement had our 2 Peter probably (or, rather, according to Eusebius, certainly) among the Scriptures, and that he even wrote a commentary on it.

The mass of modern critics would have us believe that this is as far as we can go, and that Clement marks the earliest trace of our Epistle. So Credner and Hilgenfeld expressly, while Bleek and Reuss would go farther and throw doubt even on Clement's testimony, and even such men as Alford and Westcott are in uncertainty. Hence Credner can assign its origin, at the earliest, to the beginning of the second century, and Hilgenfeld, at the earliest, to its middle; while Bleek wavers between the two opinions, although inclining to the former. That the later date, as assigned by Hilgenfeld and the majority of his school, is untenable, however, is abundantly evident from the data already before us. The basis of the opinion is simply the asserted silence of earlier writers; but the precariousness of the argument from silence may be learned from Clement of Alexandria himself. He possessed the letter and wrote a commentary on it—the proof of this is irrefragable; and yet no mention of it, no evidence of his knowledge of it at all secure,³ can be found in any of his extant

¹*Institutio Divinarum Scripturarum, præf.* (Cf. c. 8., which must be explained by *præf.*)

²Bibl. Cod., 109. He calls the *Hypotyposes* (or "Outlines") of Clement: *Expositiones τοῦ θείου Παυλοῦ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν καὶ τῶν καθολικῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ*. All sorts of conjectures have been hazarded to explain this last term; plainly it includes the Epistle of Barnabas and Revelation of Peter given in Eusebius's statement. May it be simply a scribe's error for *τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν*, meaning "the ecclesiastical books" in Rufinus's sense?

³The passage often adduced: *Cohort. ad Gentes*, p. 66, ed. Sylb., would be a most probable reference, except that it occurs also in Clement of Rome, whence Clement of Alexandria, who used freely the works of his namesake, may have obtained it. See below (the passage adduced from Clement Ro. XXXV., 5).

writings. This should teach us a lesson as to the value of the argument from silence. On the other hand, it is impossible to square the mere fact that Clement has written a commentary on Second Peter—a book bearing the name of Peter and hence either considered genuine by him, or else a malicious forgery—with the assertion that it was first published during Clement's own life-time. We may go still farther. The usage of the book by Origen is of such a character as, taken in connection with the fact of Clement's commenting on it, to exhibit it as a part of Clement's Canon of Scripture. The further evidence in the case points to the same conclusion. But Clement's Canon was not a private collection, but the same that was held by the whole Church; and the mere fact that the book formed a part of the Church Canon of the later part of the second century throws a strong probability on the supposition that it had always been part of it, and hence was as old as the apostolic age. To feel this we have only to listen to Clement's professions. He declares that he had travelled far and sat under many teachers of many names, and he holds only those books which he had found everywhere clung to as those which had come down from the apostles. If we had no further evidence than Clement's, therefore, a probability of the apostolical origin of 2 Peter would already exist, such as would require some weighty evidence to overturn. The burden of proof would certainly rest on those who denied its canonicity.

The question still remains, however, whether the assertion is true that there is no earlier evidence than Clement's for 2 Peter. Reuss hints that "Apologists" have gone so far in seeking older witnesses as, in reality, to refer any trace of Christianity in the second century to this Epistle, as if "that century could have obtained Christianity from no other source than 2 Peter." How far this sarcasm is deserved may be best determined by examining the parallels actually adduced by "Apologists."

We begin, then, with IRENÆUS, an older contemporary of Clement's. In the third book (chapter 1) of his great work against Heresies, we meet with the first seeming allusion. Peter (2 Peter i. 15) had spoken of something that he intended to have done *μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξοδον*. Irenæus, speaking of *Peter* and

Paul, remarks on what happened *μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἐξόδου*. Now this is a very unusual expression, and in Irenæus' mouth it has been repeatedly misunderstood. Does it not seem to have been suggested by Peter's words? Reading further, we come in the fourth book (chapter xxxvi. 4) to another passage in which he adduces Noah, then Sodom and Gomorrah, and Lot, to show that God will punish the wicked and save the holy. Our minds go immediately to 2 Peter ii. 4-7, whence the framing of this passage seems to have been derived. Already a presumption for Irenæus's use of our epistle is raised. This is lifted to an exceedingly high degree when we read his fifth book (chapter xxviii. 3) and read that the world shall last a thousand years for every day consumed in its creation—*ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη*—a passage which irresistibly suggests 2 P. iii. 8. There the creation of the world had been discoursed upon (v. 5), and its destruction (v. 6 and 7); *ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη*. We are told, indeed, that the resemblance is due not to dependence of one upon the other, but a mutual dependence on Ps. xc. 4. But Ps. xc. 4 reads: *ὅτι χίλια ἔτη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἢ ἐχθὲς ἥτις διήλθε*, which presents a very diverse, not to say directly opposite thought. The passage in 2 Peter depends on this Psalm and the next clause to that quoted above becomes a quotation from the Psalm. But Irenæus's statement follows, not the Psalm nor Peter's quotation from the Psalm, but Peter's *inference* from the Psalm, and that almost verbally; and it seems morally certain that it must have come, directly or indirectly, from 2 Peter. The argument is strengthened by the fact that in V. 23, 2, Irenæus repeats the same statement, and as coming from a respected source. It seems clear that we are justified in modestly asserting that the probability that Irenæus possessed 2 Peter amounts to a moral certainty.

It is, indeed, replied that a phrase which occurs in IV. 9, 2, where Irenæus quotes 1 Peter with the formula: "*Petrus ait in epistola sua*," excludes any knowledge on the part of the writer of a 2 Peter also. We may waive any question of the genuineness of the words, and answer simply that this may be a very convincing argument against Irenæus's care and scholarly accuracy in

distinguishing the special epistle he meant, but it cannot disprove his knowledge of an epistle which he has elsewhere quoted. It may be astounding to the critics, and yet it is true, that just such a loose method of quoting was most common in Irenæus's day. Irenæus certainly knew 2 John—he quotes it explicitly and by name (I. 16, 3, and III. 16, 8)—and yet he quotes 1 John (III. 16, 5 and 8) just as he quotes 1 Peter (*in epistola sua, in τῇ ἐπιστολῇ.*) Shall we say that this excludes the knowledge of 2 John? Then again, Cyprian quotes 1 Peter after the same fashion, and yet his correspondent, Firmilian, has no difficulty in quoting 2 Peter in a letter to him. Did these two old hob-nobbing bishops possess distinct and different canons? Still again, at the seventh Council of Carthage, at which Cyprian was present, one bishop is found quoting 1 John as “his epistle,” and immediately afterwards Aurelius is represented as quoting 2 John after the same fashion: “*Johannes apostolus in epistola sua poscit, dicens,*” (2 John x. 11), so that it appears that not only 1 John but 2 John also, and both together at the same time and place, could be cited in these obnoxious words. Other evidence of the same kind is abundant; but we need only adduce further a clinching fact from Origen, who is able to quote both 1 Peter and 2 Peter with the same formula, as may be seen by referring to the first quotation given from him at the beginning of this paper. The fact is, these ancient brethren were very much like us moderns, and used very free and general forms of speech. Certainly no argument from Irenæus's use of the phrase can be drawn to weaken the evidence for his knowledge of 2 Peter.

Going a few years further back into the second century, we find a passage in the writings of THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH which bears all the appearance of being a reminiscence from 2 Peter. We do not refer to *Ad Autolyicum*, II. 9, which is usually quoted as parallel to 2 Peter i. 21, but to the following passage from *Ad Autolye.*, II. 13: “The *διάταξις* of God, therefore—this is *his word*, φαίνων ὡσπερ λόγος ἐν οἰκίῳ ἐν συνεχομένῳ, ἐφώτισεν τὴν ἰπ' οὐρανόν.” The resemblance of this to 2 Peter i. 19 is too great to be overlooked, and cannot be wholly vitiated by an appeal to 4 Esdras xii. 42 (*tu enim nobis superasti ex omnibus prophetis—sicut*

lucerna in loco obscuro). We may at least claim that we have here a probable reference.

In some writings of a still older contemporary of Irenæus', MELITO OF SARDIS, preserved to us in a Syriac translation, we meet with a striking passage which seems to show dependence on 2 Peter iii. 5-7 and 10-12. In the translation of Dr. Westcott¹ it runs as follows: "There was a flood of waters. . . . So also shall it be at the last time; there shall be a flood of fire, and the earth shall be burnt up together with its mountains, and men shall be burnt up together with their idols which they have made and the graven images which they have worshipped; and the sea together with its isles shall be burnt up; and the just shall be delivered from the fury like their fellows in the ark from the waters of the deluge." Perhaps it is within the bounds of moderation to hold that this *probably* is a reminiscence of 2 Peter.

During the period which stretches back between Melito and A. D. 120, we find parallels between 2 Peter and three writers: Hermas, Justin, and Pseudo-Clement. That from 2 Clement, however, is scarcely worth pleading (2 Clem. xvi. 3, and 2 P. iii. 7); at best this may possibly depend on that. Those from HERMAS are much more striking and are certainly sufficient to raise a very strong presumption that Hermas had 2 Peter. They are three: Vis. iv. 3, 4, "Ye who have escaped from this world," Compare 2 Peter ii. 20; Vis. iii. 7, 1, "abandoned the true way." Compare 2 Peter ii. 15 (ii. 2); and much more important, Simil. vi. 4, last part: τῆς τρυφῆς καὶ τὰ ἀπατῆς ὁ χρόνος ὡρα ἑστὶ μία· τῆς δὲ βασάνου ὡραὶ τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν δύναμιν ἔχουσαι. Ἐὰν οὖν μίαν ἡμέραν τις τρυφήσῃ καὶ ἀπατηθῇ. Compare 2 Peter ii. 13: τὴν ἐν ἡμέρα τριήφην. . . . ἐν τρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν. Much stronger still are those urged from JUSTIN. In Dial. c. 81, we read: Συνήκαμεν καὶ τὸ εἰρημένον ὅτι Ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη, εἰς τοῦτο συνάγειν, which, like the parallel passage in Irenæus, must be assigned to 2 Peter iii. 8 as its source. Again in Dial. c. 82, we read: "In the same manner also as there were ψευδοπροφήται among the holy prophets that were with you, so also among us now are also many ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, of whom our Lord forewarned us." But where can this forewarning be found?

¹On the Canon, 3d Ed., p. 202, note 2.

Does it exist anywhere but in 2 Pet. ii. 1 (*cf.* i. 21): “But there were *ψευδοπροφήται* among the people, as also among you shall be *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι*, who shall subintroduce damnable heresies”? It is exceedingly difficult to see how there can be any reasonable doubt but that these passages are drawn from 2 Peter. And if so, it is noticeable that Justin refers to 2 Peter with respect, as Scripture, as, practically, the words of the Lord—in a word, as an authoritative book giving the Lord’s teaching. All that was said above about the value of Clement’s testimony may, therefore, be transferred now to Justin’s, with this difference, that the period now before us is the years before A. D. 147, instead of after 195. It will not be surprising, therefore, if we find testimonies for 2 Peter in the next earlier age.

From this next age—called the sub-apostolic, because the next succeeding to that in which the Apostles lived—and stretching from the apostolic age to A. D. 120, parallels have been adduced with 2 Peter from the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs, Polycarp, Barnabas, and Clement of Rome. That from Polycarp (iii. 2, with 2 P. iii. 15, 16,) may be passed over as only possibly derived from 2 Peter. Those from the TEST. XII. PATT. are more striking and render it probable that the author had and used 2 Peter. They are such as the very rare phrase *μισμοίς* [Oxford MS.—*μιάσμασι*] *της γης* in Benj. 8, *cf.* 2 P. ii. 20—a phrase found in 2 Peter only in the New Testament and in the Test. xii. Patt., only in its age; the rare phrase *τοὺν πλάττειν λόγους* in Reuben 3, which seems to have been suggested by 2 P. ii. 3; the use of *τήρειν* in Reuben 5, just as it is used in 2 P. ii. 9, and some peculiarities of vocabulary common to the two writings; all of which combined raise a probability of some force of dependence on 2 Peter.¹

The parallel with BARNABAS seems decisive as to the earlier existence of 2 Peter; and it is difficult to see how assent can be withheld from the statement, that we have here a plain reference to 2 Peter. We read in Barn. xv. 4: *ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ’ αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη, αὐτὸς δὲ μοι μαρτυρεῖ λέγων· Ἴδοὺ σήμερον ἡμέρα ἔσται ὡς χίλια ἔτη. Ἴτ*

¹These points are fully stated in PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, JANUARY, 1880, p. 65.

is to be observed that the closeness of Barnabas to 2 P. iii. 8, is greater than was the case in the like parallel in either Irenæus or Justin. What was said there is therefore *a fortiori* strong here. Nor can the difference of context in Barnabas be urged against his dependence on 2 Peter;¹ this is too characteristic of Barnabas elsewhere to be of any importance here.

The case with the parallels in CLEMENT OF ROME is not quite so plain. We have, first, Noah and Lot adduced in vii. 5, and xi. 1, similarly to what is done in 2 Peter ii. 5-9. And then we have two passages: ix. 2, "Let us fix our eyes on them that ministered perfectly τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεί ὁξῆ αὐτοῦ, compared with 2 P. i. 17; and xxxv. 5, τῇ ὁδοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας, compared with 2 P. ii. 2—the strength of which rests in this fact: that in each case a very rare and peculiar phrase occurs, peculiar in the New Testament to 2 Peter, and in the sub-apostolic age to Clement. Certainly this is

¹There is a great deal of error abroad as to what and how much is needful to prove literary dependence. We need greatly a full, well-thought-out essay on the general question of literary dependence—its proofs, marks, and signs. Dr. Sanday in his "Gospels in the Second century," has made a fair beginning as to the question, With how much looseness may a second century father be allowed to quote and his quotation be recognised? But all is not done yet that is essential. Something is wrong or insufficient in the general understanding of this subject when men will universally and immediately recognise this passage as exhibiting dependence on Matthew—"All this preliminary ferment, then, [speaking of the brood of American poets in the second quarter of the nineteenth century] was in some way needful. The experiments of many who thought themselves called, enabled the few who were chosen to find motives and occasions for work of real import."—(*Mr. Stedman in Scribner for October, 1881 p. 821*), and yet at the same time will doubt or deny any dependence on the same passage in the following—Ὡς γέγραπται, πολλοὶ κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εἰρεθῶμεν—(*Ep. of Barnabas, iv. 14*), or doubt or deny a dependence on 2 Peter in the passages in the text. Is Mr. Stedman's *context* a voucher for his borrowing from Matthew? Or is there something in being a nineteenth century writer, and in English, which renders it more probable that he should quote from the New Testament, than if he were a second century writer and a Greek? Certainly something is wrong with the critics. *Or is it that Mr. Stedman's passage does not help the "Apologists," while Barnabas's does?* We are ashamed to even think such a thing.

enough to raise some probability that as early as 97 A. D., Clement had and borrowed a peculiar phraseology from 2 Peter.

Now, it must have been already observed that these parallels do not turn, as Reuss sneers, on Christian commonplaces, but that they contain marked peculiarities of phraseology and thought. Some of them seem insoluble save by—all of them easiest soluble by—the assumption of dependence on 2 Peter. If we had, earlier than Clement of Alexandria, only the probable references of Theophilus, Melito, Hermas, Test. xii. Patt., and Clement of Rome, the only rational course would be to ascribe 2 Peter to the first century and to the apostolic period. The presumption of its early date thus raised would be convincingly strong. Yet this is but the weaker half of our evidence. To a moral certainty 2 Peter was used by Irenæus (A. D. 175), Justin Martyr (c. 147), and Barnabas (c. 106). One probable quotation from the early second century would have so supported the inference flowing from the testimony of Clement of Alexandria and Origen as to render the first century origin of the book the only probable hypothesis. Instead of that we have fifteen or sixteen quotations. The two earliest of the post-apostolic writers both furnish references: the one such as almost demonstrates his use of the book, the other such as raises his use of it to a high degree of probability. There are no earlier witnesses to call. How can we fail to see that to a moral certainty 2 Peter came from the first century, and may very well, therefore, have sprung from the bosom of the apostolical circle?

II. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE EARLY ACCEPTANCE OF THE EPISTLE AS CANONICAL.

In seeking to discover the attitude of the early Church toward 2 Peter, too much cannot possibly be made of the fact that this Epistle was finally accepted as genuinely Peter's and part of the Canon by the whole Church. On the theory of its ungeniuness (which implies uncanonicity) this is exceedingly difficult to account for. And this agreement as to its canonicity extends back certainly to the *fourth century*, in which, with the exception of

one branch of the Church only, 2 Peter was universally accepted as part of the Canon. The Byzantine, Alexandrian, and Western branches of the Church had at this time all accepted and were all holding confidently to this Epistle as of divine authority. The Syriac Church alone had omitted it from her canon. Not only is it found in those great monuments of the New Testament text as it existed in the fourth century, without a word or sign to distinguish it from the other books,¹ codices B and X; but it is witnessed to as existing in the Church Canon by the great writers of the day—by Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, by Athanasius, by Augustine, Rufinus, Jerome, Philastrius, by the third Council of Carthage, by the [Canons of Laodicea], Adamantius, Synopsis Athanasii, the Decreta of Damasus, Gelasius, and Hormisdas, the apostolical canons, and so on, down to our own time. Now, it has been well said that such a general support yielded to a book in the fourth century in an antecedent proof of the truth of its claims, so that with regard to it the question is not, What further proof have we for its canonicity? but rather, What proof have we which will justify us in putting it out of the Canon, authenticated as the Canon of the fourth century, as a whole, is?² Beyond all controversy this is a true position. That a book held so firm a position in the fourth century Canon is presumptive proof that it belonged of right in it; and this presumption is valid to determine our faith and rational assent unless it be set aside by cogent reasons. The question, therefore, is *not*, Independently of this presumption, what sufficient grounds have we for placing 2 Peter in the Canon? *but*, What sufficient grounds have we for putting it out of the Canon, where it seems so firmly instated?

Three facts have been and may be pleaded as such grounds: (1) The absence of the book from the Syriac Canon. (2) The doubts expressed concerning it by fourth century and earlier writers; and (3) The small amount of very early evidence for the existence of the book. Some remarks on each of these assertions will be proper.

¹In B the marginal marks of division are lacking.

²Westcott on the Canon, p. 319.

(1) It is to be admitted that 2 Peter was absent from the Syrian Canon current in the late fourth century, and after. Chrysostom accepts only three catholic epistles; Amphilocheus of Iconium, in his catalogue, while mentioning that some accepted seven, mentions also that some accepted only three. Junilius himself accepts only two, though he admits that *quamplurimi* in his day accepted seven. Even as late a writer as Ebed Jesu (14th century) confines the catholic epistles to only three. Still further the Peshito version, as it comes down to us, in all its copies of any weight of evidence, omits the same four catholic epistles (together with the Apocalypse) which all these writers omit. And the loose and manifestly exaggerated remarks of Leontius of Byzantium¹ are doubtless to be understood as classing Theodore of Mopsuestia with this Syriac school. It is clear, therefore, that from the fourth century the Syriac Church omitted 2 Peter from her Canon. On the other hand, however, it is remarked that, even if this truly represented the original Syriac Canon, it would be the testimony of only one corner of the Church and could not overbear the testimony of the whole of the rest; but in truth it is more than doubtful whether the early Syriac Church rejected these epistles. Chrysostom is the earliest witness to the shorter form of the Syriac Canon, while earlier than his time that Canon seems to have included all of our New Testament books. Thus *Ephraem Syrus*, of the preceding generation, confessedly possessed all seven catholic epistles and the Revelation in an older Syriac translation of ecclesiastical authority². He is our earliest witness to the Peshito. The original Peshito is therefore admitted by such critics as Thiersch, Lücke, and even Hilgenfeld, to have doubtless contained the omitted books, while the form in which it was possessed by Chrysostom represents the result of a

¹*Contra Nestor. et Eutych. lit. III.* (Galland. *Biblio.* XII., 686 *seq.*) Compare also the wild statements of Kosmas' Indicopleustes.

²See Hilgenfeld's *Einleitung in das N. T.*, pp. 111, 112, 122, and the authorities there quoted. Ephraem's use of 2 Peter may be noted in *Opp. Syr.*, T. II., p. 342. *Græc.*, T. II., p. 387.

critical Antiochene revision of the fourth century.¹ This conclusion, sound in itself and in its own right, is yet still farther borne out by two further considerations: The later Syriac Church was not agreed as to the number of the catholic epistles—the school of Nisibis (represented by Junilius) accepting only two; and this diversity can be best accounted for by the supposition that the objection proceeded on critical grounds, and critical grounds were for each individual to determine also how much was to be rejected. And the earlier Syrian writers certainly possessed and esteemed the rejected books. Thus Theophilus of Antioch (168–180) had 2 Peter and Revelation,² Malchion had Jude,³ and Pamphilus had Revelation,⁴ (which he assigned to John,) and seemingly also the whole seven of the catholic epistles.⁵ The testimony of the early Syrian Church, therefore, is for our completed Canon; and the omission of 2 Peter from the later fourth century Syrian Canon resolves itself simply into another case of fourth century critical doubts.

(2) The doubts expressed by certain of the fourth century writers constitute the most serious objection to the force of the fourth century evidence for the genuineness of the epistle. Reported by Eusebius at Constantinople and Didymus at Alexandria,—acted on, as we have seen, by the Syrian Church,—repeated by Jerome in Italy,—the air seems heavy with them. Nor were they of late origin. Early in the third century, Origen, in one brief statement, lets us see that they existed even then. It is necessary, therefore, that we should give them detailed attention.

¹It has been customary to say that Ephraem witnesses to a Greek, not the Syrian Canon (so Westcott). But it is clear that his Canon all existed in Syriac, and it is doubtful how far his knowledge even of the Greek language extended. See Smith and Wace's *Diet. of Christ. Biog.* II., 142 and 143, for a just estimate of his Greek learning.

²Eus. II. E., IV., 24.

³Eus. II. E., VII., 30.

⁴Pamph. Apol., VII.

⁵Westcott, p. 362.

In his catalogue of New Testament books,¹ which, as a formal passage, must take precedence of all others, Eusebius arranges 2 Peter among the Antilegomena or disputed books. This, however, does not imply more than that it had not passed thus far without having been disputed, and, therefore, adds nothing to our knowledge. He moreover distinctly states that it was among those that had been "recognised by most," and betrays the fact that his own opinion as to its genuineness was favorable. In brief, therefore, his testimony is that the book is genuine and was held to be such by the Church, although it had been disputed by unnamed individuals on unmentioned grounds.² It cannot be said, therefore, that he raises doubts as to the genuineness of 2 Peter; he simply recognises and records the doubts that had already been raised. Born probably and brought up certainly at Cæsarea, he had been from his earliest childhood in contact with the Syrian Church, and could not but be deeply affected by their critical opinions. He had the writings of Origen in his hands, and quotes the passage in which he communicates the fact that there were doubters of 2 Peter's genuineness in his day. There is no reason to believe that what he says of the position of 2 Peter has anything further than this at its base; he had promised to tell us whatever was said by earlier writers about the Antilegomena; and he tells us only of Origen's remarks against 2 Peter. We may with considerable confidence, therefore, affirm with respect to Eusebius, that he witnesses to the canonical position of

¹H. E., III., 25.

²Canon Westcott has shown (p. 388, *seq.*), that this formal statement must explain the other looser statements of Eusebius. Elsewhere (III., 3,) he declares that the book current under the name of 2 Peter had not been handed down (*παρείληφμεν*) as *ἐνδιάθετον*,—"still, since it appeared useful to many, it had been diligently read *with the other Scriptures*." And later, he says somewhat unguardedly and inconsistently: "I recognise only one Epistle [of Peter] as genuine and acknowledged by the ancient presbyters;" though doubtless he meant the whole predicate here to be taken as one single thought, which would void the inconsistency. However difficult it may be to us to harmonise all this perfectly, it is clear that the passage given in the text, as being the only formal statement, must be the one followed.

2 Peter in the Church of his day,—that his own opinion was favorable to its genuineness,—that while he recognises the fact that it had been disputed, he yet tells us nothing of the grounds on which it had been disputed, and does not imply that he had knowledge of a greater or more wide-spread doubt than we have the items of. In other words, his remarks add nothing to the evidence against the epistle, but do add to the argument for the genuineness of the epistle. The shadows of the doubts whose complete selves could not shake his faith, need not shake ours.

The state of the case with reference to the doubts expressed by Didymus of Alexandria is much the same. He wrote a commentary on this epistle—which is itself a significant fact—at the close of which we find a sentence which in the Latin translation (which has alone come down to us) appears to read as follows: “It ought not, then, to be unknown that the epistle is accounted spurious [*falsatam*, probably a rendering of *νοθεύεται*], which although it is in public use, is nevertheless not in the Canon.”¹ Like the statement of Eusebius, this only recites a fact without giving the grounds on which it is based. But, unlike the case of Eusebius, the fact here stated, if taken strictly, is demonstrably false, and Didymus’ personal opinion seems to be involved in the statement. If the original Greek stated, as the slovenly Latin seems to imply, that in Didymus’ day 2 Peter was not generally considered canonical, then Didymus has simply misinformed his readers. For, after the middle of the fourth century, when he flourished (born 309 or 314) it is confessed on all sides that 2 Peter was in the Church Canon. It is difficult to believe, however, that the Latin accurately represents the original Greek. Didymus uses 2 Peter most fully as Petrine and Scripture, in his work on the Trinity,² and this proves either that he himself

¹Migne, XXXIX., p. 1,774.

²In *De Trinitate*, he calls it a catholic epistle (Ed. Mingarell, p. 234), ascribes it distinctly to Peter (pp. 21, 28, 99, 151, 234), and cites it just like the other Scriptures (pp. 90, 115). Moreover, he cites 1 Peter under that name, thus implying in 2 Peter, (99, 182, 276, 340). It is worth while to note further that he seems to use 2 Peter as genuine, also in the *Enarratio in Ep. Judæ*, in defiance of his (seeming) adverse statement at the end of the *Enarratio in 2 Peter*. It may, perhaps, be worth noting further that the *Enarrationes* were a youthful work.

held it to be genuine, or that he was so accustomed to see it used and to use it as genuine that his critical opinion to the contrary was apt to be forgotten in practice,—that is, that it was generally considered genuine, and had been so considered through a long past. In all probability, Didymus simply repeats his master Origen; and at all events his own use of 2 Peter in his work on the Trinity sucks the poison out of his adverse statement. At the worst, it can only represent the personal opinion of Didymus supported by an anonymous minority, and therefore cannot stand against the faith of the mass of the Church.

Jerome, at last, informs us of the grounds of the early doubts. "Peter wrote," he tells us,¹ "two epistles which are called catholic; the second of which is denied by very many (*plerisque*) to be his *on account of dissonance of style with the first.*" Jerome is not himself a doubter. His notice is valuable only because it assures us that the doubters of the early Church based their objections on purely *internal*, not *historical* considerations. From this hint we can understand the whole history. This explains why it is that these objections first appear at Alexandria, and why it is that they bore their fruit away in Syria. The Alexandrian school was notable above all others for internal criticism. It was in it that the style of Hebrews and Revelation was first discussed and inferences drawn from the discussion. If this was the source of objection to 2 Peter, it is not strange that objections are first heard of there. The Antiochene school, on the other hand, was the legitimate heir of Alexandrian speculation, and was the first to drive in many matters the critical hints of its predecessor to a practical end. It is not strange, that this same course was followed in this matter also. Jerome thus unties the whole knot for us, and in doing so voids these early objections of their terror. Let there have been many or few affected by them, (and Jerome's "*very many*" doubtless refers to the numbers involved in the rejection by the Syrian Church,) they are, as founded on internal considerations, of no value to us. We appeal to the fathers not for internal but for external arguments; and we can,

¹De Vir. Ill., c. 1.

when all the external testimony is in, examine opinions as to style at our leisure.

Origen, finally, was the earliest writer who mentions doubts as to our epistle; and his words are not unambiguous: "Peter . . . has left behind one epistle which is *ὁμολογουμένην*; perhaps also a second, for it is disputed."¹ Perhaps no more colorless words could have been chosen. Origen's own opinion cannot be gathered from them, and must remain in doubt. When this statement is taken in connexion with Origen's own practice in regard to the epistle,² it is plain, (1,) that some in Origen's day disputed the genuineness of this epistle, and yet, (2,) it was the usual if not universal habit to think and speak of it as Scripture and Peter's. It is clear from this that it was individuals who doubted, but the Church that received, and that the Church had received it through a long past.

Taking a general review of the early doubts expressed, we are justified in saying that, except the later Syrians, it is difficult to put our finger exactly on the doubters. Didymus possibly, Origen possibly, were among them; but most probably they were not. They are an anonymous body. And they are a minority and a hopelessly small one; in Jerome's day they are very many—before that, plainly few. The grounds of their doubt were purely internal, perhaps solely questions of style. It is plain, therefore, that they are by no means of sufficient importance to rebut the presumption already raised for the genuineness and canonicity of the epistle. The testimony of the Church, as the Church, rings clear and strong above all doubt in favor of the letter.

(3.) While it may be confessed that the evidence for the existence of 2 Peter drawn from writers earlier than Origen, is not as copious as could be desired, it has already been shown that it exists in abundant quantity to prove the letter to be as old as the apostolic times. Further evidence might make this proof more overwhelming, but could not alter its import. It is only where one shuts his eyes to this array of passages and refuses to consider really its meaning and strength, that he can allow himself to

¹Eus. H. E., VI., 25.

²Sée p. 46 above.

speak of an insufficiency of early references to that book. The amount of evidence for it seems small, and is in danger of appearing insufficient, only when it is viewed in comparison with the remarkable mass which God has preserved for the chief books of the New Testament. When compared with what is thought—and justly so—amply sufficient to authenticate any other early writing, it looms up before us great and invincible. 2 Peter is to a moral certainty quoted by two writers, and most probably by three or four more, within the first century after its composition; and long before the next century has rolled away, it is fully witnessed to as occupying an assured position in a Canon held all-holy, and thoroughly witnessed to as a whole. Now, Herodotus is quoted but once in the century which followed its composition, but once in the next, not at all in the next, only twice in the next, and not until its fifth century is anything like as fully witnessed to as 2 Peter is in its second. Again, Thucydides is not distinctly quoted, until quite two centuries after its composition; while Tacitus is first cited by Tertullian.¹ Yet no one thinks of disputing the genuineness of Herodotus, Thucydides, or Tacitus. Clement of Alexandria's testimony alone puts 2 Peter on a par with Tacitus; Origen's testimony alone would put it on a better basis than Thucydides stands securely on. Save for the contrast between the testimony for it, and that amazing abundance which stands for the greater New Testament books, it would be simply astonishing how any one could speak of insufficient witness; and that contrast is due not to insufficiency of evidence for 2 Peter, but to astounding over-sufficiency of evidence for the other books.

Thus no one of these lines of argument, nor all together, are able to raise any cogent rebutting evidence against the presumption from the attitude of the fourth century in favor of the book. A strong presumption still remains untouched, that this book thus accepted by the great writers and the Church in general, in that century, was always in the Canon—not to be set aside save on cogent grounds. And, resting on this presumption, we might here rest the case, asking simply for reasons why this book should

¹ Cf. for these facts Rawlinson's *Hist. Evidences*, p. 376 (American edition).

be ignominiously cast out of the Canon of the fourth century. This question clamors in vain for an answer. Yet the fourth century evidence is not all that can be adduced, and it will be instructive to go farther. We have seen incidentally that the notices of Origen prove that the book was a part of the Church Canon of the early years of the third century. And corroborative witness is at hand. Firmilian, in Asia Minor (†270), quotes it as an authoritative letter of Peter "the blessed apostle," when writing to Cyprian in North Africa; whence it is hard not to conclude that he could naturally count on Cyprian esteeming it just as he did—in other words, that at this period 2 Peter was part of the Canon of the universal Church. That it was part of the North African Canon of the third century is certain from the fact that it is included in the Claromontanian Stichometry.¹ In Italy, Hippolytus at the same time seems to quote it.² It cannot be denied, therefore, that it was a part of the Church Canon of the early third century; and the evidence goes further and proves that it was *naturally* in the Canon at this time—that the men of the early third century did not *put* it in, but *found* it in the Canon. It was, therefore, in the Canon of the later years of the second century. And indeed this is independently proved. Not only was it known to several authors of the time, but it was commented on by Clement of Alexandria, and has a place in both the Egyptian versions and in the early form of the Peshito, all of which date from the second century.³ No stronger evidence of its canonical authority at the time could be asked. We must shift our question back two centuries then, and ask, What reason exists to degrade 2 Peter from the Canon of the late second century? Known all over the Church at this period and securely fixed in the Canon, we find it quoted here and there, back to the

¹See the proof that this represents the African Canon of the third century in Credner's *Einleitung*, p. 175, and Hilgenfeld's, p. 107.

²*De Antichristo*, c. 2.

³This is the old opinion as to the Peshito; and Dr. Lightfoot has rendered it the most probable date for the others. See also the opinion of Dr. Schaff and of Drs. Westcott and Hort in their new edition of the New Testament.

very earliest Christian writers; nay, Justin Martyr, before 147, quotes it in such a way as to prove that he esteemed it authoritative. What evidence is there which will compel us to revise the decision of the late second century and put the letter out of its Canon? Absolutely nothing is hazarded in asserting that its position in the Canon of this period peremptorily authenticates it as divine. Even were there no trace of it earlier, this would be enough; how much more so, with the traces we have of its earlier possession and estimation! One has but to catch the grounds on which this age held its canon, to be convinced of this. Irenæus tells us that he holds only to what has been handed down from the elders, the companions of the apostles; Clement appeals as boldly to tradition as his only dependence. Now, the teachers of these men were these very companions of the apostles. Polycarp was Irenæus's teacher, and he was the pupil of John. Clement had studied under many masters of the previous generation in all parts of the Church. The one *sine qua non* with all the writers of this age, for the reception of a book as canonical, was that it should come to them from these fathers as having come to them from the bosom of the apostolical circle. That a book was a recognised part of the New Testament of this period, therefore, authenticates it as having come from the elders who could bear personal witness to its apostolicity. So that the witness of the age of Irenæus alone, if fairly wide-spread, is amply sufficient to authenticate any New Testament book. 2 Peter has that witness. And it has more than that: it is independently witnessed to as coming from the apostolic times (Barnabas, Clement of Rome, etc.), and as being esteemed authoritative (Justin). Surely the presumption of its canonicity amounts to a moral certainty.

III. THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE IN FAVOR OF ITS GENUINENESS.

But what witness does the letter bear to itself? The Church has from the beginning held it to be an authoritative letter from Peter; that it is its own witness in this direction. It bears on the forefront the name of Peter, and this is the first thing we note in asking after internal evidence: the letter asserts itself to be by

Peter (i. 1, 14, 16). It is, therefore, either Peter's, or else a base and designing forgery. It cannot be held to be an innocent production which by some mistake has found its way into the Canon; it is either genuinely Peter's, or else it is an embodied lie. Now this raises a very strong presumption in favor of its genuineness. For it is apparent on any reading of it that a very "holy and apostolic spirit breathes through this letter." Not a false note is struck throughout the whole of it. "We feel," says Froumüller with as much truth as eloquence, "that the author stands in the grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ; that he loves truth above all things (i. 12; i. 3); that he is thoroughly in earnest about Christianity (i. 5); that he fears the judgments of eternity (ii. 1); that he believes in God's justice (ii. 9); that he despises cunningly-devised fables and speaks from a sure and personal autoptic knowledge (i. 16)." The Epistle's claim to be by Peter is thus reinforced by every mark of honesty in its form and matter.

We note next that what it tells us about its author is in striking harmony with its assertion that he was Peter. Not only does the double name Symeon Peter (with its Hebraic sound) fit, and the character of the writer reflect itself as the impulsive, quick, outspoken Peter of the Evangelists, but there are some minute points of coincidence brought out which certainly identify him. Thus, only three of the disciples witnessed our Lord's transfiguration. The author of this Epistle was one of them (i. 16-18). Can this natural reference to his own experience be the trick of a forger? That seems scarcely credible on the face of it, but it is rendered quite impossible by some minute signs in the context which prove that that scene had burnt itself into the writer's heart. His mind is full of it; it is retransacting itself before his very eyes as he writes; its smallest details are in his mouth as he speaks. We remember that it was Peter who said, "Lord, let us make here three *tabernacles*," and in verse 13 we see a reminiscence of this creeping out: "As long as I am in this *tabernacle*." Immediately after that wonderful scene the Lord had spoken of his *ἐξόδος*; and in verse 15 we find a reminiscence of this: "after my *exodus*." No forger could have introduced these reminiscences. Clearly, as the writer approaches the mention of the scene, his mind and

heart are full of it, and he naturally lets fall these minute reminiscences. The author of this letter seems certainly to have witnessed the transfiguration. Again, only seven of the disciples at most, most likely only two (xxi. 20), possibly only one, heard our Lord's prediction recorded in John xxi. 18. The author of this Epistle is one to whom Jesus had predicted a violent death (i. 14), and this must refer to this prediction. The author of this Epistle was again, therefore, Peter: who could have placed this reminiscence here but Peter?

Still again, the writer of this Epistle is the same as the Peter of the Acts. The style of the Epistle is the same as that of the speeches of Peter recorded in the Acts, as is proved by a long series of parallels capable of being adduced between the two,¹ the greater number of which turn on the usage of peculiar (*i. e.*, rare) words or phrases, and therefore present evidence of great convincingness.

Once again, the author of this Epistle was the writer of 1 Peter. In the face of all that has been urged as to the difference of style between the two, we still insist on this. The same character underlies both writings; both are the outflow of an ardent, impulsive, yet chastened heart. The writers of both bear the same relation to Paul and are anxious equally to express approval and recommendation of his teaching; the one quotes his words to a remarkable extent, and has evidently, as one object of his writing, to commend his doctrine (1 Peter v. 12 *et passim*); the other expressly declares its position on this point (2 Peter iii. 2). The writers of both are apt to draw their language from previous sources, not mechanically, but so as to show adoption by, and transmission through, a mind which has grasped at once all that has been said, has felt it through and through, and been so affected by it that it naturally repeats it in its own striking fashion. Thus 1 Peter depends on Romans and Ephesians; thus 2 Peter depends on Jude. The writers of both exhibit a tendency to adduce the *mysteries* of the truth in illustration of their arguments; thus compare 1 Peter iii. 19, iv. 6, iii. 6, 21, on the one hand, and

¹Alford adduces, *e. g.*: I. 1=Acts 1. 17; I. 3, 6, 7=Acts iii. 12; I. 21=Acts ii. 23; II. 8=Acts ii. 29; II. 8=Acts ii. 23; II. 9=Acts x. 2, 7; II. 9=Acts iv. 21; III. 2=Acts v. 32; III. 10=Acts ii. 20, etc.

on the other such passages as 2 Peter iii. 5, 10. That the *same* mysteries are not dwelt on by both does not void the argument, which turns on a quality of mind, the tendency found in both writers to bring forward incidentally the deep things of the kingdom. Still further, the doctrinal teaching of both writers, although adduced for different purposes and therefore expressed in different forms, is precisely the same, not only in ground principles but in modes of presentation, as even Schwegler feels forced to admit.¹ Even minute points of teaching, exhibiting favorite tenets, pass over from one Epistle to the other; this is true of the view as to prophecy (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 10–12 and 2 Peter i. 19–21, iii. 2), of the views of the new birth *through the divine word* (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 22, ii. 2, and 2 Peter i. 4); of the teaching given as to submission to worldly rulers (1 Peter ii. 13, and 2 Peter ii. 10); of the dread expressed of false teachers, etc. The likeness extends even to the use of special words such as *κρίμα* (1 Peter iv. 17 and 2 Peter ii. 3); *ἄρετη* (1 Peter ii. 9 and 2 Peter i. 3), etc. So that working one farther step we may say that the two Epistles exhibit striking resemblances of style, resemblances much more striking and far-reaching than the differences so freely adduced by many critics. These resemblances are seen not only in peculiar phrases, such as the form of salutation, “Grace and peace *be multiplied*,” found in these two Epistles and nowhere else; but also in the recurrence in both of rare combinations, such as *ἀμώμον και ἀσπίλον*, 1 Peter i. 19, repeated 2 Peter ii. 13 and iii. 14 and nowhere else, and also the common possession of a very peculiar vocabulary such as is represented by the occurrence in both of *ἐποπτεύσαντες* (1 Peter ii. 12, 2 Peter i. 16), *ἰσότημος* (1 Peter i. 7, 19, 2 Peter i. 1, 4), reinforced by the like community in such as *φιλαδελφία* (1 Peter i. 22, 2 Peter i. 7); *χορηγεῖν* (1 Peter iv. 11, 2 Peter i. 5, 11); *ἀπόθεσις* (1 Peter iii. 21, 2 Peter i. 14); *ἄρετη* (1 Peter ii. 9, 2 Peter i. 3); *ἀναστροφή* (1 Peter i. 15, 2 Peter ii. 12); *ἀλήθεια* in a peculiar sense (1 Peter i. 22, 2 Peter i. 12); *κομίζεσθαι* (1 Peter i. 9, 2 Peter ii. 13), etc.;² all of which are rare words in the New Testament. In the face of such considerations as these,

¹Nachapost. Zeitalter, I. 512, *seq.*

²See Plumptre's *Christ and Christendom*, p. 345.

it would certainly require very cogent rebutting evidence to convince us that 2 Peter did not come from the same hand which gave us 1 Peter.

Before leaving this general subject, however, we must present two other internal considerations which cannot be passed over, and which possess considerable weight as evidence :

(1). The relation of our Epistle to the Gospel of Mark must be considered. All antiquity tells us that Mark's Gospel bears a special relation to Peter. Now compare 2 Peter ii. 1 and Mark xiii. 22 ; 2 Peter iii. 17 and Mark xiii. 23 ; 2 Peter iii. 10 and Mark xiii. 36 ; 2 Peter iii. 4 and Mark xiii. 19. These are certainly striking parallels ; and if 2 Peter preceded Mark in time we may say they are conclusive that Peter wrote this Epistle. Yet there is a still more striking connexion between the two which seems to have all the force of a complex undesigned coincidence. All antiquity tells us that Mark wrote down what Peter orally taught of the Lord's life and teaching ; and internal criticism of Mark's Gospel corroborates this external testimony. In 1 Peter v. 13, we find Mark on intimate terms with Peter (*cf.* also for an earlier period, Acts xv. 12). Now in 2 Peter i. 15 the author promises his readers that he will see to it that they shall be in a position after his death to have his teaching always in remembrance, and in this he has especial reference to the *facts* of Christ's life, witnessed to by him, as is proved by the purpose which he expresses for so arranging, namely, that they may know that they have not followed cunningly devised fables, but facts autoptically witnessed. Surely this seems to promise a Gospel. And we have this series : 1 Peter testifies to Mark's intimacy with Peter ; 2 Peter promises a Petrine Gospel ; antiquity tells us that Mark was but Peter's mouth-piece. Who could have invented that middle term and so delicately inserted it into 2 Peter ? 2 Peter thus appears a link in a natural chain which is complete with it and incomplete without it. All three of these sources from which the links are drawn are therefore genuine.¹

(2). 2 Peter witnesses to its own date. Whoever wrote it, it belongs to a time when Peter was living, and consequently he

¹*Cf.* Plumptre, *loc. cit.*

might well have written it. We need do nothing more than consider the teaching and character of the false teachers condemned in it to prove this. They occupy a place intermediate between those condemned by Paul and those condemned by John. This has been clearly shown by Thiersch and repeatedly exhibited since, as for example, by Froumüller and Guerike; so that we may content ourselves with simply mentioning it here.¹

Conclusive independently or not, for the Petrine authorship of this Epistle, the internal evidence, considered as corroborative to the external testimonies already adduced, is certainly conclusive and ought to compel assent.

IV. THE REBUTTING EVIDENCE.

The evidence thus presented in favor of the canonicity of 2 Peter would seem to be almost overwhelming. It certainly raises a presumption of immense force in its favor, such as cannot be overturned except by equally cogent rebutting evidence. Yet, of late years, many have been found able to resist its force, such as Schmidt, Eichhorn, De Wette, Richter, Schott, Neander, Credner, Mayerhoff, Magnus, Andemars, Reuss, Daumas, Bleek, Huther, and the whole Tübingen school, from Schwegler to Hilgenfeld. It is necessary to ask, On what rebutting evidence do these writers rely? Hilgenfeld, indeed, hardly deigns to assign a reason for his action, but sets aside the Epistle summarily as, 1, presupposing the ungentine 1 Peter as well as Jude; 2, as plainly belonging to the later Gnostic period (250†); and, 3, as having insufficient external support. But most of the other writers named are less high-handed—Credner, especially, entering fully into the argument; and from them we may obtain some

¹Another rather remarkable coincidence in the use of language may be adduced here, as having some bearing on the genuineness of 2 Peter. At a time when every word and act was permanently burning itself in on Peter's heart, our Lord had said to him: "Strengthen (*στηριξω*) the brethren." Now it is noticeable that there are reminiscences of this word in both 1 and 2 Peter: *cf.* 1 Peter v. 10; 2 Peter i. 12; iii. 17. Does not this look as if he who had received that command, had written this Epistle? The word is not rare enough to found any secure inference upon; but its use in 2 Peter may count as one small item of evidence.

idea of the rebutting evidence on which they rely. It may be briefly stated as follows :

(1) There was a known tendency in the early Church to forge Peter's name.

(2) The external support of 2 Peter is insufficient.

(3) It has plainly borrowed largely from Jude, which is judged unworthy of an apostle by some, and by others is held a proof that 2 Peter belongs to the second century, on the ground of the assumed unguineness of Jude.

(4) The author exhibits too great a desire to make himself out to be Peter.

(5) Yet betrays the later time in which he wrote by many minute anachronisms.

(6) The style of the Epistle is divergent from that of 1 Peter, and the differences amount at times to inconsistencies, such as the assumption that its readers (which are assumed to be the same as 1 Peter's) were personally taught by Peter (i. 15; iii. 2).

The first of these points might raise a suspicion against an unsupported claim to Petrine authorship, but only a *suspicion*, which would, moreover, give way before any evidence. The second has already been disproved. The third, again, is clearly invalid. One inspired writer frequently quotes the words of another, which is but the Spirit's authentication of himself; and the genuineness of Jude rests on a stronger array of proof than that of Second Peter, while the argument can be pleaded only on the assumption of the spuriousness of Jude. The other three arguments, (4), (5), and (6), are purely internal and subjective—depend for their force on the mental attitude and state of the critic, and cannot rebut the array of external and internal evidences for the Epistle, even if allowed just as urged. Think of really allowing more weight to these three opinions than to all that has been adduced—external and internal—in favor of the Epistle! Still, it will be instructive for us to note the details that are urged under these heads.

The fourth argument is strongly urged alike by Credner, Neander, and Reuss. But wherein is this great anxiety seen? In i. 1, iii. 1, 2, 15, say some; in the adduction of Christ's pro-

phesy, in i. 14, "in an unsuitable manner," and the unapostolic appeal to the transfiguration, in i. 17, as a proof of apostleship, say others. But how these natural passages can be alleged to prove forgery, it requires a very advanced critic to see. They are not *lugged in*, but *fallen into*. Who can see (except Neander) how the prophecy of Christ that Peter should die a violent death, is introduced "in an unsuitable manner"? It is barely alluded to, and that obscurely: is that the way with forgers, who introduce such allusions for a purpose? The transfiguration is not adduced to prove the apostleship of the writer, but to prove the truth of the teaching which the readers had received as to the divinity of Christ by an autoptic testimony. The other passages can be paralleled from 2 Corinthians, which is allowed to be genuine; and could not fail if 2 Peter be a *second* letter of the *Apostle Peter's*. How then can this be urged against this authorship? The items adduced under the fifth head are equally unsatisfactory, and conclusive as to nothing but the hypercriticism of their adducers. (4) and (5) are moreover mutually destructive; such a consummate forger as (4) requires could not have fallen into such easy traps as (5) adduces—the fault must be the critic's, not the author's. The points actually adduced are the mixing of the presents and futures in ii. 12–15, 17–22; Gnostic traces; references to myths (i. 16); the blending of Petrinism and Paulinism (iii. 15, 16); the use of the term "Holy Mount" (i. 18), which is said to be a designation which could only have supplanted the proper name of the mountain at a comparatively late date; the mode of citing St. Paul's epistles as Scripture, which they are not esteemed to be at first; the evidences of disappointed hopes as to the speedy second coming of Christ, and the peculiar adduction of apostolic testimony in iii. 2. The basis of most of these is pure assumption. The so-called Gnostic tendencies opposed belong clearly to an earlier age than those opposed by John, while Irenæus is our witness to the contemporaneity of John and Cerinthus, who, he tells us, held the advanced doctrines controverted in John. The discovery of a blending of Petrinism and Paulinism, and a consequent betrayal of a reconciling purpose, grows simply out of a Tübingen dream; what happens if it be true that Peter and Paul were never opposed

to one another? The "Holy Mount" is not introduced as a name, but as a descriptive designation of a well-known spot. Who says St. Paul's epistles were not esteemed Scripture at the beginning? and who will undertake to prove it? Paul so quotes Luke in Timothy; why not Peter Paul? Shall we bend our theories to fit the facts, or the facts to fit the theories? The peculiarity of iii. 2 depends only on a false reading, and disappears on the restoration of the true ancient text. Why presents and futures are mixed in the repetitions from the earlier Jude, the careful exegete will not need to ask. And who shall say how soon fanatics in the early Church needed correcting as to our Lord's second coming? Evidence such as this certainly rebuts itself rather than the opposing considerations.

The latter half of the sixth head will need no reply, as it turns on a misinterpretation of plain passages. 2 Peter iii. 2, can be pleaded here only before corrected in its reading; when we read *ἡμῶν* with the best authorities, the opposite is implied; i. 15 only implies that there were close relations between the readers and Peter, such as might have been indicated by the first Epistle; the "we" of i. 16 includes all preachers of the gospel, some of whom had preached to these Christians. Much more stress is, however, usually laid on the simple argument from diversity of style. But how the details adduced can bear any weight, it is exceedingly difficult to see. Credner has probably presented this argument as strongly as it admits of—certainly more strongly than any one else as yet. The list of the "most remarkable differences," which he urges, is as follows:¹ 2 Peter's common use of *κύριος* for Christ, which 1 Peter never does, except i. 13 (borrowed from Ephesians), while on the other hand 2 Peter always so uses it, except in passages derived from Jude or the Old Testament; 2 Peter's frequent application of the term *σωτήρ* to Jesus, which 1 Peter never does; 2 Peter's application to Christ of what 1 Peter applies to God, and its seldom mention of God; the failure in 2 Peter of the common words *ἀποκάλυψις*, *ἀποκαλύπτω*, when speaking of the second advent, which are common in 1 Peter, while *ἡμέρα* is the common

¹See his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1836, p. 660, *seq.*

term in this connexion in 2 Peter; the Hebraistic or pleonastic use of the preposition *εν* in 2 Peter, a usage not found at all in 1 Peter; the failure in 2 Peter of the common 1 Peter usage of an unessential *ώς*; the substitution for the titles by which the Christian teaching is called in 1 Peter, viz., *ἐλπίς, χάρις, πίστις, ἀλήθεια, λόγος, εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, etc., of quite distinct designations in 2 Peter, such as *Χριστοῦ δύναμις καὶ παρουσία* (i. 16), "the way of righteousness" (ii. 21), the "holy commandment" (ii. 21), the "commandment of the Apostles" (iii. 2), etc.; the failure in 2 Peter of the common and frequent quotation of the Old Testament as found in 1 Peter; and finally, broadly, the diffuse, heavy, languid style of 2 Peter, as distinguished from the easier, synthetic, irregular, fresh style of 1 Peter.

Are these worth the stating, except as an interesting inquiry as to the special peculiarities of two writings from the same hand? Will they bear any weight, considered as rebutting evidence against sufficient testimony? Reuss speaks wise, even if obvious, words when he says:¹ "On the theological and linguistic differences between the two Epistles, which the later criticism has so emphasised, we lay no stress. The two Epistles are too short, have to do with wholly different circumstances; and especially there are no direct contradictions to be found. Only if the Epistle is on other grounds proved to be ungenueine, can this also be brought into account." In other words, the argument from style is not valid against the genuineness of the Epistle. We say, Amen! What, then, are we to do with this long list of Credner's? Only note the following points: 1. The list of differences is nothing like as striking as the list of resemblances; so that the problem is *not* to find a theory which will account for the differences alone, *but* to find a theory which will account for the coexistence of differences with still more striking resemblances. Diversity of authorship will not do this. 2. The differences are mere contradictions, and usually not uniform, but only *prevailing* differences—some parallels being found in the other Epistle. 3. Credner fails to take account of the very distinct occasions, objects, spirits, on,

¹Geschichte, etc., Neue Testament, § 270-2.

for, and in which the two letters were written. These determine the style of speech in this case, and will account for most if not all of the differences adduced. The fact that 2 Peter is specifically a letter of reproof and warning, will account for its general tone as different from 1 Peter (a letter of exhortation and comfort); the character of the errors opposed will account for the fact that it dwells on the majesty and lordship of Christ, his saving power, his authority and love, and substitutes him for God in most passages. This goes like a destroying brand straight through Credner's list. 4. Still further, Credner forgets that it is characteristic of Peter to rest on and write out of a previous document. The fact that Paul lay at the root of 1 Peter, and Jude at the root of 2 Peter, will account for much divergence in style; still the community of authorship of both accounts for their resemblances. The theory of diversity of authorship will thus not account for the phenomenon; we have unity in diversity to account for, and must assume unity of authorship in the account we render.

The state of the argument, then, really is this: a mountain mass of presumption in favor of the genuineness and canonicity of 2 Peter, to be raised and overturned only by a very strong lever of rebutting evidence; a pitiable show of rebutting evidence offered as lever. It is doubtless true that we can move the world if the proper lever and fulcrum be given. But if the lever is a common quarryman's tool and the fulcrum thin air! Then, woe only to the man who wields it. What can such rebutting evidence as we have here, really injure, except its own cause?

V. THE HISTORY OF THE EPISTLE.

We are surely in a condition now to assert that the canonicity of the letter is secure. We pause only to add briefly its history. Sent forth by Peter soon after the middle of the first century (say in A. D. 67), it soon found its way, as an authoritative part of the Canon of faith, over the whole Christian world. Already with the beginning of uninspired Christian literature, it is found everywhere. Clement has it in 97 at Rome; Barnabas in 106 at Alexandria; at the same time the Jewish Christian author of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, was reading it at Pella.

Throughout the second century the Church enjoyed the peaceful possession of it; and before the close of that age was demanding and receiving commentaries upon it. In the meantime the acute school of internal criticism at Alexandria was scrutinising its peculiarities, and by the beginning of the third century some were found able to magnify them into inconsistencies with 1 Peter. On these internal grounds some were now led to question its genuineness and consequently its canonicity; but no one was yet bold enough to excise it from the Canon. The fourth century found a critical school in Syria, daring above all precedent; and here at last, but only here, the subjective judgment of minute one-sided scholarship won the victory over the external evidences for the Epistle. The common sense of the Church at large, however, refused to be thus led, and preserved it from the heresy; and soon, as the value of the subjective criticism was better understood, the doubts that had been raised died away, and the Epistle's place in the Canon became once more undoubted. So matters stood until the Reformation. Then once more individual doubts revived, while once more the Church stood firm. Erasmus, Cajetan, Luther, even Calvin, spoke doubtfully of its genuineness and consequent canonicity; but even such names could not lead the Church astray. That storm was also weathered, and once more the waters seemed quiet. Once more, in these modern times, we see the attack begun; but once more we witness the same phenomena as of old repeated—*individuals* doubt, the *Church* stands firm. In the whole history of the Church, the Syrian Church alone among the Churches has ever, as a body, doubted the Epistle. From the beginning, the Church as a Church has always held it without fear and without dubiety. With the evidence as it is, so it ought to be. We think we hazard nothing in adding, so it will ever be.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

ARTICLE III.

FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON.

1. *Life, Letters, Lectures on Corinthians, and Addresses of the late FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, M. A., Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, 1847-1853.* With portrait on steel. Large 12mo, 840 pp. New York: Harper & Bros. 1873.¹
2. *Sermons Preached at Brighton* by the late Rev. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, M. A., the Incumbent of Trinity Chapel. With portrait on steel. Large 12mo, 838 pp. *Ibid.* 1875.
3. "*The Human Race*" and *Other Sermons preached at Cheltenham, Oxford, and Brighton,* by the late Rev. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, M. A., Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. Large 12mo, 236 pp. *Ibid.* 1881.
4. *Notes on Genesis,* by the late FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, M. A., of Brighton. Large 12mo, 211 pp. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1877.
5. *Robertson's Living Thoughts.* A Thesaurus. By KER BOYCE TUPPER. With an introduction by Prof. WILLIAM C. RICHARDS, Ph. D. 12mo, 256 pp. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1881.

Robertson was a "clergyman" of the Church of England. He died 15th August, 1853, *at the age of thirty-seven.* It requires no inconsiderable voice to cross the Atlantic in the first instance; but when its very echo lingers in the ears of this far-away audience for thirty years, and then speaks through the medium of *four* different publishing houses, it challenges attention. That some hearing has been given to this young English preacher, the religious press abundantly indicates. That the American audience has been charmed with the voice the following paragraphs from influential papers, fair samples of current criticism, clearly attest:

"The Christian public as well as ministers of the gospel will welcome the recent issue of another volume of the late Rev. F. W. Robertson's

¹James R. Osgood & Co., Boston, also publish Robertson's Works. *Life and Letters*, 1 vol.; *Lectures and Addresses*, 1 vol.; *Sermons*, 5 vols.

Sermons. Those previously published have exerted an influence without parallel in our day for this kind of literature—an influence deeply and widely felt in current Christian thought, since not only have these sermons led clergymen to new methods of sermonising and new views of truth, but many intelligent church-goers, and many who have little sympathy with churches, have bought and read them, and caught from them new inspiration for daily living." * * * * "Robertson represents the spiritual rest to be found by combining evangelical faith with intellectual strength. His sermons breathe a living faith in spiritual realities, expounded with the mental power and acumen which men had come to believe could not be applied to the enunciation and enforcement of religious truth."

"What is this peculiar and pungent quality, this perennial freshness and vitality, which have already established his position as the Shakespeare among sermon writers? We answer—Because his mind is Shakespearean, in the sense of universality. No uninspired man ever preached to humanity itself more absolutely. By which we mean, to essential human nature, in its relations to life as a human experience, independent of the accidents of age, clime, or sect. His grasp was always upon principles. However concrete his theme, he wrought it out along the line of these. However numerous his illustrations, they never seem to narrow but rather to widen the range of his application. His speech was to a small chapel audience, but his preaching was unconsciously directed to no less an amphitheatre than the wide earth. His preaching was not in reference to the specific men and women who sat before him. And therein he doubtless failed in the mission of a local pastor. But he was in life unknown, and his work limited, obscure, and discouraging, that he might be the teacher and shepherd of the generations to come."

* * * * *

"Robertson's are the most interesting of sermons, because he is the true intellectual shepherd who goes before the sheep, pushing aside the tangled brushwood with an effortless hand, and striding on with a step that never lags nor strays." * * * * "And because in his own mind the thought lies clear and complete, his style of communicating it is crystalline and finished. He never strikes an obscure or uncertain note. He wastes no words, nor drops into commonplace, or fills up with merely pious 'padding.'"

That this hearing has been but partial, or else the audience very indiscriminating, the writer of this article undertakes to convince any reader who has the patience to follow him.

When the topic was selected, it was the writer's purpose to introduce the article with a sketch of Robertson's life; but a study of his writings developed such a broad field for criticism that fear

of the Editors of *THE REVIEW* and sympathy for possible readers have led to the omission of this sketch in favor of the less interesting but more important task of examining the character of that work which has been so liberally commended.

Let it be said, however, in passing, that the *Life and Letters* of Robertson are edited by his admiring friend, Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, M. A., Honorary Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. The introduction, somewhat apologetic in character, indicates the editor's sympathy with the views of the author, particularly with his *progressiveness*, and this explains the otherwise strange news contained in a newspaper paragraph several years later, viz.: "The Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, author of the *Life and Letters* of Frederick W. Robertson, will hereafter conduct the services at Bedford Chapel, Bloomsbury—hitherto a chapel of the Church of England—on the Unitarian basis."

The reader will find this biography interesting. He will there learn to admire and reverence Robertson's pure, unselfish character, his chivalrous courage, his fierce contempt for popular applause, the energy which made him work when mental exercise brought agony. He will wonder at the strange paradox presented in this character; unusually reserved, and yet at times, under the seal of intimacy, confident of a constant love and sure of sympathy, unveiling the very inmost soul, and setting the heart, quivering with pain and shrinking and smarting under misapprehension, before the reader; proud as the proudest, yet humble; almost feminine in his chaste refinement and delicacy, but at the same time impressing you with a physical courage capable of leading a forlorn hope with enthusiasm, united to a moral courage equal to the unflinching presentation of views which would ostracise him where most he craved appreciation and sympathy; tender and gentle, yet rebuking a wilful and dastardly offender with "the awfulness of a judicial sentence," and in words which made the "hardened criminal writhe as if under a whip." Never a partisan nor even a party man, in every controversy he stood by himself, and was abused and maligned by both sides. He spoke from the depths of his own experience when he said that in the music of life, the undertone was sadness; *his* was the

music of the *Æolian* harp, surpassingly sweet, but almost weird in the sadness of its minor melody. Sympathy will be excited and the eye grow misty over the suffering entailed by a morbidly sensitive disposition, which found too ready play in the isolation which his peculiar idiosyncratic individuality brought upon him. The reader will be surprised at the remarkable change in Robertson's doctrinal views. Beginning by preaching all the distinctive doctrines of the Evangelical school, in 1843 he passed through a period of spiritual struggle and "agony so awful that it not only shook his health to its centre, but smote his spirit down into so profound a darkness that of all his early faiths but one remained—it must be right to do right." Out of this struggle he came to make the Evangelical school the only exception to a charity almost as broad as the range of doctrinal error. The memory of this period of darkness seemed to abide ever with him, and to render his writings peculiarly adapted to those suffering under eclipse.

The editor with rare good taste has let the author speak for himself, contributing only those links which will connect the periods embraced and illustrated in the letters. These letters, of which there are a hundred and sixty-three, are more than usually interesting. When personal, they give an insight into Robertson's character, and at other times present great variety in the range of topics, discussing literature, art, science, current events, stating and defending his exegesis of certain passages of Scripture, his doctrines and methods, etc., etc. This tempting field, however, must be left with the foregoing unsatisfactory outline, venturing only the opinion that a study of Robertson's life will suggest to the reader a suspicion that God made him a soldier and his friends made him a preacher.

ROBERTSON AS A COMMENTATOR.

Robertson tried the doubtful experiment of consecutive contextual exposition. Judging from the materials left, the experiment must have proved a success, for he clothes the ordinarily dry bones of a series with wondrously living flesh. These dis-

courses were delivered at the Sabbath evening "service." In this way he expounded 1 Samuel, Job, Genesis, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians. His success in Brighton, a fashionable watering place, described as having somewhat the Athenian rage after some new thing, proves undoubtedly that, difficult and hazardous as is the experiment, it need not fail even under the most unfavorable conditions. His published works contain only the courses on Genesis and the Corinthians. That on Genesis is very fragmentary, as its title acknowledges, embracing only thirty-one lectures, covering 211 pp. (12mo, Bourgeois type.) They omit entirely chapters iv.—xi. inclusive, xiv.—xviii. inclusive, xx., xxx., xxxiv., xxxvi., xxxviii., xlvi., and xlvi.; xxxii. and xxxiii. are embraced in one lecture, as also xxxix. and xl.; while i. and l. have each two lectures devoted to it. They are characterised by the virtues and vices of Robertson's style—often acute and suggestive, often shallow and unsatisfactory, sometimes erratic and unsound.

The lectures on Corinthians are of far more satisfactory fulness, comprising sixty lectures and covering three hundred and thirty pages, large 12mo, (type rather larger than that used in "Notes on Genesis," but not so well *leaded*.) No chapter is omitted, and generally the whole context has at least the honor of a place in the text, though of course some portions are treated with fuller exposition than others. The course is prefaced with a lecture on Acts xviii. 1, giving (1) Some preliminary inquiries respecting Corinth, viewed historically, socially, and morally; (2) Respecting the Apostle Paul. During the course he gives, in the following striking words, his idea of the character of the Epistles: "As the Gospels declared the principles of Christianity, so the Epistles exhibit those principles in their application to actual life (p. 524.) This Epistle differs from the other Epistles of St. Paul in this, that instead of being one consecutive argument on connected subjects, it deals with a large variety of isolated questions which the Corinthian Church had put to him on some previous occasion. Hence the Epistle is one of Christian casuistry—an application of Christian principles to the various circumstances and cases of conscience which arise continually in the daily life of a highly

civilised and artificial community" (p. 471). This view he justifies in the lectures, which are bright and interesting and contain many original and striking applications, sometimes surprisingly apt, of the truth, thus impressing one anew with the universality of God's word, and illustrating its own declaration that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. Among the best portions of the work may be specified his exposition of the conflict between individual liberty and Christian charity; Paul's thorn in the flesh; the context beginning, "But this I say, brethren, the time is short" (1 Cor. vii. 29-31). Perhaps the majority of readers would select as best of all his treatment of 1 Cor. xv. He devotes *five* lectures to this chapter, and shows that it is one closely connected argument throughout. Most students will leave this exposition with clearer understanding of this glorious passage, which to many appears with the undefined grandeur of some magnificent object, rearing its splendid proportions out of shadow and mist. The lectures are chiefly valuable, however, as a specimen of consecutive exposition, showing how much fresh, practical, and timely truth may be drawn from portions of Scripture which seem, to the general reader, of very special and limited application. As such they are well worth study. As a guide to the interpretation of the Epistle in detail, they are unsafe, untrustworthy, and unsatisfactory. The author might be called a *short-sighted* expositor. In seizing the leading truth of an Epistle, or even of a chapter, he is generally apt; in detailed exposition, he is as faulty as, in the general scope, he is excellent. He nowhere betrays any indebtedness to a knowledge of the original Greek of the Epistles, and the reader will miss those familiar *ear-marks* which the student of the original language inevitably leaves upon his work. In some portions of his lectures, as also in his sermons, it is quite evident that he looks upon the Word and the world through the jaundiced medium of his own morbid sensitiveness, and thus colors the teaching of the Scriptures. The looseness and carelessness of his exegesis is oftentimes absolutely amazing. Grave inferences are drawn from and important doctrines based upon what he ought to have recognised as the most manifest error of interpretation. As this is an

VOL. XXXIII., NO. 1.—6.

important point, somewhat extended proof of it will be given as the concluding part of this branch of the criticism.

In commenting on 1 Cor. i. 1, he says: "Further, we see in the fact of St. Paul's joining with himself Sosthenes, and calling him his brother, another proof of his desire to avoid erecting himself as the sole guide of the Church." P. 418. While we do not doubt the apostle's modesty, we think this an unfortunate text to base it upon, for following the word ἀπόστολος the word ἀδελφός, by its *very presence* in the text, is indicative of an immense distance between Paul and Sosthenes; so far from suggesting *equality*, it savors of exactly the reverse.

Commenting on the words, "The Church of God which is in Corinth," (p. 419,) he asks, What is the Church? and answers: "The Church, according to the derivation of the word, means the House of God;" forgetting that Paul uses the word ἐκκλησία, for certainly his knowledge of Greek must be very peculiar who would get any idea of "house" out of ἐκκλησία.

Discussing "strong meat," he alludes, p. 438, to the progress of doctrine in Christ's teaching, selecting as an instance the rich young man, Matt. xix. 16-22, saying, "Jesus would first have given him mere moral duty;" whereas Christ's words were only a method of showing him how self-deceived he was. The command, "Go sell," etc., is not a progress of doctrine from mere moral law as contained in the ten commandments, but is expegetical of the exceeding breadth of that very law which the young man thought he had kept from his youth up.

"Now we see through a glass darkly." Robertson says: "Glass in this place means more properly window, for the ancient windows were made of horn, or tale, or thin metal, through which things were seen but in a dim, confused, and colorless manner. So now we see divine things 'darkly'" (p. 541). This is barely possible; ἔσοπτρον by its derivation (εἰς, ὀράω) means something "looked into;" it is doubtful whether it ever means anything but "mirror"; it is used in the New Testament instead of the more common classic word κάτοπτρον; it occurs twice, viz., in this passage and in Jas. i. 23, where it evidently means mirror. To express Robertson's idea of imperfect transparency, some derivative of the word

ἵαλος would most probably have been used. Moreover the apparent support which the word "darkly" seems to give his view is also destroyed by the original, in which the words are *ἐν αἰνίγματι*, i. e., "in a riddle."

"The Corinthians said he had caught them with guile. He said he had not; there had been no concealment of views, no doctrine of reserve, no Jesuitry, nor subtlety of reasoning in all his teaching: his conscience told him that." P. 602. All of which is certainly true; but it is doubtful whether the apostle had any reference whatever in these words to his doctrine or his method of communicating it. They charged him with guile in that, while professing not to be chargeable unto them, and glorying in the proclamation of a free gospel, he had nevertheless *quartered his friends upon them*. See the context 2 Cor. xii. 16: "But be it so, I did not burden you; nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile. Did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you?"

In meeting the charge of being fickle and unreliable (2 Cor. i. 17 ff.): "He admits the fact—he had intended to go to Corinth: and he had not fulfilled his intention. But he denies the inference of trifling with his word; or that it was with him 'yea, yea,' and then with a juggler's dexterity, 'nay, nay.' The broad ground on which St. Paul denies the possibility of such conduct is, that he was a spiritual Christian. He could not do so, because it would be acting according to the flesh—that is, from interest, ambition, worldly policy, or private passions. Whereas, he was in Christ; and Christ was the Christian's yea, the living truth; and the word is but the expression of the life. Now what Christ was, the Christian is, in degree. Christ, says St. Paul, was true; and God has established us in Christ. Therefore, fickleness, duplicity, or deceit are impossible to us." P. 605. An examination of the context will reveal a confusion in this comment. The apostle is meeting *two* charges, not *one*—1st, against his character; 2d, against his preaching. The first is dismissed with a mere reference in v. 17; the second occupies his attention in the verses commented on by Robertson. It is the *gospel* as preached by him (his "word") which was "not yea and nay," but "yea and amen,"

etc.; not Christ as the foundation of his *character*, but Christ as the foundation of his *doctrine*.

“Every church has a right to introduce new forms and ordinances; and the church of Corinth, taking advantage of this right, introduced what was called a love-feast. * * * * There was great beauty in this arrangement, because it showed the conviction of the church of Corinth that differences of birth and rank are not eternal, but temporary, etc. Still beautiful as was the idea, it was liable to great abuse. Thus there arises a perpetual lesson for the Church of Christ:” (What? That the providence of God in this instance condemned all human tampering and tinkering with his worship? no, but) “it is never good to mix things religious with things worldly.” P. 528. Now we will hazard the conjecture that the readers of THE REVIEW would not desire a better text upon which to maintain the doctrine that *no* Church has the right to introduce new forms and ordinances than this very incident in the history of the Corinthians, from which Robertson deduces the contrary.

“Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. Even Christ we know now as the Son of God, rather than as the Son of man” (p. 645). Even a careless study of the context would prove this exegesis of “after the flesh” untenable. Neither Paul nor the Corinthian Christians had ever known Christ *as a man*; moreover the Apostle says in the same sentence, “Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh.” Does he mean they had no human acquaintance?

This same carelessness pervades also his sermons. *E. g.*, he considers the phrase “Son of Man” about equivalent to “a son of man.” “It is the power of the Son of Man *on earth* to forgive sins. It is man, God’s image, representing by his forgiveness on earth, God’s forgiveness in heaven” (p. 481). “The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins.” What power is there in human forgiveness? What does absolution mean in the lips of a son of man?” Sermon p. 478. In passing from the scripture phrase, “the Son of Man,” to his paraphrase, “a son of man,” he glibly glides over all the immeasurable distance between God and man! “The Son of Man”—that is, man—“hath power to forgive

sins." For society has this power collectively—a most actual and fearful power. Corinth., p. 615.¹ Upon this passage he rings the changes, and upon it chiefly depends, judging from the frequency of its quotation, to establish his shadow—an innocent one, however, as he explains it—of the Romish absolution. Whereas in the incident referred to (Luke, v. 21), our Lord does not deny the Pharisees' cavil its force; he admits the principle, but denies its application in his case, by immediately giving proof that he was God. In the text, "And hath given him authority to execute judgment also because he is the Son of man" (Jno., v. 27), the strongest of all Robertson's references, the words refer not distinctly to Christ's human nature, nor yet to his divine, but to the divine-human; neither distinctively God, nor distinctively man, but God-man, *i. e.*, the Mediator.

"But to as many as *received* him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to as many as believed on his name.' They *were* his own, yet they wanted power to become his own. Draw a distinction. therefore, between being the child of God and realising it." Serm., p. 281.² Here is another ready paraphrase; but note: (1) The text says, "*to become*," not, "to realise;" (2) the word used in the text, *εξουσία*, means "right," "privilege," as distinguished from *δύναμις*, "power" (*Robertson's idea*); (3) this right is conditioned upon faith and limited in the text to those exercising it, "even to them that believe on his name;" so that what Robertson claims as a right belonging to *all*, but unappreciated and unrealised by some, is declared in his very proof-text to be a *gift*, and that too conditioned upon faith. The doctrinal outcome of this misinterpretation will appear hereafter.

In commenting on the ordinary orthodox doctrine of the atonement, he says: "For it was not merely death that made Christ's sacrifice the world's atonement. There is no special virtue in death, even though it be the death of God's own Son. Blood does not please God. . . . No, my brethren! God can be satis-

¹See also Hum. Race, pp. 9-11; 92.

²See also Lett., p. 263. Hum. Race, p. 217.

fied with that only which pertains to the conscience and the will: so says the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews: 'Sacrifices could never make the comers thereunto perfect.'" Serm., p. 378. This is a flagrant misapplication of a text (Heb. x. 1). The purpose of the context is not to show the worthlessness of all bloody sacrifices, (least of all of Christ's!) but on the contrary, to contrast the sacrifice (and the bloody sacrifice, too,) of Christ with those of the old dispensation, and to show that while *they* served a righteous and holy purpose, they yet had no glory by reason of the glory which excelleth; *e. g.*, "For if the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the BLOOD OF CHRIST, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. ix. 13, 14.

In preaching on the faith of the centurion (Matt. viii. 10), the evidence (?) of its existence is given under two heads: (1) tenderness to his servant; (2) his humility. Under the second head he says: "Now Christ does not call this humility, though it was humility. He says, I have not found so great *faith*. Let us see why. How is humbleness the result of, or rather identical with, faith?" Serm., p. 314. Which suggests the old couplet, He hath optics keen, I ween, Who sees what is not to be seen! Perhaps the first impression that this incident makes upon the reader is that of the centurion's humility; but surely it is not necessary to identify faith with humility in order to find grounds for the exclamation of Christ. The centurion attributes to Christ the same power over disease which *he* had over his soldiers and servants, and Christ passes over his humility and singles out *this faith* as worthier of remark.

"Intellectually, God never can be known; he must be known by love—for, 'if any man love God the same is known of him.'" Serm., p. 567. This text is elsewhere quoted in the same connexion, as if it read, "the same knoweth him."

"The Apostle Paul found in Athens an altar to the unknown God. He did not announce in Athens lectures against heathen priest-craft; nor did he undertake to prove it, in the Areopagus,

all a mystery of iniquity, and a system of damnable idolatries—that is the mode in which we set about *our* controversies; but he disengaged the truth from the error, proclaimed the truth, and left the errors to themselves.” Serm., p. 388. It requires a peculiar exegesis to give this negative character to the teaching of Paul. Robertson, as usual, is unfortunate in his cited instance, as will appear to any one who will read Acts xvii. *through*; it is true that the apostle had the Christian tact to take the inscription upon their own altar as his *text*; but how any one who reads the *sermon* can say that he left the errors to themselves, passes ordinary comprehension. Possibly the remarks of Demetrius in Ephesus (Acts xix. 26) may throw some light upon the justice of applying this Robertsonian mode of teaching to Paul.

“‘Let every man abide in the same calling, wherein he was called.’ We are called to be members of the Church of England—what is our duty now? What would Paul have done? Is this our duty—to put such questions to ourselves as these: ‘Is there any single particular sentence in the service of my Church with which I do not entirely agree? Is there any single ceremony with which my whole soul does not go along? If so, then is it my duty to leave it at once?’ No, my brethren; all that we have to do is to say, ‘All our existing institutions are those under which God has placed us, under which we are to mould our lives according to his will.’ It is our duty to vitalise our forms, to throw into them a holier, deeper meaning.” Serm., p. 545. In this passage the Apostle is evidently guarding the Corinthians against the idea that Christianity was to revolutionise *civil* relations. He did require the most radical change in *spiritual* matters, and those who remained in the Jewish Church or persisted in carrying Jewish forms, *whether vitalised or not*, into the Christian dispensation were severely rebuked by him (see Gal. v. 1-4). Where would the Reformation have been, had Luther interpreted this passage as Robertson does?

“The evangelical ‘scheme’ of reconciling justice with mercy I consider the poorest effort ever made by false metaphysics. They simply misquote a text. That he might be just (and yet) the justifier. Whereas St. Paul says, the just and the justifier; *i. e.*,

just *because* the justifier." Lett., p. 257. Paul says "and;" Robertson interprets, "because;" if the reader asks why? the question must remain unanswered, unless it be said that *the acquittal of the guilty is presumptive proof of justice!*

"For this we read, Herod observed John, that is, cultivated his acquaintance, paid him marked attention." Sermon., p. 617. The word in the original (*σωτηριέω*) means "preserved;" Herodias "would have killed him; but she could not. For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and *preserved* him," *i. e.*, from her vengeance (Mark vi. 19, 20).

There is a curious confusion in the application of a text in the following paragraph: "It was not directly your sin that nailed your Redeemer to the cross, but the sin of the cruel Pharisees, of the relentless multitude; yet it is said, 'the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.'" Sermon., p. 760. Here is dilution indeed!

"No doubt whole years of folly we outlive 'in his unerring sight, who measures life by love.' Recollect our Master's own words, 'Her sins, which are many, are forgiven her: *for* she loved much.'" Sermon., p. 782. Let the reader consult the passage (Luke vii. 40 ff.) and it will be evident that the love is mentioned as *proof*, not *ground*, of forgiveness; else the Saviour's parable of the two debtors was perfectly pointless,

"He was not the son of the Jew, nor the son of the Oriental—he was the Son of man. He was not the villager of Bethlehem; nor one whose character and mind were the result of a certain training, peculiar to Judea, or petular to that century—but he was *the man*. This is what St. Paul insists on, when he says that in him there is neither Jew nor Gentile, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free." Sermon., p. 390. All of which, while very true, was very foreign to what Paul was insisting on in the words above.

ROBERTSON AS A PREACHER.

That he was an attractive preacher is neither hard to believe nor difficult to explain; this he would have been in any Church and at any period, but particularly so in the Church of England, and at that period when, if contemporary criticism is to be be-

lieved, the "clergy" too often laid aside their clerical character with their robes, and even when wearing them were characterised by a cold, dull, monotonous routine of perfunctory officialness; contrasted with this, his force and originality, his real sympathy with men, his intense earnestness, his manifest appreciation of the infinite solemnity and importance of the truth he preached, made his words instinct-with life and clothed them with an eloquence which startled while it attracted, which awed while it charmed. His own experience with scepticism, as has been intimated, made him peculiarly acceptable to every one similarly tried, while the sadness of his life fitted him to preach effectively to that large class designated as the sons and daughters of sorrow; and when it is remembered that these elements of popularity were enforced by such a character as that depicted in his *Life and Letters*, it is not so hard to account for this popularity as it is to understand how any one knowing him could help loving him. If this strikes the reader as rather lavish praise, the answer is, it can be afforded; there is no call for economy here, for unfortunately there will be little need of such expenditure hereafter; there is small room for commendation of anything except his character or those features of his preaching dependent solely upon it.

The structure of his sermons is uniform and uniformly simple—an introduction generally germane, two general divisions with several sub-divisions under each—the arrangement of his thought is natural and hence clear. Contrasted with this lucid *method*, there is sometimes great obscurity of *expression*, and this too where it would be least expected and is certainly least desirable. In those departments of doctrine which denominational differences have made debatable ground and where the subject therefore calls for clear-cut formula and accurate definition, he is often found abounding in rhetorical illustration or evaporating into glittering generality.

Again, the law of compensation would suggest that mystery of matter should, as far as possible, be relieved by severe simplicity of style; but our author does not always own allegiance to this blessed law. On the contrary, in some of his sermons (*e. g.*, On the

Trinity; The Sacrifice of Christ) vagueness of language keeps pace with profoundness of thought; where the channel is presumably deepest, the stream is muddiest, and what lies at the bottom thereof it passeth the power of all ordinary vision to discern. This estimate of Robertson's style is confessedly in the teeth of the criticism of newspaper paragraphs; but while many passages of his writings are worthy of all praise, yet the reader who will carefully study his works as a whole may be confidently appealed to as to the justice of the preceding sentences. There are few of the one hundred and twenty-five published sermons which are not interesting; at the same time there is scarcely *one* which is satisfactory. His works are no mean tonic to thought, frequently however in the form of a decided counterirritant, owing to his eccentric or unacceptable views. He often sees an exaggerated shadow cast by the merest glint of truth, and sometimes cries "*eureka*" where the critical reader fails to find *any* treasure-trove. He is generally superficial, giving the ideas suggested to a brilliant and original mind by the mere surface of the text, rather than those evolved, by a profound thinker, out of the depths of the subject. There is technically speaking no exposition of Scripture, no unfolding of the meaning contained *in* the text; a conspicuous absence of that characteristic described as being "mighty in the Scriptures." He impresses the reader as one who studied much in literature, philosophy, art, science, poetry, and practical life; and who brought the fruits of such study to bear upon his preaching, but devoted little painstaking careful study to the book itself. This doubtless accounts for his many careless errors in exegesis, some of which have already been noted, and also for his aberrations in doctrine, which will now engage the reader's attention.

Robertson has generally been criticised as rather erratic, not wholly sound, etc.; that *wholly unsound* would better describe his doctrine, the remainder of this paper endeavors to establish: The writer will content himself with the mere grouping and exposure of fundamental error, leaving the refutation, an easy task, to the reader.

I. INSPIRATION.

"The difference between Moses and Anaxagoras, The Epistles and "The Excursion," I believe is in degree. The Light or the Word which dwells in all men, dwells in loftier degree in some than in others, and also is of a nobler kind of inspiration." Lett., p. 186.

"Now the prophetic power, in which I suppose is chiefly exhibited that which we mean by inspiration, depends almost entirely upon moral greatness." *Ibid.*, p. 306.

"God the Spirit as the Sanctifier does not produce absolute perfection of human character; God the Spirit as an Inspirer does not produce absolute perfection of human knowledge." *Ibid.*, p. 307.

"And now before proceeding further let us endeavor to gain a distinct notion of what we mean by inspiration. An inspired man is a higher kind of man; he is one whose aspirations are more generous, more unselfish, more pure than those of ordinary men. The difference between him and common men is this: that of the twofold nature in which all participate, the fleshly and the spiritual, the lower predominates in others, but in him the higher, the heavenly, and the spiritual. What they felt feebly, almost unconsciously, he felt mightily and consciously." *Hum. Race*, p. 170.

It is not surprising that his biographer should say, "Men went away from his chapel opposed, it is true, to the popular theory of inspiration, but deeply convinced of *an* inspiration." What the exchange involved, the biographer failed to show; a line or two only is necessary to indicate it. "God the Spirit, as an Inspirer, does not produce absolute perfection of human knowledge;" of course, then, there is the possibility of error, and this possibility attaches to every sentence in the book. No chain is stronger than its weakest link. There is not one single truth in the volume upon which faith may with absolute certainty rest; there is not one single promise to which hope may confidently cling. Let us pause a moment and specify; observation can teach that "it is appointed unto men once to die," as to *everything* "after that," the Bible is man's sole authority; except for the word of God, even immortality is but a plausible "perhaps." Human speculation, analogies of nature, *et id omne genus*, are nothing worth apart from revelation; given the authoritative declaration of an inspired Bible, and they are valuable as illustrations; they are the lesser lights in the firmament of truth which but reflect the brightness they borrow from this great light "that shineth in

a dark place." Extinguish it, and they, too, are extinguished; silence this "sure word of prophecy" and all nature is immediately voiceless, sending back to man merely the echo of his own longings. "The chrysalis and the butterfly," "the annual resurrection of all nature," "the instinctive yearning of the soul," etc., etc., are serviceable to give beauty or pathos to graduating essays, male or female, but no such broken reed will serve man as a staff when he goes through the valley of the shadow death; on that journey no rod, less strong than a "thus saith the Lord," will support him. In lieu of this he is offered the opinions of *men*; "higher kind" of men, it is true, but still *men*, in whom inspiration did not produce perfection of human knowledge, and who, consequently may possibly have been mistaken with reference to a blessed hereafter and the conditions of attaining thereunto.

Such views of inspiration are none too rare; it is well to be alive to their results; no error is more far-reaching. *It poisons every stream of divine truth, because it poisons the fountain head of all.*

2. THE TRINITY.

Taking 1 Thess. v. 23 as his text, (a puzzling choice,) Robertson devotes a sermon to the discussion of this doctrine, in which it might be said that he "dispenses with" the Trinity. In this sermon are some things hard to be understood, and from which things it is difficult to wrest *any* definite idea whatever.

"Remember that the doctrine of the Trinity is a metaphysical doctrine. It is a Trinity—a division in the mind of God. It is not three materials; it is three persons in a sense we shall explain by and by." Sermon, p. 470. Then follow three illustrations, (1) material: a tree has color, shape, and size; (2) immaterial: man has will, affections, and thoughts; (3) "once more we will give proof beyond all that the act that a man does is done by one particular part of that man. You may say it was a work of his genius, or of his fancy; it may have been a manifestation of his love or an exhibition of his courage; yet that work was the work of the whole man; his courage, his intellect, his habits of perseverance, all helped towards the completion of that single work. Just in this way certain special works are attributed to certain personalities of the Deity." (P. 471.) The first power of consciousness in which God

is made known to us is as the Father, the author of our being. (P. 472.) The second way through which the personality and consciousness of God has been revealed to us is as the Son. (P. 473.) Once more, there is a nearer, a closer, and a more endearing relation in which God stands to us—that is the relation of the Spirit. (P. 473.) These, then, my Christian brethren, are the three consciousnesses by which he becomes known to us. Three, we said, *known* to us. We dare not limit God; we do not presume to say that there are in God only three personalities, only three consciousnesses. All that we dare presume to say is this, that there are three with reference to us and only three; that a fourth there is not; that perchance, in the present state, a fourth you cannot add to these—Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier.” (P. 474.)

It is hard to see the pertinency of this “daring to presume,” etc.; when God reveals himself as a triune God, it is certainly no presumption to say that there is not a fourth person in the Godhead; according to Robertson’s view it would seem that God’s being is determined by man’s state at the time; “in the present state” man needs three persons in the Godhead; if he should, in some future state, need *four*, we are led to infer that there will be a fourth! If Robertson had not mentioned and condemned Sabellianism in this very sermon, we would unhesitatingly call him a Sabellian; just what his doctrine is exactly, is hard to determine; but, at least, it may be said that it is not “the popular doctrine” of the Trinity; we will make a compromise and call him an unintentional Sabellian.

3. ORIGINAL SIN AND IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Robertson gives somewhat an allegorical interpretation of the fall (and the creation); says it is inconsistent with “physical truth.”

“But this inconsistency with physical truth does not invalidate the great, broad, spiritual truths which revelation is meant to teach. Does it alter or weaken the spiritual facts revealed in this account of creation that God does all by degrees; that he is the moral Governor of the world; the spiritual truth that the introduction of a sinful will produces immense gain in point of knowledge and immense loss in point of purity; that the man who has done wrong feels naked and is ashamed in the sight of God?”—Notes on Genesis, p. 7. “The fall, then, was only a necessary consequence of a mere state of nature. It was a step downward from innocence, but also it was a step onward—a giant step in

human progress. It made goodness possible; for to know the evil, and to conquer it, and choose the good, is far nobler than a state which consists in our ignorance of both. Until the step of nature has been passed, the step of spirituality cannot be made. 'That was not first which was spiritual, but that which was natural.'—Cor., p. 584.

From which it follows that, (1) The covenant of works was a farce; (2) Man was not created in the image of God, *i. e.*, holy, or else (3) God's own holiness is inferior to that of a restored sinner, and (4) The fall was a *rise* and man's condition was improved by disobeying God! And yet this giant step in human progress that made goodness possible, and which was only a necessary consequence of a mere state of nature, led to strange results; for, by it, according to the author, "Death, which must ever have existed as a form of dissolution, a passing from one state to another, became a curse."—Serm., p. 521.¹ Why man should be *curst* for making goodness possible, and that too by doing that which was a necessary consequence of the state in which God created him, is as mysterious as the Bible doctrine. Robertson says death must ever have existed; the word of God says, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Robertson gives a perfectly arbitrary meaning to the word death—a meaning contrary to all usage of language, and one which has not even the poor excuse of relieving the doctrine of difficulty to offer as an apology for doing manifest violence to the plain language of Scripture.

"Original sin is an awful fact. It is not the guilt of an ancestor imputed to an innocent descendant, but it is the tendencies of that ancestor living in his offspring and incurring guilt. Original sin can be forgiven only so far as original sin is removed. It is not Adam's, it is yours; and it must cease to be yours, or else what is 'taking away original sin'? Now he who would deny original sin must contradict all experience in the transmission of qualities. The very hound transmits his peculiarities learnt by education, and the Spanish horse his paces taught by art, to his offspring, as a part of their nature. If it were not so in man, there could be no history of man as a species—no tracing out the tendencies of a race or nation—nothing but the unconnected repetitions of isolated individuals and their lives. It is plain that the first man must have exerted

¹See also Serm., p. 695.

on his race an influence quite peculiar—that his acts must have biased their acts. And this bias or tendency is what we call original sin. Now original sin is just this denial of God's paternity,¹ refusing to live as his children, and saying we are not his children."—Serm., p. 281.

This scheme, unlike the views just noticed, *does* relieve difficulties, and some of the greatest that have ever perplexed and baffled the wisest students of theology, and its simplicity would also commend it, but for the fact that it is *too* simple. It sweeps away the whole federal system, it plays havoc with vast portions of the Bible, and ignores the most obvious facts of human experience. It would make original sin as simple a thing as the heredity of red hair. This would be satisfactory, *if sin were morally as indifferent as red hair*; but, alas! it is not, and there's the rub. These tendencies of the ancestor living in the offspring are *sinful* tendencies; this "influence quite peculiar" is a peculiarly sinful influence. How happens it that *such* a "bias" should be given? And these tendencies find a parallel in the peculiarities of the hound and the paces of the Spanish horse transmitted by each to its offspring! Adam sustained the same relation to the human race that the first horse sustained to its descendants!

(It is a small matter, but before leaving the extract we are tempted to inquire if "original sin is just this denial of God's paternity, refusing to live as his children," what would the author call "actual sin?")

As Robertson's diagnosis makes the disease so slight, only a very mild remedy will be required, and the reader shall now be presented with what our author considers the doctrine of *Imputed Righteousness*:

"It is recorded of one of the world's gifted painters that he stood before the masterpiece of the great genius of his age—one which he could never hope to equal or even rival—and yet the infinite superiority, so far from crushing him, only elevated his feeling, for he saw realised those conceptions which had floated before him, dim and unsubstantial; in every line and touch he felt a spirit immeasurably superior, yet kin-

¹The above extract is from a sermon on Baptism, in which the author maintains that every child has a right to baptism on account of the relation of paternity which God sustains to the whole human race.

dred, and is reported to have exclaimed, with dignified humility, 'And I too am a painter!' We must all have felt, when certain effects in nature, combinations of form and color, have been presented to us, our own idea speaking in intelligible and yet celestial language; when for instance, the long bars of purple, 'edged with intolerable radiance,' seemed to float in a sea of pale, pure green, when the whole sky seemed to reel with thunder, when the night wind moaned. It is wonderful how the most commonplace men and women—beings who, as you would have thought, had no conception that rose beyond a commercial speculation or a fashionable entertainment—are elevated by such scenes; how the slumbering grandeur of their nature wakes and acknowledges kindred with the sky and the storm. 'I cannot speak,' they would say, 'the feelings which are in me. I have had emotions, aspirations, thoughts; I cannot put them into words. Look there! Listen now to the storm! That is what I meant, only I never could say it out till now.' Thus do art and nature speak for us, and thus do we adopt them as our own. This is the way his righteousness becomes righteousness for us."—Serm., p. 501.

As sparks struck out in the white heat of extempore speech, this rhapsodical nonsense might be excused; but the same passage also occurs *ipsisssimis verbis* in the Lectures on Corinthians, p. 651.

4. REGENERATION.

With the foregoing views of man's condition by nature, the reader will not expect Robertson to teach any need of regeneration; in this matter he does not seem to have heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.

"And hence it follows that we have no right to divide our congregations into regenerate and unregenerate, wordly and unwordly, Christian and un-Christian. Him that doeth this 'shall God destroy.'" Corinth., p. 446.¹

"And now consider how opposite this, St. Paul's way, is to the common way of insisting on man's depravity. He insists on man's dignity; he does not say to a man, You are fallen, you cannot think a good thought, you are half beast, half devil, sin is alone to be expected of you, it is your nature to sin. But he says rather, It is your nature not to sin, you are not the child of the devil, but the child of God. * * * * * The other is a system common enough amongst us, and well-known to us, which begins by telling the child he is the child of the devil, to become

¹See also Serm., p. 276.

perhaps the child of God. You must choose: you cannot take both: will you begin from the foundation of Adam or the foundation of Christ?" Corinth., p. 476.

"Let not Calvinism send you with terrible self-inspection to the more dreadful task of searching your own soul for the warrant of your redemption, and deciding whether you have or have not the feelings and the faith which gives you a right to be one of God's elect" (Serm., p. 285)

"The first years of our existence are simply animal, then the life of a young man is not that of mere instinct, it is a life of passion, with mighty indignations, strong aversions. And then passing on through life, we sometimes see a person in whom these things are merged: the instincts are there only for the support of existence; the passions are so ruled that they have become gentleness and meekness and love. Between these two extremes there must have been a middle point, when the life of sense, appetite, and passion, which *had* ruled, ceased to rule, and was ruled over by the life of spirit: that moment, whether long or short * * * * was the moment of spiritual regeneration." Serm. 703.

But does not God's word divide men into regenerate and unregenerate, and does it not also furnish the criteria according to which the division is still to be made? Is not this the very *raison d'être* of the Church as an organisation, viz., to distinguish between the Christian and the un-Christian, to lessen the number of the latter by increasing that of the former? With such views, moreover, it is hard to discover any room for the exercise of the "power of the keys" on the part of the Church. His discussion of the doctrine of depravity reads as if man was at liberty to choose his theology as he selects an overcoat. "You must choose; you cannot take both." The difficulty is that every man is already on "the foundation of Adam;" at least such is the teaching of St. Paul, that "higher kind of man, whose aspirations were more generous, more unselfish, more pure than those of ordinary men;" *he* tells the Ephesians that they "were *by nature* the children of wrath, even as others." What Robertson calls "St. Paul's way," he derives from the Apostle's telling the Corinthians that they were washed, sanctified, justified, etc., overlooking the statement Paul makes of their previous condition in the *verse* immediately preceding. Possibly, however, it might be objected that these Ephesians were heathen, and hence not of the class ordinarily composing our congregations; let us take

another instance. A higher authority than Paul once told a man named Nicodemus that he "must be *born again*." Nicodemus was no heathen; he needed no "reformation;" he was instructed in the Scriptures, could doubtless quote his Bible by the page; so far as baptism was concerned, he was in all probability one of the *most baptized* men that ever lived; he was not only a church member, but a church officer; his existence most assuredly was not simply animal, it had passed the period of mere instinct, and also that of "passion with mighty indignations, strong aversions," etc., in him all these things had long ago been "merged;" but notwithstanding all this, Christ said unto *him*, "Ye must be born again." Yet according to Robertson's teaching, regeneration is but the change from the frivolity of youth into the gravity of age, and its Holy Ghost is the stern significance of life's duties and trials, its responsibilities and disappointments.

V. THE ATONEMENT.

If man *outgrows* sin as he does his clothes, of course any atonement, in the sense defined by the "popular theory," would be a gratuitous waste, and hence none is taught by him.

"No man would justify the parent, pursued in his chariot by wolves over Siberian snows, who throws out one of his children to the pack that the rest may escape while their fangs are buried in their victim. You feel at once that expediency has no place here. Life is a trifle compared with law. Better that all should perish by a visitation of God than that they should be saved by one murder. I do not deny that this aspect has been given to the sacrifice of Christ. It has been represented as if the majesty of law demanded a victim, and so, as it glutted its insatiate thirst, one victim would do as well as another—the purer and the more innocent the better. It is exhibited as if Eternal Love resolved in fury to strike, and so as he had his blow, it mattered not whether it fell on the whole world, or on the precious head of his own chosen Son."—Serm., p. 113. "Vicarious sacrifice is the law of being." (Illustrations: Rocks rust into soil, out of which the herb grows—dead leaves fertilise the soil—vegetable life supports animal—dove struck down by hawk—deer beneath stroke of lion—winged fish in jaws of dolphin—man's table covered with flesh of animals slain—anguish of mother, condition of child's life—first settlers of country pay penalty of their lives—conquerors pass over bodies of noblest slain to enjoy the victory.) "All this is the law obeyed either unconsciously or instinctively. * * * The highest

Man recognised this law and joyfully embraced it as the law of his existence. It was the consciousness of his surrender to that as God's will, and the voluntariness of the act, which made it a sacrifice."—Serm., p. 115. "By punishment is simply meant the penalty annexed to the transgression of a law. Punishment is of two kinds: the penalty which follows ignorant transgression, and the chastisement which ensues upon wilful disobedience. The first of these is called imputed guilt; the second is actual guilt. By imputed guilt is meant, in theological language, that a person is treated as if he were guilty. If, for example, you approach too near the whirling wheel of steam machinery, the mutilation which follows is the punishment of temerity. If the traveller ignorantly lays his hand on the cockatrice's den, the throb of the envenomed fang is the punishment of his ignorance. * * * * Apply all this to the sacrifice of Christ. Let no man say that Christ bore the wrath of God. Let no man say that God was angry with his Son. We are sometimes told of a mysterious anguish which Christ endured, the consequence of divine wrath, the sufferings of a heart laden with the conscience of the world's transgressions, which he was bearing as if they were his own sin. * * * Christ came into collision with the world's evil, and he bore the penalty of that daring. He approached the whirling wheel, and was torn in pieces. He laid his hand upon the cockatrice's den, and its fangs pierced him. It is the law which governs the conflict with evil. It can only be crushed by suffering from it."—Serm., p. 116.¹

As to Robertson's representation of the doctrine held *by his own Church* in common with the whole of Christendom, it is too manifest a travesty to merit comment.

And what is the substitute offered by the author, but the old naked Socinianism, with scarcely enough orthodox drapery to render it decent?

If the reader is curious to know how, according to Robertson's scheme, the death of Christ is to benefit man, he is referred to the case of "the world's gifted painter," and of those "commonplace men and women," already mentioned, who were so wonderfully stirred up by the storm. Man is fired into admiration and emulation of the ideal thus placed before him. "By realising that ideal of humanity, Christ furnished the life which we appropriate to ourselves only when we enter into his spirit." Serm., p. 119. That is, *Christ teaches every man how to atone for himself*. But

¹See also Serm., pp. 333, 409, 495 ff., 771. Human Race, pp. 116, 159. Notes on Gen., p. 145.

how? By doing as Christ did, of course. The law which governs the conflict with evil is, that it can only be crushed by suffering from it; man, like Christ, must "recognise this law, and joyfully embrace it as the law of his existence." Now this were all very well if this evil were but the "fang of the cockatrice," or "the whirling wheel," or anything which spent its force in this world and upon man's perishing body; but alas! *this evil with which man finds himself in conflict is the wrath of God* and its consequences in eternity; *this is what, according to our author's scheme, man is to embrace joyfully; this is the evil which man is to crush by suffering from it!* Does not the Bible expressly say that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men"? But Robertson declares, "Let no man say that Christ bore the wrath of God"; *then man must bear it*, and the only comfort he can derive from the sufferings of Christ is contained in the old adage "misery loves company." Indeed, upon reflection, the sufferings of Christ will but increase his terror; for if under the government of God a perfectly holy and innocent being could be allowed to endure such agonies, what must he, a guilty sinner, expect? *For Christ certainly suffered; if not in the sinner's stead, then gratuitously.* To return to Robertson's travesty: the innocent life is taken, even upon his own showing.

And thus, upon its last analysis, his view of the atonement presents us with all the difficulty of the orthodox doctrine, with none of its comfort.

VI. PRAYER.

In a sermon on this subject, among many striking thoughts and sound views, Robertson makes it evident that he holds the *subjective theory* of prayer.

"For instance, did the plague come and go, according to the laws of prayer, or according to the laws of health? * * Did the catarrh or the consumption go from him who prayed sooner than from him who humbly bore it in silence?"—Serm., p. 647. "All prayer is to change the will human into submission to the will divine"—*Ibid.*, p. 649. "That prayer which does not succeed in moderating our wish, in changing the passionate desire into still submission, the anxious, tumultuous

expectation into silent surrender. is no true prayer, and proves that we have not the spirit of true prayer."—*Ibid.*, p. 649. "Practically, then I say, Pray as He did, till prayer makes you forget your own wish and leave it or merge it in God's will. The divine wisdom has given us prayer not as a means whereby to obtain the good things of earth, but as a means whereby we learn to do without them; not as a means whereby we escape evil, but as a means whereby we become strong to meet it."—*Ibid.*, p. 650.

If prayer is but a means whereby we learn to do without what we desire, why go through the mere form of preferring a petition; why not pray, in the first instance, that we may be enabled to do without the object of desire? but then *this itself* would be a petition, and so we could only expect to learn to do without *its* object! The reader sees that this theory virtually does away with all petition, and this, after all, is the author's view.

"That life is most holy in which there is least of petition and desire and most of waiting upon God."—*Ibid.*, p. 649. "Prayer is one thing, petition is quite another. Indeed, hints are given us which make it seem that a time will come when spirituality shall be so complete, and acquiescence in the will of God so entire, that petition will be superseded. 'In that day ye shall ask me nothing.'"—*Ibid.*, p. 650.

Even granting this, one is tempted to inquire what he is to do in the meantime? But in the above citation Robertson has omitted the most important part of our Saviour's words: "And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name" (ye shall be taught to do without it? No, but) "he will give it you. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full." Jno. xvi. 23, 24. The distinction is not between petition and no petition, but between petition to Christ directly and petition to the Father in Christ's name.

VII. BAPTISM.

Upon this doctrine our author's views are somewhat peculiar; he repudiates the silly sacramentarianism of Baptismal Regeneration, as generally held by that school. Baptism does not create the child a child of God, but merely recognises the fact already existing. Every child is born a child of God and has a right to

baptism by God's covenant with the human race—though where this covenant is to be found, neither he nor any one else has ever informed us; he illustrates by coronation, which he says, "is the authoritative act of the nation *declaring* a fact which was a fact before." He criticises the Romish *opus operatum* severely; he criticises still more severely what he calls the Calvinistic view, saying that according to it, faith creates the fact; between the two, he prefers the Romish view:

"Of these two views, the last (Calvinistic) is by far the most certain to undermine Christianity in every Protestant country. The first at least assumes God's badge to be an universal one, and in education is so far right, practically; only wrong in the decision of the question how the child was created a child of God. But the second assumes a false, partial, party badge—election, views, feelings. No wonder that the children of such religionists proverbially turn out ill."—Serm., p. 273.¹

It is worthy of note that the sermon in which he gives at length these views, is based upon Gal. iii. 26–29: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Yet in a sermon from *this text* he criticises the Calvinist for saying that faith makes one a child of God!

VIII. THE SABBATH.

Robertson does not believe in the moral obligation of Sabbath observance. He classes it exactly on a par with Jewish feasts, sabbath-days, and holy-days, the observance of which Paul said was indifferent. Indeed, he selects Rom. xiv. 5, 6, from which to preach on "*The Sydenham Palace, and the religious non-observance of the Sabbath,*" at a time when an effort was being made to open this place of recreation on the Sabbath. Serm., p. 343. And from Col. ii. 16, 17, he preaches one on "*The Shadow and Substance of the Sabbath.*" Serm., p. 78.²

IX.

To the foregoing constellation, stars of the first magnitude all

¹See also Serm., pp. 484, 543; Life, &c., pp. 217, 218, 263, 668; Hum. Race, p. 128.

²See also Life & Lett., pp. 175, 178, 290, 623, 834.

of them, add some lesser lights, insignificant when contrasted with these greater, but which in other theological heavens would doubtless attract attention. *E. g.*, he is not certain as to the personality of the devil;¹ he sympathises with Warburton's view of the Pentateuch;² he believes that Moses compiled the first chapter of Genesis from Chaldean legends;³ is firmly convinced of the salvability of the heathen without the gospel.⁴

Consider also the following paragraph:

"When that glorious philanthropist, whose whole life had been spent in procuring the abolition of the slave trade, was demanded of by some systematic theologian, whether in his ardor for this great cause he had not been neglecting his personal prospects and endangering his own soul, this was his magnanimous reply—one of those which show the light of truth breaking through like an inspiration; he said: 'I did not think about my own soul. I had no time to think about myself. I had forgotten all about my soul.' The Christian is not concerned about his own happiness. He has not time to consider himself."—Serm., p. 537.

Now, even at the risk of being considered as bad as a "systematic theologian," (and the writer is profoundly conscious that he is no better than he ought to be,) we would venture the opinion that while that man may have been "a glorious philanthropist," he was a very sorry Christian, "light-of-truth-breaking-through-like-an-inspiration" to the contrary notwithstanding. The man who, in the ardor of any cause whatsoever, forgets all about his own soul, makes a fatal mistake, or else we have been woefully mistaught with reference to what constitutes man's first, chief duty.

The "*Life and Letters*" passed through five editions in two years; as early as 1873 fourteen editions of "*The Sermons*" had been published in England, nine in America, and one volume had been translated into German. The present year⁵ sees a volume of hitherto unpublished sermons given to the public together with "*Robertson's Living Thoughts*," a collection of extracts from his

¹Life & Lett., p. 261.

²*Ibid.*, p. 215.

³*Ibid.*, p. 210.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 420; Serm., p. 722.

⁵The article was prepared for the October number of 1881, but arrived too late for publication.

writings; so that, on the whole, it is not altogether an exaggeration to say that these sermons "have exerted an influence without parallel, in our day, for this kind of literature."

When one reflects upon the tendency of our times towards a rationalistic type of scepticism and infidelity, it is doubtful whether Christianity is to be congratulated on the circulation of such "new views of truth;" if, bearing this tendency in mind, the reader will now turn to the beginning of the article and consult the extracts taken from *two of the soundest, most trustworthy, and influential Calvinistic papers in the United States*, he will understand why his company has been asked on this long journey, probably tedious and tiresome to him, certainly laborious to the writer. If, however, he shall have warned the reader to be cautious in accepting such verdicts of opinion; or have succeeded in illustrating the truth that a sound exegesis is the very life-blood of a healthful theology; that no brilliancy can compensate for the lack of a close, critical, conscientious study of the word; neither he (nor the reader) will have labored in vain.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

ARTICLE IV.

DR. MULLALLY'S REPLY TO THE REV. MR.
QUARLES.

LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA, October 26th, 1881.

The Reverend the Editors of the Southern Presbyterian Review:

REVEREND SIR: The last pages of the first article in the October number of your periodical prefer a grave alternative charge against "a well-known divine." The undersigned would certainly never apply this description to himself, did he not happen to remember the comment of the "papers" quoted by the author of "Our Church Policy." The recognition of this as referring to himself compels him to appear as the accused, and to ask leave to present his defence.

Had the language of your contributor been of a courteous character, it would be a pleasant task for his humble brother, differing from him, to give his reason for saying that the present scheme of Foreign Missions had the approbation of Dr. Thornwell, and was perhaps as much the product of his mind as it was of that of any other man, and he would have been glad of an opportunity to disclaim ever having said anything stronger than that, for he well knows that it was not "strictly," if by strictly is implied exclusively, the work of Dr. Thornwell.

But since the accused is not "a well-known divine," but an obscure presbyter, a decent regard for the opinions of his brethren who read the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW compels him, however irksome the duty, to repudiate the foolish position which the language of your contributor in the place referred to insinuates that he has somehow assumed. It is not hereby intended to be said that your contributor *designed* to intimate that the undersigned put himself forward as "the defender of Dr. Thornwell." But certainly that writer's bracketed interrogation point in one place and his quotation marks in another, are suited to make the impression that the member of the Staunton Assembly described, perhaps in irony, as a "well-known divine,"

had odiously claimed to be "the defender of Dr. Thornwell." The truth is, the remarks in question were not made as a defence of Dr. Thornwell at all, but simply were a denial, made necessary by the confident references of the opposition to his opinions that if he were living he would give his support to the extreme measures advocated in the minority report on Retrenchment and Reform. As to the language of the newspapers touching the matter, it was very natural for those who regarded the doctrines of that report as void of wisdom to say in speaking of that denial "he defended the memory of Dr. Thornwell," since the minority had confidently and fully claimed all the influence of his great name in favor of a revolution which would seem to them unworthy of a high grade of prudence. It is hereby humbly submitted that if the effort to deprive the "Reform" of the argument from Dr. Thornwell's opinions was not sustained, or that if it could not be sustained, your readers could have been fully and forcibly apprised of the error in language neither verging on profanity nor conveying the suggestion of insult offered to one who was counted worthy by a Presbytery to be a member of the General Assembly, and so had a very high claim to respect, although very deficient both in gifts and attainments. (See SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, page 625, the sentence begun with the eleventh line from top, and also page 627, the sentence beginning with the sixth line from the top.) It will be remembered that the question now under consideration is not whether the member of the Assembly who denied the right of the "Reform" to strengthen itself by the name of Thornwell was in error or not, but whether the language of your contributor here referred to is such as one gentleman may use towards another, not to say such as one member of our highest Church court may use of one who in that court is his own official peer, however inferior to himself he may be in personal qualifications. Let the judgment of the Church, and of all who acknowledge the law of kindness, taught by Jesus Christ and his apostles, decide.

The character of the attempt at ridicule suggested by the transition of your contributor from the statement of the papers, which is that "he defended the memory of Dr. Thornwell," to the

application of the phrase "the defender of Dr. Thornwell" to his very humble opponent, may be illustrated thus :

The article on our Church Policy is concluded with this paragraph :

"We were in the minority, so was Dr. Thornwell at Rochester. Dr. Breckinridge was in the minority in opposing the reception of Committee men as delegates to the Assembly. We were in the minority in advocating our new Book of Church Order when it was first presented to the Presbyteries. The opposition had the majority of votes ; we content ourselves that we had the majority of the truth."

Suppose that some one taking advantage of the unguardedness of this language in reference to the suggestion of self-confidence and conceit in its author, should upon the strength of it intimate that a well-known divine, in an article on "Our Church Policy," in the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW of October, 1881, set himself up on a level of intellectual superiority with Thornwell and Breckinridge, and claimed to be the advocate who secured the adoption of our Book of Church Order, and continuing to use the editorial "we," claimed to know more than the great majority of the Staunton Assembly. Such language as this would be most unjust to the gentleman who furnishes the first article in the October number of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, albeit the paragraph quoted would bear an interpretation suited to give that representation plausibility. There is no language of the undersigned to warrant any one's ridiculing him as "the defender of Dr. Thornwell," but your contributor would place him in that false position on the strength merely of the view which a newspaper correspondent took of what he said in refutation of an argument in favor of Retrenchment and Reform drawn from Dr. Thornwell's history. The gentleman's language therefore in making your replicant odious by intimating that he either ever assumed or accepted the position of the defender of Dr. Thornwell, although in itself perhaps not so injurious, is certainly as unfounded, and as unkind in its nature, as the supposed misrepresentation would be. Besides the undersigned feels the more aggrieved, because he is not aware of having ever done anything towards the learned Professor from Missouri, to provoke any, not to say such, marked unkindness at his hands.

Will you, Messrs. Editors, permit an humble brother, without charging him with any spirit of self-righteousness or pretence of superiority to say, that, whatever latitude may be necessary to the freedom of debate, when men meet face to face, and must often speak, not in the language they would prefer, but in that which they are compelled to use, or leave thought unuttered, and so action to be uninfluenced, yet it is most highly desirable that our religious organs carefully exclude the appearance of unkindness from their columns or their pages? However much aggrieved your humble servant might have felt by the assault made upon him in your pages, he would shrink from asking space for any word of personal vindication did he not hope that what he had to say would tend to further this consummation, which all agree is "devoutly to be wished."

The issue between the author of "Our Church Policy" and the present writer is very simple. He says it was Dr. Thornwell's view that our Foreign Missionary work should be conducted "directly by the Presbyteries." The undersigned holds that it was Dr. Thornwell's judgment that our Foreign Mission work should be conducted according to the scheme at present in operation in our Church. Your contributor from Missouri quotes in proof of his position only what Dr. Thornwell said in his efforts to abolish the "Boards," which it is believed no one claiming to be a Presbyterian would now defend. That great man wrote and spoke much and well against the Executive Committee of the *Presbyterian Board* of Foreign Missions, but never uttered or penned one syllable against the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions of the *Presbyterian Church* in the Confederate States of America. Does it follow that because he taught direct Presbyterian action as preferable to "Board" committee action, therefore he taught directly Presbyterian action as contrary to the action of the General Assembly itself through its own communion? It appears that Dr. Thornwell saw no conflict between anything that he had said against the "Boards" and in favor of Presbyterian action, and the scheme of Foreign Mission work adopted by the Augusta Assembly.

The conclusive proof of this is that Dr. Thornwell himself

moved the adoption of that scheme on the floor of our first General Assembly which met in Augusta, Georgia, December 4th, 1861. On page 15 of the Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, we find this record: "On motion of Dr. Thornwell, the first resolution of the report was adopted." Turning to the next page, it is seen that the "first resolution" thus spoken of covers the creation and constitution of our Executive Committee of Foreign Missions as it now exists.

Add to this that Dr. Thornwell was a member of the Provisional Committee of Foreign Missions, with Dr. J. Leighton Wilson as Secretary, previous to the meeting of the Augusta Assembly, and from its initiation; and will any one say there is not good reason for the opinion that our present scheme of Foreign Mission work is as much the product of Dr. Thornwell's mind as it is that of any other man's?

But why was your contributor so eager to prove that Dr. Thornwell would favor remanding our foreign missionary work to the Presbyteries directly? No sooner has he seemed to himself to have proved this than he tells us that Dr. Thornwell in so doing would err. What becomes then of the force of the gentleman's *a fortiori* argument, that if Dr. Thornwell thought the Presbyteries ought to conduct Foreign Missions, he must have believed in remitting the rest of the evangelistic work to them? For the inference is obvious that if he would err in doing the first, he would err in doing the second. So the conclusion would be that Dr. Thornwell's opinion ought to weigh very little in settling the great question debated at Staunton. Verily, such dealing as this does cause many who revere his memory to wish that controversialists would cease to invoke Dr. Thornwell for the settlement of practical matters which must be settled upon their own merits in the light of existing circumstances, and which involve no radical question of doctrine, but only questions of prudence and choice lying within the scope of the governing principles which all concerned accept. We can find, in the writings of those who are gone to glory, what are the principles of Presbyterianism, but not what are the best methods for their application under present circum-

stances, within the bounds assigned by the word. However, the undersigned does approve of Dr. Thornwell's opposition to the Boards, and sees no error whatever in the quotations made from his works by the author of the article on "Our Church Policy." On the contrary, he would argue that if that wise man found our present scheme of Foreign Missions, by which this work is placed in the hands of the Assembly, consistent with all he had ever said of the nature and demands of true Presbyterianism, it is probable he would also find the same consistency as regards "the rest of the evangelistic work" of our beloved Church, and would deny that the value of this argument is impaired by any such blunder as your contributor attributes to him on the soundness of whose judgment it depends.

Your replicant never expressed the opinion that every detail in our present methods of conducting the enterprises of the Church would receive Dr. Thornwell's approbation; but he reiterates his belief that the minority report on Retrenchment and Reform would receive his emphatic veto. It is simply impossible for one man to say what in reference to specific changes of policy another may think under ordinary circumstances, and when only one or two such changes is proposed. But it seems to me plain enough on which side Dr. Thornwell would stand, had the Lord spared him to be at Staunton last May, and had the issue there joined been the same, notwithstanding his continued abode in the flesh. After the passage of the Spring resolutions he wrote as follows: "There should be no time lost in the permanent organisation of the Confederate Church. She should be getting ready for embarking fully in the work of her Master. She should have, as speedily as possible, her Committees of Missions, Foreign and Domestic, of Education, and if need be of Publication and Church Extension. A great work is before her. Let her gird up her loins and set resolutely about it." See *Life and Letters of James Henley Thornwell*, D. D., LL.D., by B. M. Palmer, D. D., LL.D., page 495.

But the only point at issue between your Missouri contributor and this defendant relates to Foreign Missions. Surely it has been made plain enough that Dr. Thornwell could not favor the change of our present scheme for the conduct of that work with-

out changing what he himself had established. It would not be prudent, in dealing with an opponent whose language is not governed by the obligations of refined and honorable controversy, to adduce personal knowledge of Dr. Thornwell's opinions received in the enjoyment of his generous, unstinted friendship during at least half a decade of years. But if anything more than has been said seems necessary in order to show that our Executive Committee of Foreign Missions was the product of Dr. Thornwell's mind and the delight of his heart, it will be found in the fourth volume of "Thornwell's Collected Writings," under the heading "Debate Touching Church Boards." Here it may be seen that before the division of the Church the very scheme adopted at Augusta was fully and clearly in the mind of the great man, and powerfully and earnestly advocated by him. The following joint testimony of John B. Adger, D. D., and John L. Girardeau, D. D., shows of itself that your learned contributor was imprudent in alleging that he who says Dr. Thornwell approved the present scheme of Foreign Missions is guilty of shameful ignorance or something worse. It is found on page 144, 4th Vol. Col. Writings. The liberty is taken of italicising except in the word *direct* which is thus emphasised by the editors themselves: "As to the conduct of missions, while insisting on the competency of the Presbyteries and preferring their control to that of *Boards*, he (Dr. Thornwell) did not object on principle to the Assembly's undertaking the management of that work, provided that its control was *DIRECT* through a mere Executive Committee. *No man had more to do than he with the organisation of our present Executive Committees.* In fact his principles regarding *Boards* have been *fully and cordially* adopted by our Church."

Any one who may be at all puzzled by the proposition that Dr. Thornwell's advocating at one time direct Presbyterian control of the Foreign Mission work, and at another time joining cordially in originating and organising a permanent central agency for conducting the same, will find the key of the paradox in Chapter XVI. of the Biography by Dr. Palmer.

In introducing the history of Dr. Thornwell's relation to the

great Board controversy on page 222, Dr. Palmer says: "It is not the business of the biographer to discuss his views, but only to afford him the opportunity of presenting them. It may be remarked, however, that he was not opposed to combined or united action on the part of the Church, but only insisted that the central agency should be simply executive; the mere instrument by which the Assembly acts, and not an agent standing in the place of the Assembly, and acting for it." Turning now to pp. 227 and 228, the inquirer will find Dr. Breckinridge, in a letter to Dr. Thornwell dated Nov. 12, 1841, speaking of a central agency or a commission of the Assembly itself as what he advocates in opposition to the Boards. Now let him be pleased to look at the next page near the bottom margin, and there he may read in a letter from him whose opinions are under investigation, to his admired friend, the author of the Act and Testimony, dated Feb. 23rd, 1842 (just the time when the article from which "Our Church Policy" quotes was in the printer's hands) the following words: "In regard to a central agency, I have expressed no opinion, because my object has chiefly been to awaken our Presbyteries to a proper sense of their own responsibilities. Whenever they shall undertake, in good earnest, the work of the Lord in conformity with the spirit of our system, the details of their plans will not be found, I apprehend, very hard to settle. On the present plan, our churches are not reached; the whole body is not, and cannot be engaged as one man: the principles of our polity, by which we are bound together and united into one body, are set aside; and we are evidently proceeding in a method suited only to the lame and crippled constitution of the Independents. This clumsy method I wish to see abandoned; I want our distinctive principles clearly brought out; and I am very indifferent as to the details by which this may be done, so that it is effectually done. If a central agency can be suggested which shall give us a proper security against error and abuse, and interfere with the regular operations of no part of our system, I shall have not a word to say against it."

Evidently Dr. Thornwell thought that central agency was found in the scheme adopted at Augusta in 1861. It was not for

direct Presbyterian action as against combined action he contended, but for the Church as against the Boards, and in the present scheme he recognised the Church itself operating under and in obedience to the demands of her divine charter as fully as if the Presbyteries were acting directly in sending and supporting our missionaries. The difference between the two plans appeared to him as having reference only to the details by which our distinctive principles may be clearly brought out, a difference which involves no question of principle, but only one of expediency, and as to which he declared himself very indifferent. He did not believe that the Church has absolutely no discretion at all. On the contrary he held, to use his own language, that "whatever executive agency is requisite in order to do her appointed work, she can, of course, employ; but she may not go outside of this necessity and transfer her work to another body to be performed by them—in the sphere of commanded things she has a discretion—a discretion determined by the nature of the actions, and by the divine principle that all things be done decently, in order."

I am, reverend editors, with profound respect,

Your humble servant,

FRANCIS P. MULLALLY.

ARTICLE V.

"OUR BROTHER IN BLACK."

Our Brother in Black: His Freedom and His Future. By ATTICUS G. HAYGOOD, D. D., President of Emory College, Oxford, Ga. New York: Phillips and Hunt. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1881.

The above is the title of one of the most timely contributions to our literature. In some eighteen chapters, brief for the most part, and simple in style, Dr. Haygood clearly states, and candidly discusses, the question of our relations to the vast negro population in the midst of us. At times the Southern reader is tempted to think the author *too* candid; yet this is possibly because he has been able to overcome prejudice and personal feelings more than most of us, and to overlook the many faults and sins of those (doubtless in many instances sincerely pious) Northern people who came down amongst us after the war to teach the negro.

At the outset Dr. Haygood would impress us with the vastness of the subject he is approaching by calling attention, in the opening chapter, to the fact that this negro population numbers more than six millions. At the close of the Revolutionary War they numbered only some seven hundred thousand. Hence in a little less than a century they have multiplied more than eight times; and a corresponding multiplication during a century more, as is shown in the September number of the *Popular Science Monthly*, would give us the astonishing number of fifty millions.

But not only are these six millions here amongst us; "they are here to stay," as our author aptly expresses it. He well says, "There is much reason to believe that the problem" (of their future) "can be better solved without a change of locality. The South is the best place for these emancipated negroes, and the people of the South will yet prove themselves to be, of all people in the world, the fittest to deal with this very difficult and delicate race-problem. What we want is not a change of blackboards, but

a thorough study and a clear understanding of the problem itself; also, the right spirit all around." Pp. 17-18.

He then discusses the three proposed schemes for the removal of this race from our midst; either, (1) by the so-called "exodus;" or, (2) by setting them apart in a separate State, as Arizona; or, (3) by transportation to Africa. The first is shown to be improbable from the experience the negroes already have of the "exodus" movement; the second is shown to be equally improbable by calling attention to the failure of our Indian policy; and the third would seem a physical impossibility, for the negroes multiply as fast as they could be transported, allowing the transportation of one hundred thousand a year. During the last decade their rate of increase has been nearly thirty-five per cent., while that of the whites has been but little over twenty-nine.

But to the Christian reader probably the most interesting chapters in the whole book are those in which the providential feature in the negro's location and emancipation are considered. "If it should be asked," says Dr. Haygood, "How came these poor Africans to this country? I answer, without hesitation, *God brought them here, 'to save much people alive.'*" "The secular historian," he continues, "will say truly that the negroes did a wonderful work in helping to subdue this Western wilderness. But the historian of the Church of Christ, and the recorder of the great deeds in true human progress, will say that the most wonderful of all facts connected with the strange history of the children of Africa in America is this: that there are now, 1881, nearly one million of them in the communion of the various Christian Churches in the United States, and that the six millions of them have been brought largely under the influence of the Christian religion." Half this number were brought into the Church in the days of slavery; and though many so-called philanthropists saw in that institution only the hand of Satan, the old plantations were nevertheless to thousands God's chosen places for their regeneration; it was doubtless his will that they should remain in slavery, that they might become possessors of a higher and nobler freedom—freedom from the dominion of sin.

The author continues, p. 30: "Seeing that the greatest fact in

African slavery in the United States is the Christianising of hundreds of thousands of them, I conclude that Christianising them was the grand providential design in their coming to this country." And again: "We must never forget that the Christianising of these multitudes of Africans here looks, and must look, to the salvation of the vaster multitudes in Africa itself." This is undoubtedly the true view to take of this whole matter.

The author then proceeds to ask why the South, and our system of slavery, should have been the chosen field and the fittest means for the working out of the great designs of Providence with respect to the negro race. He answers, (1), that no climate in the world was so favorable to the physical needs of the race; (2), that it needed the protection and tutorship of just such a superior people as was ours of the South—a people of one blood and without rival industries; (3), that it needed as a religion Protestantism pure and simple—found in the South as it is found nowhere else in America; and (4), the race needed, for its highest development, just such a protection as was insured to it either by the self-interest of the master on the one hand, or, which was far better, by his Christianity on the other.

Not less interesting are the two chapters on "Providence in Emancipation." They are, indeed, *the* feature of the book, giving the question it discusses that preëminent importance which it deserves, and leading us to view it in that light which beams forth from the evident purpose of God himself. Amongst all the aspects of this interesting question this providential one is the most striking, and well does the author say that it is "a matter of vast moment to both races, that the hand of God should be recognised in this whole history—one of the most remarkable that belongs to the annals of any nation. It is important to the emancipated negro to see God in his freedom, that there may be in his heart and life a right conscience in the use of his freedom. . . . It is equally important, so far as their duties to the negroes are concerned, that the people of the North and of the South recognise God's hand in his providential dealings both with slavery and its termination."

This portion of the book cannot be too highly commended.

God's providence is the true light in which to read all history, and it is our duty as a Christian people to read thoughtfully in this light the history our African neighbor. Again and again, almost to undue repetition, does Dr. Haygood strive to impress upon his reader this, the great theme of his book. Would that all our people might have their hearts and minds so filled with this great theme! Then would they see their responsibilities as many have not seen them, and be prompted to exertions such as they have never yet made.

The second chapter on "Emancipation" is designed further to remind us of the hand of God in this matter by giving a detailed history of the Emancipation Proclamation itself, in which history it is clearly shown that the negro himself, and his interests, were not in any sense the object contemplated in that famous document, but that the sole design and object of it was, to use Mr. Lincoln's own words, "the saving of the Union;" in short, that it was a state, not a philanthropic, measure; and that if Mr. Lincoln himself were living to-day, no man would more stoutly deny that the so-called philanthropic motives or ends had anything whatever to do with his official action. Recent articles in the *North American Review*, from unquestionable sources, are quoted to establish this view, and indeed they give Mr. Lincoln's own emphatic testimony to this effect. Hence, in a human point of view, Emancipation was a pure accident; in the Divine, a part of the all-wise, all-comprehensive purpose.

Therefore, since the negro's present condition is, humanly speaking, accidental, both races should the more entirely divest their minds of all thought of the human instrumentalities—instrumentalities viewed with dislike by the one race and almost adored by the other—and see this changed condition as a providenti alone.

Some philanthropist would do a good service to publish in tract form Chapter IX. on "The Time Element in the Problem," and circulate it throughout the Northern section of our land. It is written so candidly, with such evident charity and sincerity, that no reasonable man can be offended, either by its statements or its tone; and its careful perusal would doubtless lead some thoughtful Christians North to think differently of us, and to understand

why we did not see "missionaries, saints, and martyrs," in not a few of the Northern teachers who came South after the war.

The succeeding chapter, on "Canterbury Green in 1831—1834," is mainly a reproduction of a remarkable article that appeared in *Scribner's Monthly* for December, 1880, showing that a respectable young Quakeress, who attempted to teach a negro school, was subjected to far worse treatment, and to a more unreasonable ostracism, in Connecticut, than even the most radical and injudicious "missionaries" from the North, either male or female, were ever subjected to amongst us only thirty years later.

But still there looms up before us, in threatening aspect, what, in Chapter XI., the author styles the "National Problem." These multitudes—millions—are here, here for coming ages, and they are voters, citizens; yet not fitted to be either. As they stand, in their strangely anomalous condition, thinking men justly feel gravest apprehensions respecting them. Their condition is unsatisfactory to the whites, and equally unsatisfactory to the negroes themselves. What is to be done? Plainly *something*; but *what*? It is indeed a "problem"—one more difficult of solution than any ever found in Euclid. Our author endeavors to show how all parties have failed to deal with this "problem" as its importance demanded: the North freely giving men and money, but often doing it offensively, thereby creating in the mind of the South a positive aversion from the whole question of the negro's improvement; the South yielding too readily to these natural impulses and allowing them to dim her vision of her duty; whilst the negroes themselves aggravate the "problem" by lives of idleness, distrust of their old friends, and affiliation with political cormorants who have been all the while their worst foes.

The jealousies between North and South are dying out, a better class of Northern workers have for the most part appeared amongst the negroes, better views are naturally beginning to prevail amongst our own people, and the negro himself is learning wisdom—is slowly but surely finding out that his best interests do not centre in politics, and that the Northern stranger is not always his best friend.

Notwithstanding this more hopeful outlook, the "problem" still

lies in a great measure unsolved, and to this solution Dr. Haygood addresses himself in Chapter XII. He maintains that repression will never meet the question, pointing in proof to Hungary, Russia, and Ireland, and contends that we must elevate and improve our African neighbor. "This new citizen," says he, "is a voter, and, unhappily for all, he is not ready for his responsibilities. Voting means choosing, and wise choosing means intelligence. Woe to the land where those who hold the balance of power are in ignorance. . . . This voter *must be educated.*" Setting out with this as a fundamental principle, the author suggests four methods in its application: (1) By clearing the way, involving the removal of prejudice and indifference; (2) By the encouragement and cultivation of the negro's better motives; (3) By teaching him to help himself—to be self-supporting, self-educating; but, (4) He must also have outside help, from the State school system, from National appropriation, and from individuals, societies, and churches, both North and South.

The two chapters on "Schools for Negroes" we approach with interest, and in the main they are well written and present wholesome truths—truths we should look squarely in the face, however unwelcome. The author contends, and rightly, that we white people of the South should give more encouragement and countenance than we do to negro schools, and lays down this somewhat bold proposition: "If the work of educating the negroes of the South is ever to be carried on satisfactorily, if ever the best results are to be accomplished, then *Southern white people must take part in the work of teaching negro schools.*" P. 148. To maintain this position Dr. Haygood points to the many forms of industry in which we instruct negroes, and the various business relationships that exist between the two races. He also holds that to many of the Northern teachers who have come amongst us to instruct the negro we owe a heavy debt of gratitude, using the strangely unguarded and extravagant expression—a sad blemish to the page on which it stands—that without their efforts "the South would have been uninhabitable by this time." It is painful to utter emphatic protest against anything in a book in most respects so admirable—to differ *in toto* from an author who

is worthy of all praise for the lasting service he has rendered in giving us by far the best contribution yet offered towards the solution of this great national problem; yet his estimate of the influence of these Northern teachers must be pronounced rash in the extreme. It is probably a higher estimate than some of the more radical of these teachers themselves would make. Surely the author made it inconsiderately. Where is the yet lingering influence of that mighty and untold factor, the *cultus* of the Southern household and of the old plantation? Where is the influence, since emancipation, of daily contact with a superior, cultivated, and Christian race? And above all, where is the influence of the half-million of Christians that emancipation found amongst them? It is earnestly to be hoped that the author will, in future editions, cancel this wholly erroneous and hurtful estimate of Northern influence.

But Dr. Haygood is undoubtedly right when he expresses the belief that Southern teachers can do more for the advancement of negro students than Northern ones; and that in view of the interdependence of the two races and their providentially associated interests, it becomes us in every sense to be ourselves the instructors of our negro neighbor, and not to commit him to those who are ignorant of his real character, whose methods are unsuited to him, and who almost inevitably impart to him foreign ideas that are more or less prejudicial to the best interests of the two races destined in the providence of God to live side by side. But, after all, our author expresses the true view when he says (p. 153), that "a large part of this work of educating the black race must be done by the negroes themselves. It would be, in many respects, better for them if they could furnish thoroughly trained and competent teachers for all their schools."

Our General Assembly has seen the importance of this view of the matter in its religious aspects, and has adopted the right course in establishing a training school for colored men, in which they may be fitted to go forth as pastors and evangelists to their own people.

The feeling is a natural one, and therefore to a certain extent a divinely implanted one, which prompts each race to prefer a

ministry of its own. Race instincts are gifts of the all-wise Creator; therefore let us regard them. For many reasons we cannot give to these six millions of negroes a white ministry; one of these reasons ought to be patent to us all, *viz.*, we fall far short of an adequate supply for our own people. This fact alone, aside from all argument from race instincts, would suggest that our only course, if we would really give the gospel to these millions at our doors, is to establish, and generously, cordially maintain, training schools in which to prepare approved colored men for the great work of ministering to their own people.

Almost every conceivable consideration points to a like course with reference to their general education. We cannot furnish a sufficiency of competent teachers for our own race, and, aside from race instincts, we cannot therefore accomplish much in the secular education of the negro, except through channels similar to those now happily employed by the Church, *viz.*, by training schools for teachers. Let white men, in a few centres, prepare colored teachers, and let these latter go forth, and in the countless school houses of the land instruct the children of their own race. Such a solution of the educational part of the problem certainly has much to commend it.

In the succeeding chapter, on "Some Work Good People are Doing," Dr. Haygood gives a detailed and interesting account of the various educational enterprises set on foot for the instruction of the negro, both by Northern and Southern effort.

It is gratifying to read the utterances of Gov. Brown, as reproduced from his speech on this subject in the United States Senate; and the statistics and views of Dr. Orr, School Commissioner for Georgia, as given before the National Educational Association, at Chautauqua, showing how much the South herself is doing in this great matter. It is shown, also, what vast sums various bodies North are annually expending in this good work, sums aggregating millions, and in their effects reaching hundreds of thousands of pupils.

It is to be regretted, however, that Dr. Haygood seems to have known nothing of our own enterprise at Tuskaloosa. It is true it appears insignificant, with its handful of students and few hun-

dreds of dollars annually contributed; and yet, in coming time, it will no doubt be viewed in a different light—indeed, will be looked upon as the most interesting feature in all this great work, if Dr. Haygood and the great body of Southern people are right in maintaining that we of the South are the people to do this work best, and to be the real friends and helpers of the negro race. For our Tuskealoosa Institute—the growth of five years of patient toil and consecrated labor, as it were, the life-blood and last labors of one of our most devoted and scholarly men—must through all coming time be looked upon as the pioneer effort of Southern Christians in this vast field. Some day its proportions will doubtless assume their proper aspect, and what now seems insignificant may yet loom up into an importance and interest overshadowing even the gigantic enterprises of our Northern friends, sustained though they are by millions of money and hosts of well-trained men.

This brings us (passing over the two chapters on the negro as a member of the community and as a land-owner), to the two closing chapters of the book, on “African Churches in America,” and “Africo-Americans in relation to Africa.” Setting out with the principle that the religion of the negro, with all its defects, is genuine, Dr. Haygood utters the sentiment of every thoughtful Christian when he says, “The hope of the African race in this country is largely in its pulpit. The school-house and the newspaper have not substituted the pulpit . . . in any Christian nation. . . . But for this race the pulpit is preëminently its teacher. Here they must receive their best counsels and their divinest inspirations. I say *its* pulpit; I mean this. White preachers have done much and ought to have done more, . . . but the great work must be done by preachers of the negro race. . . . In every mission field the ‘native ministry’ does a work that no other can do.” Again, he says, “There is somewhere, in their secret thoughts and aspirations, a mighty under-current of sentiment that tends to bring them into race-affiliations in their religious development. It is an instinct that does not recognise itself, that does not argue, that cannot express itself in words, but that moves straight on to its ends, steady, resistless, and, in the end, trium-

phant." P. 227. Again, "This instinct will never rest satisfied till it realises itself in total race-separations. Whether we of the white race approve or disapprove matters little. The movements that grow out of race-instincts do not wait upon the conclusions of philosophy." In the course of this chapter the author takes occasion to express the earnest hope that the next General Conference of the M. E. Church, South, will establish a theological school for colored men. May his ardent wish be fulfilled, and may the great Church he represents, which already has such a hold upon the negro race, rise to a hearty grasp of the same momentous truths which he sets forth! No doubt he is correct when he affirms that beyond all question we as Churches ought to help these colored communions more earnestly than we do. "It is a sad thing," he reminds us, "in the life of even one man when he fails to see and embrace an opportunity to do a good deed, or to forward a great movement toward the triumph of our Lord's kingdom. It is a sadder thing when a whole Church, or a whole people, misses its opportunity. We of the South have come to such a place and such a time in our history that we have again offered to us a great opportunity to help a whole race in two continents. May we be wise and faithful to make the most of it, in the love of God and man!" Again, "Our obligation to help the negro in his social and religious development . . . does not grow out of his relation to 'our party' or to 'our Church,' but out of our common relation to Jesus Christ, our Elder Brother, and to God our Father."

But in view of the recent action of our General Assembly relative to the establishment of a mission in Africa, probably in the valley of the mighty Congo, the reader will peruse with peculiar interest and pleasure the closing chapter of the book, which discusses the relation between the two branches of the one race, the African and the Africo-American. "It is simply unthinkable," the author writes, "that in the plans of Providence for the thousands of Africans in America, the millions of Africans in Africa should have no place. To my view, nothing solves the problem of their providential coming to this country, of their providential maintenance as a race in process of civilisation and Christianisation,

of their providential emancipation . . . that leaves Africa out."

In casually alluding to representative men amongst us who in other days toiled heroically to bring these millions to Christ, Dr. Haygood should include in succeeding editions of his work mention of the Joneses, the Adgers, the Girardeaus, the Wilsons, the Dicksons, and multitudes of others in our own fold; and the many good and great bishops and pastors amongst the Episcopalians, the Baptists, and the Lutherans, who have faithfully labored for the salvation of this race. But these are only minor faults of a book destined to do a great work, and which should be in the hands of all our people. It discusses a mighty problem—one with which we all have to deal whether we will or not, and involving the gravest questions of duty. It is one, contact with which we cannot avoid, and every such contact inevitably gives rise to duties of transcendent moment.

In conclusion, the providential aspects of this question are its all-absorbing ones to the child of God. And to Southern Christians, beyond all others, are these providential aspects impressive in the extreme. We of the South were not a sea-faring people; we had no ships to bring these sons of Africa here, had we wished to engage in the traffic. They were brought to us—immediately, by the hands of men, but really and over all, by the hand of God, committing them to us as a solemn trust. With us they sojourned under benign influences for many decades, when again a great transition came. In a day these millions that had been ours, committed to our guardianship and care, were ours no longer. It is true the deed was done by a human decree; but over and above the hands of men was still the hand of Him who had, across the trackless deep, guided these children of Africa to our shores.

Some things that we could do for them in other days we can now do for them no more. Other things that we could not do then we now have an opportunity to do on a scale of usefulness unexampled in the history of nations. To the six millions here we can give a pure gospel through a trained ministry of their own; and through them the Church of the South, irrespective of denominations, has opportunity such as no other Church on earth

has to send the Word of Life to the two hundred millions in the land whence our millions came.

No Church, in all the annals of missions, ever had an opportunity so glorious, so inspiring. Will she embrace it and do her duty to the negro here, and to his heathen kinsmen in his native land?

D. C. RANKIN.

ARTICLE VI.

PRELATIC ASSUMPTIONS.

Truth is stranger than fiction, history is more mendacious than fable, and opinion is louder and more effectual than logic. Such reflections naturally and unavoidably present themselves whenever we hear or read the repetition of errors a thousand times exploded, and as often revived.

Every blow at the barriers that interrupt the harmony of Christian intercourse is struck in behalf of love and peace. There is no bitterness in the intent of the present article. If deemed offensive in form, it shall be defensive in spirit. It is not designed to reopen controversy now closed, but to meet the issues of a controversy *always pending*. A new generation is ever present, exposed to the influence of old errors and extravagant claims, and needing some defence at the hands of its living instructors. The High Church bubble was pricked into collapse many years ago by the pens of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, in New York, and the Rev. John H. Rice, in Virginia. But the young laity of our Churches, of all denominations, know almost nothing of those discussions; and to-day it is with them, as with their fathers, an open question whether the claim of the exclusive party in the Episcopal Church is true or false.

The character of this claim is familiar to all. It forbids the recognition of other orthodox Churches, and warrants exertion to entice their members from their communion. A pretension so incompatible with Christian courtesy and so productive of bitter

and uncharitable impressions cannot be safely allowed to force its way, by mere *repetition*, into the plastic minds of successive generations of our people. The Christian public should have the *antidote* presented as often as the *bane* is urged upon it. But the process is continuous, as almost every village can testify; and even where a better spirit prevails in a community, the constant influence of the organic forms of that denomination, operates as an arrogant rebuke to all others for the want of that apostolic character which it claims to possess exclusively.

The claim to which we refer is expressed in the Constitution of the Church in the following words: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons." The exclusive party in the Episcopal Church builds its proud policy upon this language, as its corner-stone. But, strange to say, the appeal of the Prayer Book here made to the words of Holy Scripture has been almost universally abandoned as untenable, and, in controversial writings, a form of expression unknown to the Prayer Book, has been substituted for it. It will be noticed that, in the original form, the orders are arranged according to their standing grade in the Church—1. *Bishops*; 2. *Priests*; 3. *Deacons*. This is the organic law of that Church, which cannot be abandoned without giving up all its distinctive characters. It purports, by its very terms, to be in accordance with the plain language of Scripture. It teaches as a scriptural truth too evident for any diligent reader to misunderstand, that in the days of the apostles the first and highest order in the ministry were *bishops*; the second, *priests*; the third, *deacons*. It is impossible to escape from the fact that this, and this alone, is the doctrine of the Church on that subject. An appeal to any record is to the language, the terms, the phraseology of that record. The claim is therefore unequivocal, that the *language* of the Scripture conveys to every diligent reader this precise arrangement of the orders of the ministry in apostolic times. And yet, when the proof is demanded at the present day, the Christian world is astounded with the announcement that the Scriptures teach no such thing,

and the Episcopal Church claims nothing of the kind. On the contrary, it is almost universally maintained that the scriptural scheme was, 1, *Apostles*; 2, *Bishops* or *Presbyters*; 3, *Deacons*. As this is entirely different language from that of the Prayer Book, it is obvious that the original appeal to the plain expressions of the New Testament has been totally given up. The diligent reader who finds the term *bishops* so frequently occurring in the Acts and Epistles, can no longer infer that it signified a member of the *first* order in the ministry, as the Prayer Book had led him to believe, but must learn from the highest individual authorities in his Church that it was employed to designate the *rectors* of particular parishes. He is also expected to receive the dogma inculcated by the same authorities, that the first order in the ministry were then denominated apostles, of superior dignity and authority to the primitive bishops. This vast change in ecclesiastical phrase, so contrary to that long used in the Church, is not pretended to be derived from the *obvious* usage of Scripture which every diligent reader may discover, but from profound research and overwhelming argument!

The depth of this research and the force of this argument will now be estimated and measured as accurately as lies in our power, and the attention of intelligent Episcopal laymen is as cordially invoked as that of our brethren among the "Dissenters."

It is now almost universally conceded that, if apostolic usage were followed, the title of *bishop* would be applied to the *second* order in the ministry rather than the *first*. We refer, of course, to the Episcopal scheme of these orders. The truth is admitted by the best scholars and critics in the Church of England that there was a *plurality* of bishops at Ephesus and Philippi, and in each of the cities of Crete to which Titus was sent. The term *ἐπίσκοπος* (*bishop*) is used in each of these passages in the sense of a minister in a single congregation or parish, overseeing a flock not of ministers, but of laymen; and the word cannot, without violence, be perverted to any other meaning. No man of sense and candor can understand by it a *diocesan* in the modern sense.

The authoritative declaration of the Church, and the opinion of the great mass of its most learned interpreters, are therefore

irreconcilable. The difficulty has been sorely felt by the high prelatie party, who are equally anxious to maintain the position of the Church, and their own. Their plea is that the difference is purely *verbal*. But the appeal of the Church is to the very *words* of the Scriptures. "It is evident to the diligent reader," not to the learned critic or the keen logician, that the three orders were, 1. Bishops; 2. Priests; 3. Deacons. Each party has discovered a threefold cord that cannot be broken. But the one testifies that it is composed of red, blue, and green strands; the other, of blue, purple, and green. And both insist upon the *orders* of the colors. Now here we find a strange discrepancy between the witnesses; and especially is it strange that the middle order in the one scheme bears the same name as the first order in the other. The effect is like that of the testimony of two witnesses to the initial letters of a signature. If the one should make it A. B. C., and the other B. A. C., the conflict would greatly impair the evidence.

The force of this criticism lies in the claim of the Church to the three orders by their *names*. The words are: "these orders—bishops, priests, deacons;" and she then proceeds to establish the future government of the body upon the very order in which the names are arranged. She professes to derive all this from the *verbal* usage of Scripture—the only medium by which the diligent reader could possibly discover the alleged facts. On the other hand, the great body of her teachers and defenders insist that this verbal usage cannot be relied upon. The use of words underwent a change. The term apostle became obsolete, and that of bishop, originally applied to presbyters, was adopted in its room. If this is not disagreement, we know not what agreement is. It is a little too exacting for the Church to tell us, in her fundamental law, that it is plainly taught in Scripture that, in the days of the apostles, she was governed by *bishops*, as the first order in the ministry, and then, by the mouth of her teachers, to tell us she was governed by *apostles*, as the first order, the bishops being subject to them; and when the difference between the statements is pointed out, to assure us that the two statements are equivalent. The terms have changed, but the things represented by

them are unaltered. If this were so, there could be little reliance placed in the phraseology of the Bible, and our Episcopal friends would find such criticism fatal to themselves.

Our present inquiry pertains altogether to the *phraseology* of the New Testament. Although the Church appears to date its three orders *from* the days of the Apostles, she, in reality, maintains that such was the form of government *during* that period. Otherwise the appeal to Holy Scripture would be absurd. We limit ourselves, on purpose, to Scriptural evidences, to meet this appeal. The light thrown back on the teaching of the New Testament by the "Fathers," confirms this evidence, but is not needed, for the reason that the Scripture, in our own tongue, is accessible to every reader.

Moreover, we insist that our inquiry is a verbal one, and that, in such a discussion, *words* are *things*. The proposition under examination is that it is evident to all diligent readers of Holy Scripture that, in apostolic times, there were three orders of ministers in the Church in a certain succession. It could only be evident from careful inspection of the language employed. It will not do to say, that bishops were, in that day, *called* apostles, and priests were called presbyters. This is a manifest begging of the question. It is the very thing which high-churchmen affirm, and Presbyterians deny. How is it possible to prove, *from Scripture*, that it describes the same object in different language from our own? How do we learn that the object denominated a *ship* in the New Testament was often what we call a *boat*? How do we discover that "*carriages*" signify *luggage*? Simply by comparison of old and modern usage. Surely then, if it is affirmed that the word *bishop*, as now used in the Church, is represented in the English Bible by the word *apostle*, it ought to be shown by a similar comparison. If the translation is defective, let it be proved. By this rule the new version ought to subject the word *apostle*, and its Greek original *ἀπόστολος*, to thorough examination, and if it is found necessary to change the translation to *bishop*, well and good. In like manner, if the Church is right, *presbyter* or *elder* should be translated *priest*. But it is manifest that a diligent reader of

King James's version could never make such discoveries. *Carriage* has changed its meaning within four centuries, but *bishop* has not. It signifies now what it did in the days of Cranmer. Neither has any change been effected in the word *apostle*. The critics do not even suggest the substitution of the one for the other *in print*, but they nevertheless require the diligent reader to make a *mental* substitution, so as to conform the reading to the theory of the Church.

No more radical revolution could be imagined than the actual adoption of these *mental* amendments. The *priest* would vanish from the Church. Every rector would become the *bishop* of the parish. There would be scores in a single city. Apostles would be as common as the Mormons have made them. The various dioceses in the United States would be administered by successors of the apostles, and a bench of apostles would have their seats in the British House of Lords.

But seriously, What is the foundation of this high-church theory? Is it scriptural? So far as it concedes the scriptural title of bishops to parish ministers, it undoubtedly is, as Presbyterians have ever maintained. But is it scriptural to assign to deacons a place in the ministry of the word? Is it scriptural to represent the apostolic office as permanent in the Church, the sole repository of the function of ordination? We shall prosecute this inquiry in the order we have adopted.

1. If anything more fanciful than the ascription of *preaching* functions to the scriptural deacon was ever advanced by intelligent writers, we are yet to find it. Stephen, it is true, argued his cause; but did he do so as a *deacon*? Philip, it is true, preached the gospel; but did he do so as a *deacon*? It is *assumed*, in both cases, on purely imaginary grounds. Not only proof, but probability, is absolutely wanting. Both of them were ordained *as deacons*, for a specific function, particularly defined and detailed by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles. That function was to "serve tables," that the apostles themselves might have more time for prayer and preaching. This preaching of the apostles is called by Luke "the ministry of the word," and in the original is represented by "διακονία τοῦ λόγου"—deaconship of the word.

Here, then, in the very act of ordination, the deaconship of *tables* is contrasted with the deaconship of the *word*, and yet the churchman contends that the deacon was ordained to the ministry of the word, and practically exonerates him from the service of tables!

Again, in the third chapter of First Timothy, we have the qualifications necessary for the bishops and deacons laid down in almost identical terms, with this significant exception, that the bishop must be "apt to teach," whereas this requirement is omitted in the case of a deacon. This omission is *proof* that teaching the people was not contemplated as a function of the deacons, under the apostles, as we have proved that "serving tables" was the special function to which they were ordained. Now we ask the diligent reader, if the fact that Stephen defended himself in a *speech* before the Council, and the fact that Philip afterwards preached the gospel, are sufficient to upset this proof! The high-churchman of our day appeals from *words* to *facts*, but it is important that the facts be *pertinent*, and the words *equivocal*. But the words we have produced are *not* equivocal, and the facts are far from pertinent. As well might one contend that, because Paul was set apart as an apostle to the Gentiles, and was afterwards found making tents, therefore tent-making was a leading function of his apostleship!

Surely it will not be affirmed, that whatever an individual consistently did *after* ordination was *included* in his ordination. The proposition is too absurd to be stated. But this proposition is the logical basis of the claim of deacons to a place in the ministry of the word. If this is its only foundation, it is a bare assumption, and cannot be evident to any diligent reader. Thus, summarily, the third and lowest order of the ministry of the Church vanishes at a single touch; and without further sacrifice of time and space, we proceed to ascertain the grounds on which an order *superior* to scriptural bishops or elders, can be more consistently claimed as the evident teaching of Holy Scripture.

2. Here, in the outset, the claim in question encounters a difficulty that does not exist in the case of the deacon. In reference to the latter, the Church and her learned interpreters are at one. But in reference to the first order, the discrepancy is re-

markable. The Church calls them bishops, the doctors call them apostles. That is, the Church holds that, in apostolic times, the highest order of ministers was composed of bishops, and that this is evident to every diligent reader; but the learned men of the Church hold that bishops were then *inferior* to apostles, and the first order was the apostles themselves. We offer our friendly mediation between the Church and her interpreters, and might propose a method by which they may be promptly reconciled.

It is a great objection to the present theory, that the *title* of the office has disappeared. In fact, it disappeared with the very men who held it; and further, it is an equally grave objection that the successors of the apostles have ever since been called, as is alleged, by the title of an inferior order. But of these facts of ecclesiastical history, occurring after the Canon of Scripture was closed, we will say nothing. The question for us is, whether, before that time, the apostles were the diocesans of the Church, alone authorised to ordain and to confirm. Such a fact ought to be easily settled by a diligent reader of the New Testament.

It ought to be determined, in the first place, in what sense the word apostle is to be taken; for everybody knows it is used in more senses than one. The twelve apostles of our Lord cannot be meant, for that number was fixed and limited to those who had been familiar with his life and witnesses of his resurrection. It is absolutely certain that the twelve had no successors *as a fixed, unchangeable college of witnesses*. But it is contended that they and certain others constituted an *order* in the Church, invested with exclusive duties and dignity, and, in this sense, *had* successors. This is the thing to be proved from Scripture. Can it be done? Can the diligent reader or the most erudite critic, demonstrate that Peter administered a diocese and performed all the ordinations and confirmations therein? Can it be shown from the Scriptures that James occupied a diocese in or around Jerusalem and governed a body of clergy within certain geographical bounds? Is it possible to point out the limits of Paul's jurisdiction, or to ascertain how he would discharge such episcopal duties consistently with his commission "not to baptize, but to preach the gospel"? Can any information from the Bible be given con-

cerning the dioceses of John, Thomas, Matthew, and the other apostles? or, if Timothy and Titus held such a rank, concerning the extent, revenues, and administration of their several provinces?

So far as our knowledge goes, no serious effort has ever been made by the most arrogant Prelatist to establish any of these points by Scriptural authority. Attempts of a desperate character have been made to give a plausible color to certain *suggestions* in their favor, but of convincing proof not a syllable has ever been written. Of these attempts the most determined have been directed to the presumed prelacy of James at Jerusalem, Timothy at Ephesus, and Titus in Crete. But the whole amount of the alleged evidence is precisely as much as and no more than the records of the Presbyterian Church contain in reference to the home and foreign fields of missions. James, Peter, and John are spoken of as "seeming to be pillars" in the Church. The same has frequently been said of eminent ministers in this Church. James said in the Council, "my sentence" or opinion is thus. Any member of a Synod or Assembly can say the same. Paul went to the residence of James where the elders were assembled, and his party were gladly received. Any returning missionary can in like manner pay his respects to a pastor and the assembled ministers and elders without implying prelacy. Peter requested that his escape from prison should be communicated to James and the brethren. But this news could have been sent equally well to a Presbyterian minister and his brethren. Is this all? Yes, this is all that can be gathered from the New Testament to show that James, the Lord's brother, exercised diocesan jurisdiction in the city of Jerusalem! To call it proof would be too insulting to its authors. It is simply a feeble effort to reconcile the facts of Scripture with a theory already adopted *on other grounds*. How easy it would be to reconcile the same facts with the opposite theory of ministerial parity, will appear at once on trial. *Assuming* that James was a very influential pastor in the city, and a prominent member of the resident college of apostles, what could be more natural than the respect and deference

accorded to him? All the incidents referred to harmonise as completely with the one assumption as with the other.

Such would be the result, even if we had nothing to *rebut* the prelatie theory in other parts of the history. But to a diligent reader, free from prejudice and prepossessions, there *is* powerful evidence in the same book of Acts that the Apostle James was *not* a prelate. When the question of imposing circumcision upon Gentile converts was considered in a full council at Jerusalem, consisting of the apostles, elders, and brethren, and James is introduced merely as a *speaker*, and his opinion, being submitted to the convention, all sitting in a body and voting together, was adopted by them, the decree was issued, not in the name of a diocesan, nor in the name of the college of apostles, but in the name of the *apostles, elders, and brethren*. See Acts xv. 23-29. Whatever Church government this fact indicates, it certainly does not indicate prelaty. The House of Bishops and the clerical and lay deputies are all together on one level, and there is not a breath of distinction among them in respect to authority and jurisdiction. The apostles were not prelates, and of course James was not one. If he had been one in any modern sense, it would surely have leaked out in these narratives. The *silences* of Scripture are full of instruction. They are entitled to their due weight, and ought to influence the judgment of the diligent reader. To such it can never be evident that there were three orders of clergy in Jerusalem, of different rank and power, when we find this council thus composed of apostles, elders, and brethren, all voting together, on terms of absolute equality.

We say nothing of the status of these elders and brethren. We say nothing of the question concerning this decree, whether authoritative or advisory. But we say this, and press the point even to the quick, that, in the council, the presumed members of the prelatie order sat as a *minority*, and might have been outvoted on a division by the other orders present. It is not often that this order has placed itself in such a position in the modern Church.

Again, we argue that James could not have been a prelate if Peter was not. But the latter apostle affirms that he was an *elder*, like those whom he addressed, and exhorts them to discharge

their *episcopal* duties to the flock in a proper spirit. If the elders thus taking the oversight of the saints (ἐπισκοποῦντες), were *inferior* to the prelatie order, Peter was the same, and we are forced to the conclusion that no such order existed. For no one will be so bold as to affirm that this leading apostle was of *inferior* rank. There is no escape, unless we resort to the subterfuge that the apostle calls himself an elder in an *unofficial* sense, in allusion to his age. This cannot be conceded without implying that the elders addressed were merely men of advanced years, which would involve the absurdity of supposing that the elders acquired their official position by virtue of their seniority alone. For obviously these elderly men are addressed as *bishops*, an official title, and *all* the old men could not be supposed to hold that position.

But the principal force of the high-church party is expended upon Timothy and Titus, whom they claim as apostolic prelates in Ephesus and Crete. Strange, indeed, is the fact, if it be a fact, that of all the dioceses in the apostolic Church there are but three, all told, whose chief pastors can even be conjectured. No mention is made of any such officer at Philippi, Thessalonica, Athens, or Corinth, or any other prominent city of the Roman empire. Epistles were addressed to Corinth, Philippi, and Thessalonica, as well as Ephesus, and yet no allusion is made in any of them to the *diocesans* supposed to preside over them. The discourtesy is unaccountable. These sees must all have been vacant, and what the people did for lack of ordinations and confirmations, can never be known. Apostolic epistles, at the present day, to the Virginians or Georgians, without reference to their chief pastors, would certainly imply *vacancy*, and import the necessity of a prompt provision for their benefit. We are utterly at a loss to explain St. Paul's failure to express his concern in the premises. Did he forget that those important dioceses were each *without a head*? or did he *underrate* the necessity of providing for confirmations in them?

It may be suggested that he himself discharged these prelatie functions. But there is a difficulty in the way. As a *witness*, he declares that his apostleship was not derived from man. His commission and ordination as a *missionary* were received at An-

tiach, without the imposition of prelatie hands. Whence, then, did he derive his authority to ordain or confirm? No apostolic bishop had ever consecrated him. The Lord himself had not commissioned him as he did the twelve. The "prophets and teachers" at Antioch could not confer prelatie rank.

But supposing him invested with this authority in some unknown way, he certainly exercised it *sparingly*. Timothy and Titus seem to have been his only appointees, and he seems to have reserved to himself the care of all the other churches in the Gentile world. The visitation of this immense province was, we know, faithfully discharged, as far as in him lay. But instead of frequent references to the difficulty of administering so vast a diocese, we hear nothing on the subject. On the other hand, he appears to feel especial anxiety that the apostles Timothy and Titus shall be faithful to *their* charges which he has intrusted to them. The whole statement, from beginning to end, must seem to a diligent reader altogether unlike the transactions of the modern Church, and irreconcilable with its regular threefold distribution.

These observations have been made preliminary to the examination of the prelatie records of Timothy and Titus. That whole order is reduced to these two questionable cases. But, in regard to them, it must be acknowledged that, according to the prelatie logic, nothing is easier than the proof of their prelatie rank. *Assuming* that ordination was a prerogative of apostles alone, it can readily be shown that those two ministers were clothed with such power; and thus we have it proved directly from the Scriptures, that there was such an order consisting of two persons at least. The demonstration would be triumphant, but for that precarious *assumption* made at the outset. This a clear illustration of what we asserted at the beginning of this paper, that *opinion* is more powerful than argument. We find certain excellent and able writers coming to the Scriptures, with minds fully made up in favor of an order of ministers superior to bishops, and endeavoring, with all their ingenuity, to conform the record to their system. In this case, they find the New Testament a prompt witness. Timothy and Titus *did* ordain bishops. *Therefore* they both belonged to the highest of our three orders of ministers!

But, one moment, gentlemen. Is it proved already that ordination and confirmation belonged exclusively to a superior class of ministers? When and where was the demonstration made? Is it possible that you have *imagined* this point settled and proceeded to build your argument upon it, when, in fact, this was the very matter at issue? No, no, it is replied, the argument is the other way. We *assume* that Timothy and Titus were superior to bishops, and finding that they alone ordained and confirmed in the churches to which they were sent, we reason *infallibly* that these were the exclusive prerogatives of that superior class. Again we must call a halt, and ask for the *proof* that Timothy and Titus were superior to bishops. And this we find to be a *naked presumption* as gratuitous as the other, and the ingenious authors stand convicted of reasoning alternately *in concentric circles*, happy in the contemplation of their eminent success.

What are the facts, without respect to theory? And first, who ordained Timothy? By some it is understood that he was ordained by Paul alone, (II. Tim. i. 6,) "by the putting on of my hands." By others it is contended that "he was ordained with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," including Paul as a member of the body (I. Tim. iv. 14). If the former supposition be admitted, it amounts to this, that Paul, who was ordained by "prophets and teachers" at Antioch, conferred upon Timothy orders no higher than their source. But, even supposing the apostle conferred upon him a rank equal to his own as it was bestowed from heaven, the highest function of that rank was, according to Paul himself, the *preaching* of the gospel: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." (I. Cor. i. 17.) The inference is unavoidable, that preaching the same gospel was the most important duty with which he clothed Timothy in his ordination to the work of an evangelist. But it cannot be admitted that Paul alone ordained him, when we are expressly taught by the apostle that he was ordained by the *presbytery*. Even supposing the presbyters to have been assistants or coöperators, they could have only coöperated in ordaining him as a *presbyter*. Such then was the rank he held when he was sent to Ephesus. And if the apostolic prelate was a presbyter, what becomes of the order superior to presbyters? Titus alone remains.

But if Timothy was ordained a presbyter, no one will pretend that Titus was anything more. At this point the grand fabric of a superior order tumbles from its corner stone.

But great stress is laid upon the *assumed* fact that Timothy and Titus performed all the ordinations in their dioceses, and therefore were superior to bishops or presbyters. But where is the proof? Does the diligent reader discover any evidence that, in localities where bishops or presbyters already existed, the two evangelists ordained others, unassisted by such presbyters? If Paul had the coöperation of a presbytery in the ordination of Timothy, is it reasonable to suppose that the latter would dispense with it? When the apostle exhorts Timothy in the words, "Lay hands suddenly on no man," is it necessarily implied that *his* hands alone were to be employed? Then any exhortation to an individual must be so understood as to exclude all participants, and the Saviour's words to Peter, "Feed my sheep," implied that he was to be the primate of the whole Church! Such reasoning is puerile.

But what necessity is there to imagine that these changes concerning ordination had reference to localities in which ordained ministers existed? There is not a syllable to render it even probable. If not, it follows that these evangelists were simply charged with the duty of ordaining officers over churches newly organised by them, and thus the other assumption perishes like the first.

Let it be borne in mind that this effort of the high-church party is to show that Timothy and Titus belonged to an order above bishops, and then known as *apostles*. And yet there is no confident assertion urged by them that this order embraced any one but these two evangelists. At least it may be said that no argumentative proof of any apparent force is employed for any other. According to the Scriptures, Paul had no successor. The twelve, as such, could not have any. None is assigned to Barnabas. And now we ask for the proof that Timothy and Titus were apostles at all. If they were not, they could not have apostolic successors.

The effort to attach an apostolic character to the official position

of these two ministers is one of the most signal failures ever incurred by human ingenuity. The "signs of apostleship" are all wanting. They were not commissioned by the Lord, they were not witnesses of his resurrection, they were not addressed under such a title. And here is the strange feature of the whole scheme, that the modern diocesan bishop claims to be a lineal successor of them, not as bishops, but as *apostles*, when, in point of fact, they themselves had no claim to such an official designation. It seems to a reasonable mind that if there had been at that period an order of ministers superior to bishops in jurisdiction and destined to have successors, there would have been found some fixed appellation to distinguish them. As it is now so generally assumed that the word *apostle* was the title of the office, the diligent reader is sorely disappointed to find no such application of the term. We hear nothing of the Apostle of Jerusalem, the Apostle of Antioch, or of Athens, Corinth, or Rome. And when we come to the cases of Ephesus and Crete, and the very men are pointed out who occupied the sees, we see no recognition whatever of their official titles. On the contrary, in the uninspired foot-notes to the Epistles addressed to them, they are styled respectively *bishops*, not *apostles*, of Ephesus and Crete.

Names are things. There is always a reason for the titles applied to office, and *changes* of the style of designation have a deep significance. The firm adherence of the New Testament writers to the rule, never to apply the title of *priest* to the ministers of the gospel, indicates concert, purpose, and principle. Now the term *apostle* is, with equal rigor, withheld from *all association of places*. The modern bishop, on the contrary, is always attached to some *locality*, at least in name; and to claim for him a lineal descent from the apostles, with such a difference staring us in the face, wears to us the appearance of a weak infatuation, not to say of unparalleled audacity.

The diligent reader, who is still in love with his three orders, will doubtless be inclined to distrust the amendment proposed to the language of the Church, and disposed to fall back to the old position of three scriptural orders—*bishops*, *priests*, and *deacons*. But with much respect for such conservatism, we cannot give him

the desired rest. Alas, for him, that system has utterly perished in the controversy between the high-church and the sects. It is no longer possible to revive the old distinction of orders between *bishop* and *presbyter*. We would like to see the attempt again made, for the edification of our conservative friend. This has often been done with mortifying results, and now, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, none but a bold and reckless controversialist will dare to maintain that the scriptural *bishop* was superior in rank to the *presbyters*. Tradition and the Fathers were formerly appealed to with confidence. Now, tradition, *so far as it elucidates Scripture*, is overwhelmingly *against* the theory; and as to the Fathers, the most trustworthy of them acknowledge that the superiority of bishops originated in *post-apostolic* times. The learned Jerome argues it elaborately, and conclusively proves it. The allusions of most of the others to scriptural usage is strongly confirmatory of his views. But it is useless to multiply words to show that *opinion*, within and without the prelatie Church, is decidedly unfavorable to the claim now under consideration. We do not appeal to opinion, but to scriptural proof, and that proof is always ready, and has never yet been invalidated.

We refer to the two familiar passages in Acts xx., and Philipians i. 1. The literal translation of the Greek in these two passages, makes, as every intelligent reader knows, bishops and presbyters of the same order. This has now received the sanction of the English Committee of Revision, by whose authority the new version of the New Testament is published. This Committee, composed so largely of the best talent and scholarship of the *Church of England*, has thus put in black and white, what was evident enough before, the fact that the *elders*, of the *one flock* at Ephesus, were the *bishops* of that flock. In the old version, they were styled *overseers*, but the Greek word in the original has been *ἐπισκόπους*, all the time. There were therefore, beyond dispute, a number of *presbyters* or *elders* in the single parish of Ephesus, and these were addressed by the apostle as the *bishops* of that parish. Here is a *fact*, independent of opinion, and one so conclusive that all the contrary opinions in the world

could not shake it. And the other passage is equally decisive. Unless the apostle can be charged with an unaccountable *oversight* in addressing the members and officers of the church at Philippi, his omission of all allusion to the *second* order, whilst particularly including the *first* and *third* orders, is a fact that speaks as loudly against the scheme as the positive one just noticed. We repeat, we insist, we challenge contradiction in interpreting these two facts, uninfluenced by theoretical prepossessions, that they not merely suggest, but demonstrate, beyond a shadow of misgiving, the *equality* of bishops and presbyters in the Apostolic Church.

Not only is this equality put entirely beyond question, but the further fact is also rendered indisputable, that these parishes or congregations contained a *plurality* of these parochial bishops. Under the influence of a theory already adopted, some partisan writers have endeavored to show that, at, or near Philippi, more than one parish *might* have existed. No evidence is adduced. It is simply urged that it *might* have been so. Supposing the suggestion were plausible, the omission of *presbyters* would be as unaccountable as ever. But it is not by any means plausible. If true, it could avail nothing for the theory of diocesan bishops, for there was a plurality of bishops at *Philippi*. But that it is not true, is manifest from the infancy of the Church, the paucity of its members, and the absurdity of locating several diocesan bishops in one insignificant see. But the gratuitous assurance of the suggestion is patent, when we collate this passage with that in Acts xx., where the flock is expressly designated as *one*. Ephesus was at least as populous a city as Philippi. Its single parish was under the episcopal supervision of a number of *presbyters*, styled *bishops*, and that man must be desperate indeed who would contend that these bishops were the administrators of so many dioceses. And if this cannot be maintained in reference to Ephesus, of what use is such a surmise with reference to Philippi? It is not worth the ink expended in stating it.

Our diligent reader must by this time be painfully compressed between the two mill-stones—the unscriptural aspect of the modern theory of the three orders, as *apostles*, *bishops*, and *deacons*, and the untenable doctrine of the Church, represented

by *bishops, priests, and deacons*. The situation is decidedly uncomfortable. We would offer relief, but it would probably be resented.

Reviewing the ground, we think it is evident that the Episcopal Church in the United States, venerable and respected as it deservedly is, occupies an indefensible position. If she would consent to abandon the assumption that *priests* were an order of the ministry in apostolic times, and to change the title of her *bishops* so as to conform their designation to their presumed apostolic dignity, the battle with the sects might be fought more consistently, if not more successfully. As the matter now stands, she claims one thing, and proposes to prove another. The two theories are mutually destructive. The Church theory that *bishop* was the title of the first order, according to the Scriptures, not only contradicts the view of most of the high-church critics, that the *Apostles* constituted that order, but is actually the only opinion left open to the diligent Episcopal reader. The term *bishop*, now used in that Church, has precisely the same meaning which it had in the reign of King James. The Church, at that day, as well as now, adopted it to express the highest order. As such, the translators employed it in their version, and there it stands unaltered in the new version, signifying throughout, as the Church maintains, the *highest order* in her ministry. On the other hand, the authority of her highest and most competent teachers is now, more than ever, insisting that the scriptural *bishop* was a presbyter or elder, of the rank assigned by the Church to the *second* place.

The Church will not receive suggestions from any dissenting source. It would be too derogatory for her dignity and *prestige*. But looking up to her vast elevation from the low level of our origin, we are at least at liberty to whisper to our equals that this apparently irreconcilable difference in the Church might be adjusted. Once admit that both parties are *partially right*, and the chief difficulty is easily overcome. It would be too severe, and inconsistent with our charitable sentiments, to contend that there is no truth on either side. They are, in fact, both right in one essential point. The *bishop* was the highest order, and the presbyter

was his equal. The Church is right in regard to the first proposition, and her most distinguished authors and teachers are right as to the second. They may be reconciled, and the parties brought into sweet accord, *by one concession*, which may be humiliating, but not necessarily fatal or degrading. Let them, therefore, without the least suggestion of Presbyterian influence, but prompted solely by the love of truth, each entertain for a moment the possibility, *that, in apostolic times, there may have been but one order in the ministry of the word.* We know well that such a suggestion, should it ever reach apostolic ears, would be simply shocking. We are guilty of temerity in writing it down. Our insignificance is the only shield of our presumption.

But perhaps we may venture so far as to suggest that it is time for some abatement of that superciliousness which is sometimes exhibited in prelatic circles. A moderation of *tone* would well become the entire Church, in its present condition. If there could be found a single sentence in the New Testament warranting its position, there might be some excuse, although hardly a justification, for its attitude towards the rest of the Christian world. Even then, the spirit and example of the Master would inculcate meekness and humility. But when such a sentence *cannot* be discovered, and the grounds of prelatic assumption, as held by different parties in the Church, are found to be *mutually contradictory*, an attitude of exclusiveness appears to outsiders altogether inexcusable. It is in reality a mark of weakness. It is a virtual confession of a want of clearness in the evidence of its claims. But the spirit of such a policy is unchristian. How can it be reconciled with the principles of the gospel? Would Christ himself virtually close the doors of his Church against any who embrace his faith, bear his image, and love his person, simply because they ignorantly omit an *uncommanded rule of order*? But prelatic ordination and confirmation are *not* commanded, and yet Christian societies, in which, on conscientious grounds, they are not submitted to, are *virtually* excluded from the Church. The communion of saints, which implies equality, is not allowed them. No official recognition of them is permitted. The validity of their ordinations and ordinances is denied, and their bishops are refused

the privilege of ministering to Episcopal congregations. Exceptions in practice occur among the liberal, on personal responsibility; but this policy of exclusion is the policy of the denomination, and, as such, we arraign that policy as unchristian in the sight of the Lord.

It is unchristian, in the first place, because it is unauthorised. The "thus saith the Lord" is altogether wanting. But it is further unchristian, because it sanctions a *principle* which the gospel condemns. It recognises *order* as more sacred than spiritual *truth*. It pointedly declares that the *source* of a minister's authority is more important than the *truth* which he proclaims. The *means* is exalted above the *end*, and the channel through which the faith is communicated is held to be more precious than the faith itself.

That this is true of the high-church party will be seen at once by observing the operation of the system. A considerable number of the ministers of that Church, especially in certain parts of the country, notoriously preach heresy. But even in the absence of any such charge, the opportunity of doing so is rarely denied to one canonically ordained. The question of *orthodoxy* is seldom raised in that Church. But no minister of another denomination would be admitted to preach the *pure gospel* in the same pulpits, or to dispense the sacraments at the same altars. This is what we mean by placing *order* above *truth*. Prayer is offered in the liturgy against "false doctrine, heresy, and schism" with equal fervor; but, in its practice, the Church makes *schism* a far graver error than either of the others. The Church is fortified with the most formidable ramparts against *schism*, as the most deadly enemy to which she can be exposed. And *schism* is, in her view, the great crime of rejecting the supremacy of prelatiic orders.

This principle, we say, is unchristian. The Lord himself declared before Pilate, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the *truth*." The same end must therefore be the mission of his Church; and she is unfaithful to that mission, whenever she puts the truth in the background, and makes "the laying on of hands" the chief object of her jealousy and care.

The attitude of the Church towards other Protestant denominations in the present day, may be fairly represented by a military array—an army of professed patriots in full view of a formidable host of enemies. Unity and coöperation are essential to success. But one of the numerous divisions in the Church militant stands aloof from the rest, and over its encampment flies a banner, inscribed with such legends as these: “This is the true patriotic army;” “The officers in this division are the only ones regularly commissioned;” “The commander in chief has his headquarters in this division;” “The officers and soldiers of other divisions are warned that they cannot be recognised at headquarters as a lawful part of the army, but as irregular and unauthorised associations, chargeable with insubordination, and hereby required to disperse, and enter the service in the ranks of this division.” What would be the effect of such a scene in the very face of an overwhelming host of invaders? Would not such insolence, on the part of a small fraction of an army, be supremely absurd and ridiculous, were it not for the peril attending it, and the treachery it implied? Would not the enemy rejoice to discover such weakness and dissension in the army arrayed against him, and be amazed that a competent commander would tolerate the proceeding? And above all, would not the accusation of insubordination (or *schism*) brought against the bulk of the army, recoil with terrific force against the single division that proclaimed it?

Such is the actual attitude of the Episcopal Church towards other denominations of Christians. Such is the spirit of her arrogant pretensions and boastful isolation. Such is the inconsistency of her exclusive claims with her clear title, on higher grounds, to the respect and love of the Christian world. She owes it to herself and to her Lord to abandon the odious posture, the only tendency of which is to involve her in that very *schism* which she so unwarrantably charges against others.

JAMES A. WADDELL.

ARTICLE VII.

THE LAW-GIVING AT JERUSALEM.

To those even slightly acquainted with the history of human thought it will seem trite to remark, that often a mere assumption gains the place of an accepted theory, and long holds sway as unquestioned, if not unquestionable truth, when a little inquiry shows it either baseless, or open to very grave doubt. We note a fact so obvious, only because this paper is intended to suggest doubt relative to a theory long current in the Church, to wit, that the assembly at Jerusalem, of which we have the record in the fifteenth chapter of Acts, was a Church Council; the greatest, indeed, as well as the first, but the warrant and model for all the rest, and for all ordinary church courts.

Though not unchallenged, this theory has long held controlling place, not only in the Prelatic heresy and the Popish apostasy, but also in Evangelical Churches. In the Presbyterian Church some go so far as to assert, that this record, viewed as that of a council, "affords the main scriptural support of the Presbyterian system;" and our published standards strengthen this assumption by selecting proof texts for the assertion of our polity chiefly, if not solely, from this one chapter of the word of God. Moreover, in our Presbyteries (embracing all our church courts under this title) whenever any question of the nature and limits of their authority arises, appeal is at once taken to this so-called "Council at Jerusalem," and argument attempted from its constitution and proceedings to theirs.

Thus, if wide-spread and long-continued assent among men were proof conclusive of the truth of anything, this theory is largely justified in asserting its own truth on this ground, as, indeed, it is not diffident in doing. But notwithstanding all this, to such of its advocates as have the fear of God before their eyes, there are some things in the record sorely perplexing, as they attempt to apply the theory either to subsequent councils or the ordinary governing bodies of the Church. For example, there is the composition of this Assembly. In it were not only the or-

dinary presbyters or elders, but inspired apostles, the medium of divine revelation, empowered to attest it "through mighty signs and wonders by the power of the Spirit of God,"—men who in matters of doctrine "conferred not with flesh and blood," nor were limited to truth already revealed and recorded, but were themselves the Lord's instruments for completing the volume of his word. Heresies and apostasies may claim to have apostles in their assemblies; the Church, never, since "the Twelve" were called from grace to glory.

Then, again, there is the fact that this assembly sent forth its decree in the name of the Holy Ghost, and bearing this signature, rather than its own. Heresies and apostasies may do this; the Church, never, since the Spirit ceased to attest his presence by outward and visible proofs. It prays for his presence and guidance, and expects this in its ordinary administration of his word; but while it knows that the word is infallible, it knows also that itself may err in interpreting and applying the word, and that the test of its own fidelity lies, not only in praying for the Spirit, but in waiting for and watching the event, to assure itself that it has found both the truth and the true application of it.

Once more, there is the fact that this assembly committed its decree, thus signed by the Holy Ghost, to writing, with the express purpose that it might take its place as part of divine Scripture, and, by being read as such in the churches, prevent any undue influence of another part given through Moses. Heresies and apostasies may "think to change times and laws" by the decrees of their councils; the Church, never, since the Canon of Scripture was closed, and the terrible curse denounced against any who add to or take away from it.

Difficulties like these stand in the way of this theory, by whomsoever held; but they peculiarly oppress Presbyterians, and help, doubtless, to account for the fact, that, however these may agree in holding it, no two of them agree in applying it, and no one of them long agrees with himself, if often called to practical dealing with it as it comes up in our presbyterial debates. In fact, the field occupied by this assembly is so wide that a Presbyterian may walk in it all his life and never turn in the same path; its

temple so spacious that he may pitch the little tabernacle of the ordinary Presbytery daily within it, and never twice in the same place; always within, indeed, and amply covered and protected, but occupying a scarcely appreciable portion of the temple's area. He feels, thus, an embarrassment under the council theory, of which the Prelatist experiences little, and the Papist nothing; for the former of these insinuates, and the latter boldly asserts, that the miserable little cabin which his system patches together of the mud and straw of human tradition is none other than the temple of God, the "ivory palace" of the great King; and that its puerile convocations of fallible and often foolish and wicked men are assemblies of plenipotentiaries of the Lord, guided and controlled by the Holy Ghost through living "apostle-bishops."

But, beside such things, there are others which greatly perplex the Presbyterian in connexion with this council theory; as, for example, such as follow: First, that it is not of Presbyterian origin, but came down to us from the Prelatic heresy through the Popish apostasy. It sprang into existence after the days of the apostles when "grievous wolves" had already "entered among the flock," and from among the elders had arisen "men speaking perverse things," men, like Diotrophes, "loving to have the preëminence," and "saying that they were apostles, when they were not," but only "liars;" and it grew into shape, consistency, and strength in ratio as that heresy felt the need of its aid in enabling a usurping hierarchy to enslave the Lord's freedmen, the Church of God. As this hierarchy developed into the harlot apostasy, and formed its adulterous union with the State, during and after the reign of Constantine, so called "the Great," this theory was urged with increasing vehemence, to justify the demand for civil and military power to enforce the decrees of councils as the very word of God; and it reached its culmination in the tyrannies and atrocities of the Papacy in alliance with the resuscitated western and so called "Holy Roman Empire." Thus, to the Presbyterian, it has a suspicious origin, and a career of which suspicion is not at all predicable, for it is too abominable to admit of hesitation in pronouncing upon it the sentence of utter condemnation.

But, again, it gained admission among us through a very questionable channel, that of Churches united with the State. We greatly and justly honor the Reformers, those "mighty men of valor" raised up by God to restore his word to the people, and his visible Church to the light of day, after ages of burial under the corrupt mass of "tradition of men," and we rejoice in all the good it pleased him to work through them; but no one can suppose that it was given them to apprehend all the truth, and rightly apply it in its multifarious bearings; and every one knows that, to a man, they held to the union of Church and State, and the necessity of employing the power of the State to enforce the authority of the Church. True, they modified the Popish theory, and put the Church in measurable subjection to the State, but the union they insisted on. But, as above intimated, this error strongly inclines its adherents to this council theory, because the latter insinuates something of divine infallibility and authority for the ordinary government of the Church, and tends to justify its enforcement by the civil power. If the deliverances of ordinary church courts are only the judgment of men in interpreting and administering the word of God, the question lies, whether this judgment is so certainly correct as to bind the conscience; but if, like this decree at Jerusalem, they are the very word of God applied by himself, the only question is, whether physical force ought to be used to compel submission. Now, while the Reformers all affirmed that "synods and councils may err," they also affirmed with perhaps equal unanimity that the decrees of the Church should be enforced by the State, and thus practically went far to affirm the very thing they theoretically denied, the assumption that synods and councils do not err, but are infallibly guided by God; and this, as we think, largely owing to the influence on their minds of this very council theory of the assembly at Jerusalem. In our view, the history of Presbyterian, as well as other state Churches, shows this; and even to this day the more zealous advocates of this theory manifest a decided leaning to "strong measures" to enforce their views of Church discipline. But in view of such an origin, introduction, and tendency of the theory, the Presbyterian may well hesitate about

accepting it, and question whether, had the matter come up *de novo* in Presbyterian Churches not allied with the State, such a theory would ever have been adopted, or even broached.

As to the plea that this record in Acts fifteenth is "the main scriptural support of the Presbyterian system," this seems tantamount to the assertion that the Presbyterian system is not scriptural at all, and makes one feel that the sooner it is given up the better. Any system resting only on one chapter of the Bible has but a very narrow basis, and the Presbyterian is constrained by the standards of his Church to demand, not only "the Bible and nothing but the Bible," but also "the whole Bible," and when pointed only to one chapter he feels as though he were put out of court. Besides, this chapter can be read through Prelatic and Popish, and Congregational, as well as Presbyterian spectacles, and is as confidently alleged against us as we can allege it in our favor. Moreover, this plea bases on the very grave error that the doctrine of Christ and his Church is chiefly, if not exclusively, of the New Testament, while the Presbyterian knows, that this is the one great central doctrine of the whole word of God. He knows that as the Christ was proclaimed in Eden immediately after the fall, so his visible Church was founded then and there, and that in all dispensations and under all forms, whether in the family, the nation, or as now under the gospel, among all nations, "it is one and the same." He knows that as by divine appointment it was governed in the family through the family elder or "old man," the natural head, so in the nation and among all nations, by like divine appointment, it is governed through elders chosen by the people, rationally and morally, the no less natural head; and that, since its extension beyond the family limits, when we describe it as a people in covenant with God to accept and obey his revealed will as administered through elders chosen by themselves, we define the perpetual constitution and the very essence of the Church visible. In short, the Presbyterian knows that the Bible reveals but one religion and but one Church—the Christian religion and the Christian Church; and that the one main article which the New Testament adds to the confession of faith which has come down to us from Adam and Abel is that these are the

Jesus Christian religion and the Jesus Christian Church. Knowing all this, he believes in his soul that his own is that very Church in its most purely scriptural form which was founded in Eden, and he has no idea of allowing himself to be shut up to one chapter, or one book, or one moiety of the word of God, but ranges through the whole with ever new confirmation of his faith, both as a Christian and a Presbyterian.

On the other hand, the error he thus rejects is dear to the heart of all dissidents from the Presbyterian polity; for, in the comparative silence of the New Testament relative to the constitution of the Church, such find that dim obscurity under which they may bring in their own devices and shape the temple of God to their own notions rather than according to that "pattern" which, as with David, "the Lord has made us to understand in writing." Their constantly reiterated phrase, "the apostolic and primitive Church," reveals their erroneous theory, that the apostles founded or constituted the Christian Church *de novo*, while the fact is that all they did, or were authorised to do, was to extend to all nations the Church founded from the beginning of the gospel in Eden on the Rock Christ, now known to be the Rock Jesus the Christ. This Church is indeed stripped of all those typical institutions which, by the advent of the Christ, became "decayed, waxed old, and ready to vanish away," but it is the same Church, left with its Presbyterian government, its weekly Sabbath and Sabbath assemblies for the worship of God and instruction in his word, and furnished with commemorative symbolic and sealing ordinances, which are to endure until the Christ "shall appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation."

Taking this scriptural view of the Church visible, the Presbyterian feels free to set small store by the fifteenth chapter of Acts as the basis or even exponent of his Church polity, and at liberty to scrutinise the council theory of the assembly whose record is there given without fear, ready to accept and hold it if true, or to dismiss it without ceremony as the spawn of heresy, if false, and in neither case to suppose that his system has gained or lost much.

Perhaps much of this is rather our own course of thought than

that of Presbyterians at large; but of this, at least, we are well persuaded, that there is among them a growing dissatisfaction with the Council theory, and a deepening conviction of its utter futility for all practical purposes as affording a standard of appeal for the nature and powers of the ordinary church court. Such dissatisfaction first moved us to that study of the word of God upon the subject, some of the results of which we herein set forth, although still holding the whole matter *sub judice*, and ourselves ready to modify or renounce, as truth may require. The essence of our view is expressed in our heading, "The Law-giving at Jerusalem," in which we seek to embody the thought, that the transaction under discussion is the New Testament counterpart of the law-giving at Sinai, the formal assumption by the Lord Jesus as the true Lawgiver and King of that throne which, as Christ the Son, he occupied on "the flaming mount," when he spoke through Moses the servant, and the solemn announcement to the Church and the world that he alone is, and ever has been, King in Zion. This view we develop in the way of reply to certain questions.

I. What gave rise to this assembly? To this, we think, any fair interpretation of the record answers, the need of a divine law-giving, of adding a chapter to the written word of God. But if this be so, the council theory is at an end; for this is a question, not of interpreting or applying Scripture, nor even of determining whether an alleged revelation was a real one,—that is, a question not of the sort which might be referred to a council, but one both of determining the reality of an alleged revelation, and then of incorporating it as an additional section in the statute book of God; a question of making Scripture of that which before, whether revealed or not, was certainly not Scripture. To appreciate this point, one needs only to recall the fact testified by Scripture itself, that much of what God spoke he did not see fit to incorporate in his written word; so that, beside the revelation, the command to write was necessary before it could become a part of the "volume of the book." To such work, obviously, no council could be competent. For illustration, suppose it should now become necessary to settle authoritatively the contro-

versy between the Calvinistic and Arminian schemes of doctrine, to write out the decree of settlement and send it the Churches with the design and effect that its public reading should end the dispute among the faithful forever,—that is, with the design and effect that such epistle “should be received with the same reverence and obedience as the other Scriptures,”—could a council do this? Yes, it may be said, provided that in that council were inspired apostles. But what means this, except, provided that in that council God himself should speak? And what this, again, except, provided it were no council at all, but only an assembly to hear God speak, and, by his command, to put his words on record for the use of the Church? that is, provided it be an assembly like that at Sinai. But, in effect, this is precisely what this assembly at Jerusalem was and did. It was an assembly in which were inspired apostles; it heard God speak through them, wrote out the things declared, signed the writing with the name of the Holy Ghost, the author of all God-given Scripture, and sent it out to be received and obeyed by the Church as the word of God. And, mark the fact, however assailed by this council theory, the Church has been receiving and obeying the decree as the direct word of God ever since. True, the question before the assembly had been settled by revelation long before. Years had elapsed since the Lord had both proposed and answered it through the apostle Peter in the matter of receiving the Gentile Cornelius, with his household, into the Church, without requiring observance of the ceremonial law given through Moses. (Acts x. and xi.) But not only had a large part of the Jewish believers in the Lord Jesus as the Christ failed to perceive and accept his solution of the problem, but even Peter himself seems not to have discerned its full significance and bearing, and, as an apostle to the circumcision, he seems to have had no further practical concern with the subject until the present emergency forced it upon him. Very probably his tergiversation at Antioch, for which Paul reprovved him “before them all” (Gal. ii. 11–14), was one immediate occasion of this assembly. He would hardly have been guilty of such conduct after its decree had been sent forth; and the “certain who came from James,” as they

are described in Galatians, or "who came down from Jerusalem," as here in Acts, would have found in this error of Peter, by which "even Barnabas also was carried away," just that confirmation and encouragement needed to make them uncontrollable, and lead them to force an issue. In this, or some like way, the question had come up anew, in connection with the important church of Antioch and those other churches formed by Paul and Barnabas in their first mission from that church at the call of the Holy Ghost. (Acts xiii. and xiv.) All these were largely, if not chiefly, composed of Gentiles; and these had been received as on the same level with those Jews who accepted the Lord Jesus as the Christ, and in entire disregard of the Mosaic ritual law. Paul claimed that he did this by revelation from the Lord Jesus Christ, and under guidance and control of the Spirit of God, who sealed his work by "mighty signs and wonders." But now, as against him, many Jewish believers, zealous for the law, asserted that all this was in open violation of the Scriptures; that Paul's course proved him to be no apostle, but a wicked pretender and a betrayer of the faith, and they proclaimed to the Gentile converts at Antioch and every church, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." In all this they had the advantage of appeal to the Scripture, the written and acknowledged word of God, "Thus it is *written*," and to Paul's assertion of revelation made to and through himself, they could reply, as Isaiah of old to the necromancers, "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." This, with the fact that all the other apostles observed the law, and that Paul himself did, when among Jews only, gave them immense influence among Jewish believers, and power to shake the faith of many, even of Gentile converts, and they had kindled a flame of controversy which threatened to consume the Church.

Here, then, stood the case: Scripture must be met by Scripture, asserted revelation must prove its claims to be admitted to record, and become by divine commandment part of the written word of God. But for this appeal must be made to the Lord himself, and in the way now appointed by himself, through apos-

tles whose claim to apostleship was unquestioned. Under former dispensations the way for such appeal was through accredited judges, prophets, or the high priest, with Urim and Thummim, but now through attested apostles. That no voice but the Lord's in response to such appeal could meet the present crisis, seems to have been the judgment of this assembly in our view of the record. True, our version says "the apostles and elders came together to consider the matter," but in the nearly seven hundred times of its occurrence in the New Testament this is the only one in which the word here translated "to consider" is so translated. In every other case it is rendered "to see" or "to know" or some equivalent word. So we think it should be here. As Moses and the elders went up into the mount, not to deliberate what they should say in God's behalf, but to see or know what he would tell them to say in his name to the people, the apostles and elders now came together to see or know what the Lord would have them say in response to this overture from the Church at Antioch, asking an indisputable written law for the whole Church, whether the reaffirmation of the old or incorporation into the law book of the alleged new one. They sat, not as the Lord's counsellors, but his instruments and messengers to the Church.

II. Who composed this Assembly? The record tells us (v. 2) "The apostles and elders at Jerusalem;" specifying thus its constituent elements and the place of its meeting. Taking up these in their order we have

(a) "The Apostles." There was no question in the Church of the apostleship of any who received their commission from the Lord, during his personal ministry on earth, but only of that of Paul, who claimed to have received it after the Lord's ascension. Thus, however any might have felt justified in rejecting anything supposed to be asserted as revelation only by him, all would receive it when coming through the others or any one of them. If we adopt the view, that Gal ii. 1-10 is Paul's account of this assembly, there were in it at least three of these other apostles, James the Less (James the brother of John having been slain by

Herod—Acts xii. 1–2—before this time), Peter, and John; all of them “apostles to the circumcision,” and eminent above the rest. This number would meet the general law for “two or three witnesses,” and their agreement in regard to any asserted revelation, whether for or against it, would remove all doubt as to its true character from the mind of the Church. Whether other apostles were present or not is immaterial, since these were amply sufficient as the medium of appeal to the Lord and of certifying his response to the representatives of the Church gathered with them.

(*b*) “The Elders.” In this element of the assembly we have what may seem to militate against our theory of a divine law-giving, since it may be asked, What place could ordinary uninspired elders have in such a transaction? But the answer, clear, scriptural, and decisive, is, Just that which the elders had at Sinai, and in every law-giving in former dispensations, that of judging the credentials of alleged revelation, of accepting it on behalf of the people, and undertaking to administer it among them. It is for this that their office is ordained of God, and they themselves chosen by the people in every dispensation; as a brief examination of Scripture will show. Even under Abraham, when the covenant, basing in the family, provided for a speedy extension to the nation, and, in due time, to all nations, the extensive household of many families must have been governed by him, the covenant prophet-head, through the family elders; and under Jacob, when the family was beginning to develop into the nation, the record makes it obvious that he, the prophet-head, ruled through his sons, the family elders. But when we come to Moses, sent as leader of the people already become a nation, we find him submitting his credentials as God’s legate to elders chosen by the people, and administering the divine law through them. Thus (Ex. iii. 16) he is directed to lay his commission and its divine attestation before the elders of Israel, and (iv. 28–31) he and Aaron do so, and accept their assent as that of the people. He is commanded (xii. 3) to speak to the congregation concerning the paschal lamb, and does so (v. 21) by speaking to the elders. He is directed (xix. 3–8) to propose the law-covenant to the people, and does this

to the elders, accepting their assent as that of "all the people." It is declared (Ex. xx. and Deut. v.) that Jehovah spoke only the ten commandments audibly to the people, and at their petition delivered the rest of the law to Moses, to be accepted by them; while we learn (Ex. xxiv.) the medium through which both the delivery to him and the people's assent were attested, to wit, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and the seventy elders; and accordingly it is declared (Deut. xxvii. 1) that "Moses with the elders commanded the people," etc. In these and like scriptures we perceive that it belonged to the elders to see that nothing was imposed on the people as revelation which was not really such, and that all genuine revelation should be duly carried into effect among the people by the elders. The seventy elders stood with Aaron and his sons as Moses' sureties to the people that what he asserted to be God-given law was really such. True, they were not in audience when he received it (Ex. xxiv. 1-2), but they did see the God of Israel (vs. 9-11), the same God, the Son and Christ, who was now to speak at Jerusalem, and thus had the pledge of his presence and dealing through Moses.

The same thing appears in that law (Deut. xiii. and xviii. 20-22) by which any false claimant to the prophetic office was to be stoned to death by the people. The people were to act as executioners, but who as judges? Certainly the false prophets were not to be subjected to mob law or lynch law. It is the settled principle of Scripture, that the elders are the ordinary and perpetual administrators of all law, and, therefore, of this; and we find (Deut. xvii. 8-13 and like scriptures) ample provision for such extraordinary cases as this of pretenders to prophecy. When "a matter too hard" for the elders arose, they must go to the place appointed by God, "to the priests, the Levites, and to the judge that shall be in those days," who should show "sentence of judgment." Here is provision for appeal not only to those instructed in the law, but also to God; for the judges were rulers divinely raised up and directed, and the priest was the ordinary medium for such appeal by Urim and Thummim (Num. xxvii. 21). Thus the elders were to see that, when necessary, such appeal should be made, and due response received, and then to act accordingly;

thus becoming sureties to the people, that the law administered by them was none other than the law of God, unmixed with the passions and prejudices of men. They were the jury, without whose verdict nothing could be executed as law, as well as the officers, without whose executive coöperation no sentence of law could be carried into effect.

In the setting up of the monarchy, and more especially in its doctrine, the elders disappear somewhat from view; and in the latter period they, with the priests and merely official prophets, fully shared in the general corruption; but traces of this law, nevertheless, often appear. For instance, when Pashur, the priest, smote Jeremiah and put him in the stocks (Jer. xx. 2), he was only overstraining and abusing this law, in acting without the elders and unjustly condemning a true and faithful prophet. So, when Shemaiah wrote to Zephaniah the priest (Jer. xxix. 24-29), "The Lord made thee priest, that ye should be officers in the house of the Lord, for every man that is mad, and maketh himself a prophet, that thou shouldst put him in prison and in the stocks," etc., he was only mis-stating this law; and when the elders joined the princes and people (Jer. xxvi. 17) in rescuing Jeremiah from the priests and corrupt official prophets, they were only in the course of official duty. But at the period of our Lord's personal ministry on earth, this law reappears in more correct formal execution, though most wickedly perverted in spirit; and when the priests and elders called John the Baptist, our Lord himself, and afterwards his apostles, to account for undertaking the prophetic office as public teachers, they did only what this law bound them to do, and were guilty only in the malignant and dishonest spirit in which they exercised their office, and the judicial persecutions and murders which resulted from its prostitution.

The point we seek to make in all this, is, that the elders were always coördinate judges in every case of alleged revelation and the adoption of law, and the administrators of law when adopted. They were so before and at Sinai; they were so from Moses to Christ; they are so still; for they still sit as judges in every case of trial for heresy, as in every other judicial case; and without them no Presbytery from the Session up is scripturally constituted,

nor can there be without them a lawful church court. In the absence of their consent and coöperation the whole process of declaring and administering God's law in the Church is arrested, and this by divine appointment. Even now in the ordinary government of the Church, the teaching elder stands on the Lord's part to expound his word, while the ruling elder stands on the people's part to judge of the exposition and accept it for the people, and administer it among them, if according to Scripture. In this, by the way, lies the fatal legal demurrer to the action of the so-called councils of the Prelatic and Popish heresies, claiming to be "decrees of the Church." Not one of these assemblies was ever a scriptural church court; for into none of them were admitted "the elders of the people," but only the preaching elders of a usurping hierarchy. Their action is, thus, illegal, judged by the word of God, however it may commend itself as scriptural in other respects. When Prelatist or Papist asserts in regard to the traditional laws and observances of his communion, "the Church has decreed them," the reply is, the Church has decreed nothing of the sort, and was never allowed a voice in what was done in its name in your communions. This disposes of the legal claim: the moral may be met in each case on its own merits.

Here, then, lay the necessity of the presence of elders in this assembly at Jerusalem, on the theory that it met to receive a divine law-giving. By the Lord's appointment no law can become law, or go into force in the Church, without their presence and concurrence. On the other hand, if their presence at Jerusalem made this assembly a council, then their presence at Sinai made that a council also, and we may argue from this latter to the powers of the ordinary Presbytery just as many argue now from the former.

In connection with this presence of the elders, let us say a word relative to the official position of that James who first gave expression in this assembly to what became the substance of its decree. Was he the apostle or an elder? We have no zeal against the commonly accepted notion that he was the apostle James the Less; only we insist that, if so, he spoke as an apostle, and not as that shammiest of all shams, an "apostle-bishop" or

diocesan prelate, as Prelatists say, nor, as Presbyterians put it, as the apostle-pastor of the church at Jerusalem, having added the pastoral to the apostolical office. We should as soon believe that Moses would become chief ruler of a synagogue, as that an apostle would become pastor of a particular church. As Moses was God's ambassador and minister plenipotentiary to set up the Church in the nation of Israel under the form it was then to wear, so the apostles were his ministers of like grade to set it up among all nations in its New Testament form; and in neither case was there commission or right to leave this high work for that of the ordinary pastor or elder. If, then, this speaker was the apostle, we insist that he spoke as the apostle James, and not as prelate James, nor pastor James.

Concerning the different men of this name the Holy Spirit has been pleased to make a record which leaves the way open for endless discussion, as to which is which, with as little hope of arriving at any decisive result, as probably there would be of good from it, if attained. Every one is at liberty to form his own views according to his light, and under this liberty we have come to several conclusions which we hold for ourselves, without desiring to impose them on others. Among these are the following:

(1.) One of these Jameses was a utérine brother of our Lord, for we take literally those Scriptures which speak of "the brother of our Lord." We have no sympathy with any sentimentality about "Mary ever Virgin," nor with that which shrinks from the thought of her having had other children in ordinary wedlock, after she had become "the mother of Jesus" by divine generation. On the contrary, we view such sentimentalism as a snare used by Satan to prepare the way for idolatrous worship of Mary, and hold that these are sound reasons why God should so order it, that she should bear other children after the birth of our Lord; such for example, as these: (*a*) to give demonstration that she was an ordinary mortal, like the rest of us, and no more to be worshipped than any one called to eminent position in the Church; (*b*) to show, by the fact that her other children were only common men and women, that the Lord Jesus owed all which was peculiar about him to his divine paternity and the unmeasured

unction of the Spirit, and not to his mother; (*c*) to manifest that God attaches no peculiar sanctity to celibacy, Satan's snare to introduce concubinage and worse forms of licentiousness, but puts honor on marriage as instituted by himself. But, for whatever reasons on God's part, we believe that, after the birth of the Lord Jesus, Mary had by Joseph, four sons, "James and Joses and Simon and Judas," besides daughters. (Matt. xiii. 55, 56: Mark vi. 3.)

(2.) This James, and not the apostle, was the one permanently resident at Jerusalem, and probably the chief elder and pastor of the Church there. That there was a James so resident is implied in Acts xii. 17, xxi. 18, and xv. 1, taken with Gal. ii. 12, that this was James the Lord's brother, who was not an apostle (John vii. 5), we understand Paul to assert in Gal. i. 19. The particles here translated "save" and elsewhere, "except," "but," etc., are often used, as is well known, to denote not exception but contrast, not the taking out of one of the same class, but the introduction of one of a different class. Thus, in John xvii. 12, "None of those given is lost," but the "son of perdition" (not given) is lost. So in Luke iv. 25-27. To no widow in Israel was Elijah sent, but to a Zidonian widow (not of Israel) he was sent; and no leper of Israel was cleansed by Elisha, but Naaman a Syrian leper (not of Israel) was cleansed. So in many other passages which might be noted; and so here in Gal. i. 19—Paul saw no other apostle than Peter, but he did see James the Lord's brother, not an apostle, but standing so high in the estimation of the Church, that some might deem seeing him equivalent to seeing an apostle. Paul is asserting that he derived the gospel which he preached, not from those who were apostles before him, but direct from the Lord, and proves this by the fact that for three years after his call to the apostleship he saw no apostle at all, and then only Peter; and he introduces James whom he saw at the same time probably for the reason above indicated. Had it been the apostle James, he would hardly have put his assertion in this form; and if, as we believe, the phrase "the Lord's brother" is to be taken literally, it is certain that this James then seen was not the apostle of that name. Moreover, we in-

cline to think that, as Mark and Luke, though not apostles, were used as inspired penmen, so the James and Jude who wrote the epistles bearing these names were not the apostles, but the Lord's brothers. Neither of them calls himself an apostle, and Jude (verses 17, 18) speaks as though he were not one; and his mention of himself (verse 1) as "the bondservant of Jesus Christ, but the brother of James," may be a delicate allusion to this fleshly relationship, as swept from sight and thought by the glory of the Lord Jesus as the Son of God. So also James (i. 1) calls himself only "the bondservant of the Lord Jesus Christ," and makes no claim to apostleship, and thus may be alluding to the same fleshly tie as annulled to his thought in the same way; while his writing "to the dispersion" may infer his own dwelling at Jerusalem. But, be all this as it may, this James the Lord's brother, if we may believe tradition, lived, and at Jerusalem, for at least ten years after this assembly there, and would probably be a prominent member in it; and if he was the James who spoke, he spoke as an elder and not as an apostle. If this be so, it would give us the exact counterpart of the assent of the elders at Sinai to the law-giving through Moses. As they replied to him in behalf of the people, "All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do." So in this view of the matter, the elders here reply through James to the apostles in the same behalf, to the same effect. True, he was a teaching as well as ruling elder; but in an assembly where inspired apostles stood on the Lord's behalf, all the elders would stand as representatives of the people. Furthermore, as, according to tradition, this James was a zealot for the law, the assent of the elders to the decree through him would come with peculiar emphasis. In Acts xv. 1, we find that "certain who came from Judea" stirred up this ritualistic strife at Antioch, while Paul says (Gal. ii. 12) that they "came from James." He would hardly have made such a statement, if James had not been really implicated in the business (not merely alleged to be so by these "certain"), and it seems much more probable that this was James the elder, than James the apostle, and thus his address in the assembly, beside its direct force, would have that of a public recantation of his former error: a fact which

would greatly strengthen the impression of the decree upon the Judaizers. On the whole, then, we incline to this view concerning the speaker, while we grant the plausibility of the other, and holding there seems no possibility, and is no need of a decisive settlement of the question, claim that it is in no way material to our argument, however it may help to round out our theory of this assembly.

(c) "At Jerusalem." As the first two limitations refer to the constituent elements of the assembly, so this relates to the place of its meeting. That judgment should be had at Jerusalem was highly expedient even from the human point of view; for the aggressors in this controversy were the Judaizers, who would be constrained to yield to a sentence pronounced by those supposed to be on their side, even if against them; while the other party, claiming to act under divine direction, could make no objection to any lawful appeal to the Lord, wherever made. The church at Antioch proposed the appeal, as the record tells us, and, probably, at the suggestion of Paul himself. It well accords with his whole character, if we imagine him saying to that church, Since these who oppose us do not acknowledge me as an apostle, nor you as a properly constituted church, let us refer the whole matter to those whom they do acknowledge as apostles and a church. They must accept the sentence of such, and we, directed as we know we are, by the Holy Ghost, may well abide his judgment thus given.

But in its divine aspect, this whole transaction shows a far stronger reason why judgment should issue from Jerusalem. If, as our view assumes, this was a divine law-giving, and intended to announce that the true Lawgiver, the Son, known in the flesh as the Lord Jesus, and now formally seated on his throne, would henceforth tolerate no conception of himself but as sole King in Zion, the law must go from the earthly Zion, Jerusalem, for ages the capital of his visible kingdom. No longer Moses the servant, but Christ the Son, must be recognised as the source of all law, past or present, and not "Mt. Sinai in Arabia," but Jerusalem in the Holy Land of the covenant as its seat. "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

(Is. ii. 3.) Accordingly, Paul says (if we regard Gal. ii. 1-10 as his account of this transaction), that he "went up by revelation;" and thus, if he refers to the going up at this time, settles it that the Lord himself appointed the place, as well as the composition, of this assembly.

We hold, then, that everything in these matters relating to the assembly, as well as the question before it, favors the theory of a divine law-giving rather than that of a council; and we ask, is it supposable that Paul would have felt justified in submitting to the deliberations of a mere council, what he knew to be a revelation and command of the Lord? If it be answered, Yes, if inspired apostles were in it, we say as before, that this gives up the council theory. Inspiration is for revelation. Only illumination is needed, where human deliberative judgment is called for.

Before leaving this point of the place of meeting, let us note what we deem the entire misconception of this record shown in the appeal made to it, whether by Prelatist or Presbyterian, to prove the gradation of church courts, and subordination of the lower to the higher. The assumption is that the lower court (Session or Presbytery) of the church at Antioch appealed to (or was appealed from to) the higher (Presbytery or Synod) of that at Jerusalem, or composed of the representatives of the various churches, but meeting there. We fail to see anything in the whole transaction, as here recorded, in the slightest degree approaching one of this nature. The record says the assembly at Jerusalem was composed of the apostles and elders there; that is, of the elders of the church there, not gathered there from all the churches. But this would make a court, whether ordinary or extraordinary, of precisely the same grade with that formed by the Apostle Paul with the elders at Antioch. Then again, the matter of reference was not the mere action of the court at Antioch, but what it alleged to be, that of the Lord himself, but denied by these intrusive Judaizers to be his; and the reason for reference was, that these intermeddlers were under the jurisdiction of the court at Jerusalem, and not of that at Antioch, and could be dealt with for their heresy only by the former. It was not an appeal against the court at Antioch to that at Jerusalem, but of the former to the

latter, to restrain the heresy and disorderly conduct of persons under its jurisdiction, creating trouble in the bounds of the former. Moreover, as we think we have shown, the appeal, in the highest and truest view of it, was really to the Lord himself, to say through the apostles at Jerusalem what he had before said through Peter at Joppa and Cesarea, and through Paul at Antioch and elsewhere, and cause it to be incorporated in his written word; while in its lower aspect, it was an appeal from one court or church to another and equal one, to put a stop to the disorderly action of persons under its control in the bounds of the complainant. Accordingly, the decree in its preamble reprobates the heresy and lawlessness of these persons, and in its body agrees to the divine truth as maintained by the church at Antioch.

The unity of the Church and the gradation of its courts may be proved from other scriptures, and the latter as one consequence of the former; but any one who attempts to prove such gradation from the record here must, like "the small servant" in "The Old Curiosity Shop," with her orange-peel and water, "make believe very much."

III. How did this Assembly act? We have already pointed out what we deem a misconception in our English Bible, of the design of the apostles and elders in meeting, found in the words (v. 6) "they came together to consider the matter"; but here again we meet that in the record which seems to favor the council theory, in the words (v. 7) "when there had been much disputing," or "seeking," or "inquiring." What, it may be asked, could this be for, but to find an answer to the question submitted for decision? But, is discussion always relative to the answer to be given when a question is asked, or even always so intended? Is it not often the mere outbreak of uncontrollable passion? much of which we know existed in this case. Often, too, however intended, it serves only the purpose of defining the question; and this, we think, was probably the Lord's design in permitting it in this case, whatever was that of the disputers; for thus, not only would the assembly be better prepared to understand the reply, but brought to see the fact that this reply must come from the Lord, as alone competent in

authority, as well as wisdom and knowledge, to answer. At all events, this seems to have been the result here, for the decree is based, not on the disputing, but on the statements of the apostles as to what the Lord had said and done through them. This fact seems to carry with it the inference that the discussion resulted only in the conviction that the case was above and beyond man's authority and understanding. As we have shown above, the question was, What is now the law, and henceforth shall be the written law, in the Church? This was raised by the fact that, apparently against a revelation written in the Lord's statute book, and acknowledged and obeyed for ages by the whole Church, was now alleged a recent revelation, unwritten, though claiming to be divinely confirmed, which was already accepted and put in force in part of the Church. The "disputing" having served to make all this clear, the assembly proceeds to do what alone it was competent to do, look to the Lord for a solution of the difficulty; and this through his apostles, commissioned and inspired to make known his will. First, Peter states, what they all well knew, and had all formally accepted at the time, how that, years before, the Lord had settled this very question through Peter himself, in the matter of Cornelius and his household. Then (if we follow the order of names) Barnabas states what the Lord had said and done through Paul and himself at Antioch and in their recent mission among the Gentiles; and Paul confirms him. If this was the order of speaking, probably Paul put Barnabas forward as less obnoxious to the Judaizers, his own confirmation making the statement virtually his own. Perhaps, however, we need not follow the order of names, but hold that Paul, as being an apostle, followed Peter, and Barnabas confirmed him. Then what? More disputing, discussing the bearing of the facts, weighing the probabilities, or any of those processes by which deliberative assemblies arrive at a conclusion? Not at all; but James, whether apostle or elder, speaks—refers to Peter's statement as showing that the Lord had settled the question long before it came up in connection with the course of Paul and Barnabas, and then shows that this settlement is precisely in accordance with Old Testament prophecy and promise. He then announces as clear to his

own mind a conclusion and course of procedure, which the assembly unanimously adopts. This it at once proceeds to embody in a written decree, to which it affixes the signature of the Holy Ghost, and formally appoints commissioners, Judas and Silas, to bear it to Antioch, that it may be read there and in all the churches (vs. 30-31, xvi. 4) as an additional portion of the written word of God, in order to counteract all further misapprehension and misapplication of the ceremonial law given through Moses (v. 21). And the Church has been so reading and using it ever since.

Now in all this it is to be noted that as to the facts of the case and the words of Old Testament Scripture, neither James nor any one else in the assembly knew one single thing at the time of adopting the decree that he did not know before the assembly met. The whole difference in their minds lay in the mode of viewing the facts and the Scripture, and the sense that this change was wrought in them by the Holy Ghost. Excepting visible manifestations of the Spirit's presence, the case is strictly parallel to that during Pentecost (Acts ii.), where only the like change had occurred. As in the walk to Emmaus, the Lord expounded to the two disciples "the scriptures concerning himself" (Luke xxiv. 27), so during the forty days between his resurrection and ascension, he spoke to the disciples of "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," to which they were to bear witness, but only after they received the gift of the Holy Ghost (Acts i. 1-8). At Pentecost they knew nothing more of the facts of the Lord's life and death and resurrection and glorification, nor of the words of Scripture, nor of those of the Lord explaining and applying it to himself than they did before; but they saw and felt the meaning of all these things with immeasurably greater clearness and strength, and felt what they did not feel before, the ability and authority and overmastering impulse to give utterance to them as none other than the very words and truth of God; and all this in strict accordance with the Lord's promise concerning his sending the Comforter (John xiv. 26; xvi. 7). So was it now: fire was applied to the mass of facts and scriptures smouldering in their minds, and at once it burst forth into the clear flame of divine

truth, filling them with heavenly light and heat, and all as manifestly from the Holy Ghost as when he visibly attested his presence by the tongue-shaped flames resting on their heads. Under this sure knowledge and unmistakable consciousness of his presence and power, they took action as above stated, and only such knowledge and consciousness could have justified them in so doing, or the Church then and ever since in accepting this action as a giving of law by the Lord himself, a breaking of the chains of ceremonial bondage by the King's own hand and his gracious grant of gospel liberty.

We submit, then, that in no proper sense can this be regarded as the act of a council, but that it must be held to be a divine law-giving under "the ministration of righteousness" as really as that at Sinai was a divine law-giving under "the ministration of condemnation," although with that absence of the material and visible glories of terror displayed at the latter, which the Holy Ghost declares through Paul (II. Cor. iii. 7-18) to correspond to the difference between the law and the gospel. No one can consider it, without seeing that there is something in it far above and beyond the reach of any mere council, and no one can think logically and not see that in ratio as he admits anything in it extraordinary, he destroys the foundations of the council theory.

If, now, we look a little at the far-reaching practical effect of this decree on previously given Scripture and the life and worship of the Church, we shall find our view confirmed. There is no need to suppose that even the apostles, except, perhaps, Paul, appreciated the full force of what had been done; for, when "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," oftentimes they knew not, at least fully, the meaning of what they uttered (1 Peter i. 10-12), and very possibly in this case the members of the assembly supposed that the decree only relieved Gentile converts from observing the ritual law of Moses. In fact, however, whether we look at the decree itself, or subsequently given Scripture, or the after providence of God toward the Church, they had been instruments in the hands of the Holy Ghost for tearing down and removing out of the way that whole majestic structure of typical observance, the erection of which

had occupied the ages from the fall to Moses, and in part even to David and Solomon, and the possession and use of which had formed the visible distinction and glory of the Church, especially from the time of Moses to that of this assembly. From the re-constitution of the race after the flood to the advent of Christ, the Church visible had been confined, as to the main element of its membership and chief centre of its worship, to one family, tribe, nation. Why was this? Not because man's enmity to God constrained the Lord to choose witnesses for himself from among individuals and nations; for this reason remains, and will do so to the end of time; but because man must be impressed with a sense of his need of a Redeemer, prepared to apprehend the person and work of this Redeemer, and enabled surely to recognise and identify him when he should appear. If the first two of these ends required such "carnal ordinances" as would in their own nature act as a wall of separation to those who observed them from the rest of mankind who refused to adopt them, the last required that such ordinances should so cluster around the person of the Redeemer, like branches out of the parent stem, that at his coming he should stand in their very focus and centre, and be seen to be as necessarily their root as their offspring. Accordingly, it is a demonstrable and demonstrated truth, that all the Messianic lines of chronology, genealogy, locality, character, and action, of type, doctrine, command, and promise, as these are prophetically laid down in the Old Testament Scripture, point to and meet in the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ, and so signify and demand him, that without him they become void of meaning, the mere "baseless fabric of a vision."

But, now, as, when a building is completed, the staging used in its construction must be cleared away, lest it obstruct both view and use, so, when the Christ had actually come and finished his work, all those typical things so necessary to prepare his way must be removed, that his Church and the world might find the view of his person and work and the way to his presence alike unobstructed, and the Church might go forth to all nations and dwell among them, bearing not the dim torchlight of type and prophecy, but that of the Sun of Righteousness fully risen and

shining in his glory. And here, we may remark by the way, is seen the gross error of the Prelatic and Popish heresies in reviving some of the typical rites of the Old Testament, stealing some of man's device from the heathen, and inventing others for themselves, and, of the whole, forming a so-called ceremonial of the Church. This whole business is not only an insolent usurpation of the King's prerogative of law-giving, but a grossly ignorant and heathenish misconception of the Spirit's teaching relative to what is now necessary to aid the soul in attaining the clearest and fullest view of Christ and his salvation. Under pretence of assisting in this work, they impede it, and act a part which, however worthy of commendation in a man-milliner or posture-master, is beneath contempt as claiming to be that of the Church. And so of every attempt from whatever quarter to "cultivate æsthetics" in the Church by enforcing prettily ordered ritual performances. The place for scenic display and human robings and posturings and recitations is the theatre, not the church. But, to return: the Spirit does this sweeping and mighty work of destruction by the simple means of this brief decree. Away goes all that worship by bloody sacrifice which had come down from Adam, with that accompanying distinction of clean and unclean beasts first mentioned in the command to Noah (Gen. vii. 2), that circumcision which had come down from Abraham, and that priesthood which had come down from Moses and Aaron. With these went all that need of a central city and temple for worship which they created, with all that accompanying cumbersome ceremonial which had hampered the free activity of daily life. Except that which belongs to moral character and conduct, nothing was left in the habits of ordinary living to distinguish the believer from the world. As to the organised Church, none of its ordinary officers, except elders and deacons, remained; none of its sacred seasons, except the weekly Sabbath; none of its solemn assemblies for worship, except that of the synagogue (which answers precisely to our "congregation" or "particular church") on the weekly Sabbath. As to the signs and seals of the covenant, not one of those used in former dispensations remained at all, but the Church must henceforth use only those instituted by the Lord Jesus when on

earth—baptism and the supper. In fact, excepting sacrificial worship, which was now abolished, the Church was brought back to its position under the covenant with Noah (Gen. ix. 1-17) when Church and world were coextensive.

The coincidence of these two situations is very striking, and throws great light on the meaning and force of this decree; let us consider it a little.

The ante-diluvian race forfeited and lost its life by incorrigible iniquity. Idolatry, indeed, is not specifically mentioned among its sins, yet that it practically existed, as everywhere and with every soul that does not genuinely fear and love God, is certain; and that it formally existed is most probable, and may be inferred from the record (Gen. iv. 26, Heb.) that in the days of Enos "it was begun to call in name of Jehovah." This verb, "to call," is frequently used in regard to the prophets in the sense of "to proclaim" or "preach;" and this passage seems to indicate that the line of God-fearing patriarchs became, like Noah, "preachers of righteousness." This is probably what Peter affirms (2 Pet. ii. 5) of them and Noah. Not that Noah was "the eighth person," as in our English version, or that he "with seven others" was saved, as the Revision has it, but that he was "the eighth preacher of righteousness," which, beginning the enumeration with Enos, is literally the fact. These all in their generations preached in the name of Jehovah against the growing apostasy, which, we can scarcely doubt, involved the setting up of false gods in form and name, as well as indulging false conceptions of the true God. But however this may be, by the flood God reduced the race to those who, in profession at least, acknowledged him alone, and his covenant with Noah proceeds on the assumption that he alone is to be acknowledged as God, the Lord of life, the Giver of all its good, the Controller of all its powers and actions. Now, in strict conformity with this, the decree of this assembly prohibits all idolatry, even in that indirect and modified form which, refusing open acknowledgment of idols, yet partakes idol sacrifices as such. Again, in the covenant with Noah, man is for the first time invested with any control over the duration of life, whether of man or beast. Before this no beast could

lawfully be slain, except for sacrifice, and no man, not even the murderer Cain, or the self-avenger Lamech, could be put to death for any cause; but henceforth man is bound by divine command to slay the murderer, and allowed to slaughter beasts for food under the limitation (Gen. ix. 4): "but flesh with the blood thereof, which is the life thereof, shall ye not eat." As we understand this proviso, it is to serve as a perpetual reminder that, however life may be put at man's disposal, God alone is the Author and Lord of it, and man may deal with it only as a servant strictly bound by the law of his Lord. Now the decree at Jerusalem renews this limitation, and applies it also to "things strangled," as having the blood in them. Those who view this as a mere ceremonial provision retained for a temporary purpose would do well to refer to this covenant with Noah, and reflect, that, if this provision is now obsolete, the whole covenant is so, and, therefore, no longer have we not only any right to flesh for food, but also any security against another flood. Thus, perhaps, their minds and consciences might be quickened through their stomachs, and their love of "flesh meat" might do good service in making them "strict constructionists" of the word of God; and if, like Gonzalo in "The Tempest," they "would fain die a dry death," they would become more careful about abrogating any part of the covenant with Noah. Let us consider ourselves bound to refrain from blood, let the Lord consider himself no longer bound to refrain from the destructive use of "the waters of a flood."

The third provision of the decree prohibits fornication, and *a fortiori*, adultery. This pertains to man's subordinate control of the beginning of life, as that concerning blood, to his authority over the end of it. Here also the action must be strictly under the law imposed by God, the Lord of life. Now, by the flood he had reduced the race to the condition imposed by the original marriage law of one man and one woman. This law is designed to secure "a godly seed," as the Holy Ghost informs us through Malachi (ii. 14-15), and, as experience shows, gives the only constitution of the family capable of securing this end, by preserving proper parental love and care for children. It was this family constitution that God blessed in Noah and his sons, as at first in

Adam; and so, too, this decree carefully provided for its preservation by prohibiting any violation of it, as did our Lord when on earth; while it is to be noted, that idolatry had not only set aside the divine limitations in both these matters of blood and sexual commerce, but had sanctioned their opposites, and even sanctified them by introducing them among its rites of worship. It was greatly necessary, therefore, while removing the fetters of typical ceremonial observances, to remind the Church and the world that man was still "under the law to Christ," and to impress that fundamental principle of all divine law, "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." This is amply effected both in the covenant with Noah and this decree; and as under the former the Church was fitted to dwell among all nations, testifying the gospel of the Christ to come, signed and sealed by typical sacrificial worship, and requiring only godly living, so under the latter, relieved of all ceremonial incumbrance, it is fitted to go forth to all nations, testifying the gospel of Jesus the Christ come, signed and sealed by the commemorative symbolic ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, requiring only living to him, and having its simple government by its own chosen elders to administer the completed word of its living King to the end of time.

Let any one look, now, at this tremendous sweep of the work of "destruction and reconstruction" wrought by this decree, stretching back through the ages to the fall, and forward to the last great day, and ask himself, if this is the work of a council, a work which would be committed to a council, or which a council could do? Whether, in the very nature of the case, this assembly at Jerusalem could have been anything but an assembly like that of Moses and Aaron and the elders at Sinai, an assembly "to hear what God the Lord would speak," and to put the word on record at his command, for the faith and obedience of his people? Whether the absence of visible glories and an audible voice is anything more than what is demanded by the purpose of the Lord Jesus to keep his glory concealed from every eye but that of faith, until "He shall come the second time without sin unto salvation," in order that, by the preaching of the simple word of the

gospel, he may "try the hearts of the children of men"? And whether, therefore, this transaction is not the very counterpart of that at Sinai; wherein the only Law-giver and King speaks as directly and manifestly, though not as vividly and audibly, as he spoke at Sinai; giving, thus, one striking fulfilment of his prophecy and promise, "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem"? This is the view we advocate, and which we claim has been practically that of the Church, ever since the decree was sent forth; for, however some of its members may have befogged themselves with the Council theory, the whole Church has ever bowed as reverently before this decree as the direct word of God, as it has bowed before the Decalogue, or any portion of his word.

We have indulged in some prolixity in this discussion, because, although we believe the Church has always held to its essence, the form of our theory is, to us at least, somewhat new, and we wished to present it as fully and fairly as we could. But whatever may be thought of it as a whole, we think that, in setting forth our view, we have suggested good reasons for challenging the Council theory; for suspecting it to be alike unscriptural, un-presbyterian, unphilosophical, and unreasonable; and for arousing Presbyterians to inquire, whether, in true allegiance to their King and his Church, they should not renounce and resist it as gross heresy, fruitless of good and fruitful of evil. If what we have said shall awaken abler minds and direct more skilful pens to a full discussion of the subject, our main hope in writing this paper will be realised.

A. W. CLISBY.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE DIACONATE AGAIN.

Having, in the last number of this REVIEW, answered the objections urged by our reviewer against the scripturalness of our positions in regard to the diaconate, we were engaged in meeting his charge that they are illogical, when we were compelled to pause. We now continue our consideration of that branch of his argument.

The series of resolutions touching the deacon's office, which was submitted by its committee to the Synod of South Carolina, begins as follows: "The deacon belongs to a different order from the elder; from which position it follows, first, that the higher office of presbyter does not include the lower office of deacon; secondly, that these two offices should be kept distinct." The logic of these propositions the reviewer pronounces to be bad. He contends that if it be admitted that the presbyter and the deacon belong to distinct orders, it would not follow that the higher office of presbyter does not include the lower of deacon; but that, on the contrary, in any system of orders of which higher or lower may be predicated, there must be the involution of the marks of the lower in the higher.

1. We propose, in the first place, to state precisely the meaning of the Synod's committee in this utterance, and to vindicate the force of the inferences enounced.

It is evident that in fixing the signification of the terms employed, we must be governed by the *usus loquendi* of Presbyterianism. We thus, at the outset, get quit of all ideas of sacramental grace, hierarchical dignity, and titled rank, as suggested by the term *order*. It is scarcely necessary to remark, also, that we must discriminate between the different senses in which that term is used by Presbyterians. It is, for instance, employed to signify method and regularity. This is the meaning of the word in the apostolic exhortation, "Let all things be done decently and in order." The term *orders* as we have it in our own Con-

stitution,¹ is used to indicate the methods according to which candidates are to be inducted into the respective offices of the Church. But in this discussion the term orders is applied to the relation existing between church officers. It is a symbol of classification; it designates the generic classes to which ecclesiastical officers are assigned. Let us particularise. There is the general class, church officers. If this be regarded specifically, the principle of differentiation is the relation sustained to a certain institute—the Church. The class or order of ecclesiastical officers is thus distinguished from that of civil officers. In this respect the class is but a species. But considered as in relation to the ecclesiastical sphere, the class, church officers, is the highest general class, or, if we may venture to speak in the terms of logic, the highest genus. To this generic class or order all the officers of the Church belong, and in this relation there is no difference between them—they are all of the same order. But this highest class or order is divided into subordinate classes or orders, which themselves, in turn, may or may not be proximate genera, containing under them specific classes. Under the highest generic class, church officers, comes, for example, the specific class, presbyters, which again becomes a subordinate generic class—a proximate genus, distributable into the two specific classes, preaching presbyters and ruling presbyters; that is, presbyters who both rule and preach, and presbyters who only rule. Or, to employ different but equivalent phraseology: under the highest order, church officers, comes the subordinate order, presbyters, which is distributable into two specific classes, preaching presbyters and ruling presbyters. Both these kinds of presbyters, consequently, while specifically different, belong to one and the same order—presbyters. Both rule. That imparts to them a generic denomination. But one kind preaches, and the other does not preach, but only rules. That stamps their specific designation.

In like manner, under the highest generic class, or order, church officers, comes the subordinate general class, or order, deacons. The case would be attended with no difficulty, but would

¹Chap. VI. Title.

be perfectly plain, if with Calvin¹ we could regard the class, deacons, as a proximate genus, under which fall two specific classes, namely, 'deacons who distribute alms to the poor and have charge of ecclesiastical goods, and deacons who are devoted to the care of the persons of the poor and the sick. Viewed in this light, the two different classes, presbyters and deacons, contemplated in relation to the highest class—*summu*m genus—church officers, are coördinate species; but in turn become generic classes—proximate genera—containing under them respectively lower classes as coördinate species. It would be manifest that, according to this reduction, the classes or orders, presbyters and deacons, are generically distinguished from each other. Each possess an essential attribute or generic mark which discriminates it from the other. For, the attributes, rule on the one hand, and ministry to the bodies of the poor on the other, which would be specific properties, regarded in relation to the highest class, church officers, become generic, considered with reference to the specific classes contained under the general classes, presbyters and deacons. The essential attribute, rule, belonging to the proximate genus, presbyters, is possessed by the specific classes, preaching elders and ruling elders; and the like attribute, ministry to the bodies of the poor, belonging to the proximate genus, deacons, is possessed by the specific classes, almoners to the poor and curators of the persons of the poor. Looked at from this point of view, the significance of the proposition, "the deacon belongs to a different order from the elder" would at once be understood and admitted. And then the logical inference would be clear and indisputable, that "the higher office of presbyter does not include the lower office of deacon." The office of presbyter is actually discharged by the specific classes of officers, preaching presbyters and ruling presbyters. They, according to the reduction under consideration, would differ from the specific classes of deacons, both generically and specifically. They would differ generically; for, the generic attribute, ruling, which would belong to the class, pres-

¹*Institutes*, B. iv., c. iii., § 9.

byters, would not be possessed by the specific classes of deacons which would be included under another generic class; and the generic attribute, ministry to the bodies of the poor, which would belong to the generic class, deacons, would not be possessed by the specific classes of presbyters which would be included under another proximate genus. But differing generically, as all presbyters do from all deacons, it would follow, *a fortiori*, that they would differ from them specifically. As presbyters would not include *in* them the generic attribute of the deacon, they could not include in them his specific attributes. The conclusion is plainly established, that "the higher office of presbyter does not include the lower office of deacon."

But let it be supposed that we are not prepared to concur with Calvin as to the position which has been stated, and that the class, deacons, is to be treated as undistributable into subordinate classes. The result at which we must arrive will be substantially the same—that is to say, deacons must be considered as belonging to a different order from presbyters, and the inference will be legitimated that the presbyter does not include the deacon. It is true that, according to this supposition, deacons would not be a proximate genus, containing species under it, and the logical argument would have to be abandoned which is built upon a comparison of specific classes of presbyters with specific classes of deacons. But, conceding this, we still hold that deacons must be regarded as having all the significance of a general class, or order, contrasted with that of presbyters. It will be admitted—the reviewer admits—that the generic class, church officers, contains under it the two specific classes, presbyters and deacons. In other words, the highest order, church officers, is distributed into the two orders, presbyters and deacons. While, therefore, the generic attribute belonging to the highest class, or order, is possessed by both these specific classes, they are, at the same time, distinguished from each other by specific properties. Of course, then, these properties are not common between them. They constitute the differentia of the respective classes. Ruling, being the specific property of presbyters, does not belong to deacons.

Distribution,¹ being the specific property of deacons, does not belong to presbyters. Deny this, and you deny the admitted fact that the highest class, church officers, contains under it the specific classes, presbyters and deacons. But the specific class, presbyters, is also a proximate genus—an order, containing under it the two specific classes, preaching presbyters and ruling presbyters. Both these include in them the generic attribute, ruling, which belongs to the class, presbyters. Each is a specific class of presbyters with a peculiar property of its own, which distinguishes it from the other. Now, deacons do not come under the generic class, presbyters, as one of its species. If they did, they would possess the generic attribute, ruling. They would be presbyters who distribute. They would, in that case, not be generically opposed to presbyters—they would not constitute an order different from them. They would belong to the same order with them. But they are a different order from presbyters. Although, in logical strictness, they are only a species, yet as a class they are contradistinguished from the generic class, presbyters, and not merely from the specific classes, preaching and ruling presbyters. Our argument, then, is, that if the generic class, presbyters, is different from the class, deacons, it follows that presbyters, whether considered generically or specifically, cannot include the deacon. It is but putting the same thing in different words to say that “the deacon belongs to a different order from the elder; from which position it follows, that the higher office of presbyter does not include the lower office of deacon.” To deny this is to take the ground that one class includes another class which is contradistinguished from it by the non-possession of its essential attribute; for, the essential attribute of presbyters as a proximate genus is ruling, and that attribute deacons confessedly do not possess. In fine, presbyters include neither deacons *under* them in the sphere of extension, nor *in* them in that of

¹We use the term, *distribution* not as exhaustively indicating diaconal functions, but as expressing an eminent function of the deacon which represents all his duties. This is done in those Presbyterian formularies which allow that there are other special functions than distribution which belong to the deacon.

intension. We repeat it, that there is but one sense in which presbyters include deacons, but in the same sense deacons equally include presbyters. It is that they both include the essential attribute of the highest generic class, church officers.

The reviewer charges us with a confusion of concepts when we infer that, because presbyters and deacons belong to different orders, the office of presbyter does not include the office of deacon. There is here, he says, no inference at all, not even a *non sequitur*. A further exposition of the obvious import of the argument will evince the irrelevancy of this sharp criticism. There were two reasons for employing the term *office*: first, because the maxim against which we are contending employs it—"the higher office includes the lower;" secondly, because we were unwilling, by continuing to use the term *order*, to raise the question whether there are *three* orders of church officers—preaching elders, ruling elders, and deacons. That question would have encumbered the argument. But as the introduction of the term *office* has been characterised as illogical, we proceed to justify its employment, and to maintain the legitimacy of the argument into which it enters.

The argument might have been thus expressed: the deacon belongs to a different order from the presbyter; therefore the order of presbyters does not include the order of deacons—that is, because the orders are different, one does not include the other. The form of the argument would then have been beyond criticism, whatever may have been thought of its truth. But we would not in that way have compassed the end which was sought. We desired in one brief utterance, suited to a resolution, to prove that neither the generic office of presbyter, nor the specific office of preaching presbyter or of ruling presbyter, includes the office of deacon. That could not have been done if the term *order* had been substituted for *office*, without implying that the preaching elder and the ruling elder belong to different orders. But as it is, we do not see that we have outrageously violated the rules which govern the forms of argument. What is the force of the word *order*, if it do not signify a general class of officers or offices? What is meant by the affirmation that the deacon be-

longs to a different order from the presbyter, but that he belongs to a different general class of officers from him? And as officers derive their denomination from the offices which they hold, what further is signified but that the office of deacon does not belong to the generic office of presbyter, but is different from it? The argument, by this simple explanation, is seen to be this: the office of deacon does not belong to the generic office of presbyter; therefore, the office of presbyter does not include the office of deacon. If the office of presbyter is generically different from that of deacon, it follows that the office of presbyter, considered either generically or specifically, does not include that of deacon. Had we foreseen that a technical refinement would raise a question as to the mere names rather than the things, we would have employed the awkward periphrasis, *generic office*, instead of the single and well understood word *order*. The terms *higher* and *lower*, as qualifying office, are of no logical value in the argument, and might have been omitted. They simply express the degrees of importance which are conceived to belong to the different offices. And we take occasion again to remark, that if the offices differ in importance, that fact furnishes no proof that the greater (or higher) includes the less (or lower). If it be conceded that the office of preaching is greater in importance than that of simple ruling, it does not follow that the office of preaching includes that of simple ruling. Nor does it follow that because the offices of preaching and ruling are greater than that of distributing, the former include the latter.

We have thus shown that there is no such confusion of concepts, as is charged, in the argument: "The deacon belongs to a different order from the presbyter; from which position it follows that the higher office of presbyter does not include the lower office of deacon." The concept *order* is the same as the concept *generic office*. The concept *office* is, consequently, that which is employed throughout the argument. The dispute about the terms is mere by-play; the reviewer may as justly have criticised the employment of the term *elder* in one part of the statement and the term *presbyter* in another. The real contest is in regard to the position, that the presbyter and the deacon differ as to

order or generic office, and therefore the presbyter does not include the deacon. That being the real question, all that we would now say concerning it is, that it has been discussed in the article which preceded this, and in the foregoing part of the present.

The reviewer also censures the logic which infers from the position that presbyters and deacons belong to different orders, that the "two offices should be kept distinct." He informs us that difference has reference to essence, and distinction, to accidents, and that we lost sight of the fact that two things may be distinct as to accidents and yet be the same as to essence. The implication of the criticism is, that the deacon's office may be accidentally distinct from the presbyter's, and yet may be essentially the same with it. He says:

"And this brings us to the last logical knot, in these knotty resolutions, that needs untying, though it deserves cutting. 'The deacon belongs to a *different* order from the elder; from which position it follows,' etc. The writer italicises the knotty word. If the author of those resolutions had written '*distinct*,' the *non sequitur* would have been felt by all and seen by some; and the difference could not have reappeared so plausibly in the inference under the mask of a distinction between *higher* and *lower*. A *difference* resides in the essence of a thing, and is created by a nature; a *distinction*, in its subsistence, and is created by an *accident*. Two drops of dew are distinct, but not different. A quart and a pint of water are distinguished from each other merely by proportion, and each must have the same nature, water."¹

Now it is obvious from the phraseology that while in the Resolutions the term *different* is used to express difference as to essence, or generic attributes, the term *distinct* was not employed in its logical sense relatively to the other. The language is, "these offices should be kept distinct." The word *kept* ought to have prevented the criticism. For the plain meaning of the language is, not that the offices are different as to order, therefore they are distinct, but therefore they should be practically separated in the operations of the church—they should in practice be kept apart. And that inference was pertinent, because, although it is

¹S. P. REVIEW, April, 1881, p. 352.

conceded that the offices belong to different orders, they are nevertheless practically blended: the presbyter, in our practice, discharges the functions of the deacon proper. The criticism is "cutting," but its keen edge severed an imaginary "knot."

But as the reviewer was determined to be technically nice, let it be supposed that our argument was what he construed it to be, namely, that the offices of presbyter and deacon are different in essence, therefore they are distinct in accidents; and that his reply was directed against that argument. Upon that supposition, we would remark, first, that it is impossible, in consequence of its vagueness and indeterminateness, to apprehend the point of his reply. We are wholly unable to tell whether he speaks metaphysically or logically; whether he means metaphysical or logical essence and accidents; and whether he intends separable or inseparable accidents. If, therefore, we attempted a rejoinder, we would draw our bow at a venture. Secondly, whether he speaks metaphysically or logically, the reply is totally irrelevant to the issue. Our argument, as he conceived it, is: things which are different in essence must be distinct in accidents. He answers: things which are distinct in accidents may be the same in essence. Granted. We have no disposition to deny that two drops of dew, though distinct in accidents, are the same in essence. But what on earth has that to do with our supposed affirmation, that difference in essence implies distinction in accidents? that fire and water, for example, are different in essence, therefore they are distinct in accidents? The learned reviewer nodded when he concocted this reply—*quandoque Homerus dormitat*.

2. Having expounded the import of the argument in the Resolutions, and sustained it against the criticism of the reviewer, we will, in the next place, notice some of his positions in regard to the question of orders.

(1.) He appeals, at the very outset of his discussion, to what must have appeared to him a strong analogical argument. He summons us to the British House of Lords, and bids us observe that its members, whatever be the difference of order between them, all sit as barons, the lowest order entitled to seats. Therefore, is the inference, higher orders involve lower; and therefore,

further, the higher order of presbyters includes the lower order of deacons. Now, we doubt whether it be a fact that all the members of the House of Lords sit in it as barons; we doubt whether that be the theory accepted at present as to the composition of that body. If not, the supposed analogy fails. But if it be allowed that the fact is as stated, what would be established by the analogy? According to the supposition, barons would simply be synonymous with lords, and lords are rulers. The generic attribute of the class is ruling; and of course every member of it is a ruler, whatever peculiar properties he may possess. But do the fiscal officers of the government—the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Lord of the Treasury, or others—sit in the House of Lords? If not, are they included in the orders entitled to sit in that House? If the analogy be worth anything, it ought to show that these officers of finance are barons entitled to membership in the House of Lords; and then there would at least be some plausibility in the inference that deacons as the lower order are included in the higher order of presbyters. But then also it would show that deacons are the lowest order of Presbyterian rulers, and that all presbyters sit in church-courts as deacons! This is what is established by the analogy, and it is just a little too much. We might, for the mere sake of argument, for we have no inclination to refer to an analogy like this, turn the inference against the reviewer. The class Lords, as rulers, does not include the class, Commons, who are equally rulers. Therefore—if we were disposed to resort to a fanciful analogy—might we argue, the class preaching elders, although rulers, does not include the class ruling elders who are equally rulers. But enough has been said to evince the inadequacy of the illustration furnished by the House of Lords. In no way is the case of the deacon touched by it. The fact is, that in no free government, so far as we know, is the department of finance included in any other. For instance, in the government of the United States and in that of each State, the office of Secretary of the Treasury is not included in either the Executive, or the Legislative, or the Judicial office; and yet it is an indispensable element of the system as a whole, is necessary to secure the ends of the govern-

ment and is absolutely under its control. We do not refer to human analogy to support our divine system, but to show that it cannot be used against it, so far as the matter under consideration is concerned.

(2.) We proceed, against our inclinations, but in obedience to the imperative requirements of the discussion, to exhibit the inconsistencies of the reviewer's argument—inconsistencies which, if they can be proved, certainly invalidate its conclusiveness.

First, our argument, as we have already seen, has been subjected to a fiery criticism, because, as it was alleged, it confounded office with order; it began with order in its first premise and concluded with office—presbyters and deacons differ in order, therefore their offices should be kept distinct. Now can it be possible that the critic does the same thing himself? Let us hear him :

“The higher office is that which has the nature of the lower and one or more natures besides. Now, if the word *higher* can in any sense be predicated of the presbyter and his order, it is the sense we claim for it when we say, the higher office or order is that of presbyter, or the presbyter is the higher officer of the church.”¹

As it cannot be urged that the terms *office* and *order* are here used distributively, but are employed to designate the same thing, the reviewer's criticism, like the reputed Australian weapon, returns upon himself.

Secondly, the logical argument concerning the relations between church-officers, the reviewer contends, cannot take notice of their natures. He says :

“Logic, in any given case, does not and dares not take notice of the principle of classification or the natures that are unified.”²

Well, then, when the reviewer's “logic begins to work,” we would expect that the notion of natures would be dropped out. But what is the great argument which he employs? It is precisely this: a higher order which has the nature of a lower must include the lower; the higher order of presbyter has the nature of the lower order of deacon; therefore the higher order of pres-

¹P. 348.

²P. 347.

byter must include the lower order of deacon. To prove, by citation, that this is his position would be superfluous. We meet it *passim*. Upon the reviewer's own principle, then, his argument proceeded without warrant from his logic—they parted with each other.

Thirdly, let us look at the reviewer's statements in regard to the difference of orders and ask whether they hang together. After, with technical nicety, stating the discrimination between difference, as relating to an essence created by a nature, and distinction, as referring to accidents, he proceeds to say :

“In this we have done him whom we oppose no wrong, for he too evidently takes it in that sense, to wit, that he is speaking of orders which have the same ecclesiastical nature. But ‘different ecclesiastical orders’ means the orders of churches differing in *ecclesiastical polity*, as Prelatic orders and Presbyterian orders.”

Here it is affirmed that Prelatic and Presbyterian orders are different; and of course it follows that they are different as to nature, since difference of order always implies difference of nature. It is admitted by the reviewer that the orders in question are ecclesiastical orders. Now, what renders an order ecclesiastical? The fact that it consists of ecclesiastical officers. But the reviewer strenuously and everywhere maintains that the Presbyterian orders of presbyters and deacons cannot be different, because they are of the same nature. If they were of different natures, argues he, one could not include the other; but as they are of the same nature, one does and must include the other. What, then, is the nature in regard to which they are the same? The answer—the only answer—is that which they possess by virtue of their being ecclesiastical officers. This is the only answer possible, for the reviewer distinctly says that considered specifically as presbyter and deacon, they have different natures: “The presbyter, besides his own personal nature, has the nature of the deacon.” That is, as deacons or church officers they have the same nature; but presbyters, as presbyters, distinguished from deacons, have a different nature from them. The sameness of nature, therefore, is in the possession of ecclesiastical office. It is only because they are ecclesiastical officers that they are not

different in order. But both Prelatic and Presbyterian orders are orders of ecclesiastical officers. They therefore possess a nature which forbids their being considered different orders. The reviewer, however, affirms that they are different orders; they are different and not different at one and the same time! The reviewer cannot escape this contradiction by saying that he declared them to be different as to "ecclesiastical polity." For ecclesiastical polity must fall either into the category of nature or of accident. If of nature, it is maintained that these orders are different; if of accident, it is maintained that they are only distinct. But the reviewer says that they are different. Hence they are said to be of different natures, and the contradiction is apparent. For it is clear that these orders cannot be ecclesiastical and not ecclesiastical at one and the same time. Nor will it do for the reviewer to say that he was speaking of different churches, when he affirmed a difference of orders. For different churches are churches. They are possessed of a common ecclesiastical nature, however they may differ in other respects. He would not take the ground that no prelatical organisation is a church. If, then, the reviewer admit that these orders are composed of ecclesiastical officers, he concedes that, according to his own showing, they are not different. If he affirm that they are different, he denies that one of them is composed of ecclesiastical officers. If, further, he contend that Prelatic and Presbyterian churches are different "ecclesiastical worlds," and therefore involve different "systems" of orders, he would merely shift the terms without changing the sense. We press the question, What constitutes the element of difference between these systems of orders? It must be a nature. Is it the nature of ecclesiastical officers? If so, one system must be affirmed to contain ecclesiastical officers and the other not to contain them. Will the reviewer say that no Prelatic organisation contains ecclesiastical officers? If it be said, on the other hand, that the difference of nature lies in the *kinds* of ecclesiastical officers contained in these systems of orders, the question is given up; for that is the very sort of difference which we have affirmed as existing between the orders, presbyters, and deacons, in the Presbyterian Church. We say that they partly differ in nature,

because they are different kinds of ecclesiastical officers; he says that they are not different in nature, because they are alike ecclesiastical officers.

The difficulties still increase. The reviewer holds that orders are different when one of them is ecclesiastical and the other is secular.¹ Now that may mean that this is the sole ground of difference between orders, or it may not. If it mean that the sole ground of difference between them is, that one is ecclesiastical and the other secular, it is affirmed that the orders of all Prelatic churches are secular; for it is maintained that Prelatic and Presbyterian orders are different. If it mean that there may be other grounds of difference between orders, then why may not ecclesiastical orders in the Presbyterian Church differ from each other? Why may not the kind of office held constitute a ground of difference in order? That, we have seen, the reviewer himself must admit, unless he denies that Prelatic churches are ecclesiastical, and their officers ecclesiastical officers.

Fourthly, there is another inconsistency which must be noticed. It is only necessary to quote a few of the reviewer's utterances in order to evince it:

"The higher order includes the lower order in any and every system that is unified by one nature; that is, the office of presbyter includes that of deacon."²

"The higher office is that which has the nature of the lower and one or more natures besides."³

"The higher order or office is the one that comprehends the nature of the lower order or office, together with that other nature which is its mark of distinction. And observe, again, this distinction of 'higher' and 'lower' must be made, or we have only one order, and presbyter-deacon."⁴

"The meaning, taken in intension, of the proposition, 'the higher ecclesiastical order includes the lower,' is the one for which the writer is contending—the one held by the Reformed Church, and every other too, to wit, that *the presbyter, besides his own personal nature, has the nature also of the deacon.*"⁵

Taken in connexion with the reviewer's formal enunciation: "a difference resides in the essence of a thing and is created by

¹Pp. 350-353.

²P. 353.

³P. 348.

⁴P. 348.

⁵P. 349.

a nature; a distinction, in its subsistence, and is created by an accident," the first of these passages plainly affirms that presbyters and deacons do not belong to different orders, for the reason that they have one and the same nature. Their nature being the same, their essence is the same. But the other passages just as plainly affirm that besides a nature common with the deacon, the presbyter possesses a peculiar nature which the deacon has not. Here then are two natures which are different; and since difference in nature grounds difference in order, the presbyter belongs to a different order from the deacon. Oh, no; they only belong to distinct, not different, orders. They do not differ in nature, they are only distinct in accidents. That is, the presbyter who has a different personal nature from the deacon is only distinct from him as to accidents! The reviewer obliterates his own distinction—like Saturn, he devours his own progeny. We admit that presbyters and deacons possess a common "nature" as they are ecclesiastical officers, but we affirm that they have different "natures" as they are certain kinds of ecclesiastical officers, namely rulers and distributors. While in one sense they are of the same order, in another they are of different orders. The reviewer himself establishes this, and therefore demolishes his position that as the orders possess the same nature, the higher includes the lower.

What now becomes of the reviewer's illustration, that "a ten-foot pole" includes a yard-stick? When things are of the same nature, the greater must include the less; a ten-foot pole is of the same nature as a yard-stick, and being greater than it includes it. So the presbyter, being of the same nature with the deacon, and greater than he, must include him. This would be irresistible if the presbyter were simply a greater deacon than the deacon proper. But the reviewer says that he is greater than the deacon, not as he is deacon, for in that respect he is the same with him, but as he is presbyter. He has a peculiar nature of his own, which is precisely the thing which makes him greater than the deacon. He includes the deacon because he has the same nature with him; he includes him because he has a different nature from him! We have the choice between using the yard-

stick or the pole against the reviewer. We prefer the pole. The presbyter is too much for him.

We have thus vindicated the argument of the resolutions before the Synod of South Carolina against the reviewer's criticisms, and exhibited the inconclusiveness and inconsistency of his positions. The doctrine has been fortified, that, in a regular condition of the Church in which all the offices are filled, the higher (or **greater**) office of presbyter does not so include the lower (or **less**) office of deacon as to make it legitimate for presbyters to discharge the functions of deacons.

As the other doctrines for which we have contended, namely, that the deacon is not confined to the care of the poor, and that he is not restricted to congregational limits, have been met by little more than assertions to the contrary, we simply refer to the arguments which have been advanced in their support in previous numbers of this REVIEW.

III. We come now, in the third general place, to the consideration of the reviewer's theory as to the nature of the Church, which is flung across the path of our doctrine that the temporalities of the Church ought to be committed to the deacon. The old Form of Government and the new both say that to the deacons may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the Church. The reviewer would expunge this clause, and substitute for it another to this effect: The management of the temporal affairs of the Church ought not to be committed to deacons, as such, but to secular officers. We would amend the clause by substituting "ought to" for "may"—the management of the temporal affairs of the Church ought to be committed to deacons. The issue, therefore, is fairly joined.

We condense a statement of the reviewer's theory from his own account of it. The Church is to be regarded in two aspects. In one aspect, it is "ecclesiastical;" in the other, it is "secular." As ecclesiastical, it has divinely appointed officers, who are ministers of the word, ruling elders, and deacons. As secular, it has no divinely appointed officers, but creates its own offices and appoints its own officers. In this latter sphere, the officers, provided they "be within the organisation," need not be presbyters or deacons,

but may be any persons deemed qualified for the discharge of secular business. Ecclesiastical officers as such, and consequently deacons as such, are excluded from the performance of these secular functions. The two orders or classes of ecclesiastical and secular officers are mutually exclusive, for the reason that they are of "different natures." In the ecclesiastical sphere, the distinction between spiritual and temporal is "totally irrelevant." The real distinction is between ecclesiastical and secular spheres. This being the true distinction, the Church, viewed as ecclesiastical, "involves a constitution different" from that of the Church, contemplated as secular. The two bodies are "different in matter, nature, orders, offices, functions, and ends."¹

There are two suppositions which are forced upon us by an endeavor—a hard one, we confess—to reach an intelligent construction of this theory: Either the Church is one institute or body capable of being regarded in two special aspects distinguishable from each other; or there are two institutes or bodies, different from, but related to, each other. In regard to the first supposition, it may be said, that nothing is more common than to conceive the same thing in different aspects occasioned by the different relations which are sustained or the different functions which are discharged. That is true, but such a construction is impossible in this instance. The aspects of the Church, as an ecclesiastical, and as a secular, body, are declared to be "different in matter, nature, orders, offices, functions, and ends." Clearly, then, these aspects are said to be *essentially* different. Now as to this extraordinary supposition, that the Church may be regarded in two aspects which are essentially different, namely, as an ecclesiastical body and as a secular body, we submit the following remarks.

In the first place, the reduction is illogical. If the two bodies into which the Church is conceived as distributed are "different in matter, nature, orders, offices, functions, and ends," we would have the Church as a genus containing under it the two species, ecclesiastical body and secular body. But the genus here is itself ecclesiastical body, since, from the nature of the case, the Church

¹P. 350.

is an ecclesiastical body; and then we would have an ecclesiastical body distributed into the two species, ecclesiastical body and secular body. Touching this, it may be observed, first, that one of the species is perfectly coincident with the genus—ecclesiastical body is made a species under the genus, ecclesiastical body; and the other species does not possess the essential attribute of the genus, for a secular body cannot be ecclesiastical. Secondly, one of the species, namely, ecclesiastic body, has no specific mark, and the other, namely, secular body, has no generic mark. Thirdly, the one institute, the church, which is an ecclesiastical body, is distributed into species, one of which is exclusive of the very genus under which it is contained, for, plainly, ecclesiastical body is made to contain under it secular body which is non-ecclesiastical. In a word, we have a church, which is in one species nothing but church, and in the other species no church at all—an ecclesiastical body which in one specific aspect is only ecclesiastical, and in the other not at all ecclesiastical.

In the second place, in order to save the unity of the Church, the reviewer says that it is to be viewed in two aspects. Of course, then, both of these aspects must pertain to the same institute. But in order to show that one of the bodies spoken of, namely, the secular, is not really the church at all, one of these aspects of the same institute is declared to be different in essence from the other. The reduction is therefore self-contradictory, since two aspects of the same thing must be the same in essence with that to which they pertain; and consequently must be essentially the same with each other, although specifically different. To say that they are essentially the same and essentially different, is a contradiction. The reviewer does affirm that the Church may be regarded "in two aspects," and at the same time he affirms that these aspects are "different in matter, nature, orders, offices, functions, and ends." This surely is a contradiction.

But, let us take the second supposition, namely, that there are two distinct, but related institutes, the one ecclesiastical, and the other secular, and that these are essentially different from each other. Touching this, the following strictures are presented.

In the first place, this would involve the use of the term *church*

in two generically different senses. We would have one church which is ecclesiastical, and another church which is secular. But such an employment of the term would be inadmissible.

In the second place, an ecclesiastical church would be a tautology, and a church simply secular an impossibility.

In the third place, it would be illegitimate to speak of two such bodies as aspects of one and the same body.

In the fourth place, the reviewer's position, so important in its bearings upon the question of the very nature of the Church, to wit, that the two supposed bodies, ecclesiastical and secular, differ as to "matter, nature, orders, offices, functions, and ends," must be subjected to examination—

1. As to matter. The matter of anything is that out of which it is constructed—the basis of its form. Now, what is the matter of the Church? As she is visible, the persons who compose it. And as, in this relation, it is not necessary to speak of children, we may say, the communicants. What is the matter of the supposed secular body? One of two answers must be given: either the communicants of the Church, or partly the communicants and partly the non-communicating adherents of the church. If the communicants alone, as they would be the matter in both cases, it is impossible to see how the two bodies would differ as to matter. If the communicants partly, and partly the non-communicating adherents of the Church, as the matter would be partly the same in both cases, they could not differ entirely as to matter.

2. As to nature. The term is ambiguous. It may mean entity. If it be taken in this sense, the theory would teach that, as the two bodies, ecclesiastical and secular, differ in nature, they are different entities. The term *nature* may be taken to signify the complement of essential attributes which enter into the make and constitution of a being or thing—its essence. If this be the sense in which it is used, the theory would maintain that the two supposed bodies differ as to essence. Their make and constitution are different; they are separate, although related, institutes. In regard to this particular element of the theory, it is remarked:

VOL. XXXIII., NO. 1.—13.

First, it would have to be admitted, that the two organisations could not be collected into unity under the denomination of the church. Their essence being different, and one essential mark of the church being that it is ecclesiastical, that essential mark cannot characterise an organisation which is confessedly non-ecclesiastical. To call it church is to use the term abusively; it would be equivalent to saying that it is a non-churchly church—a non-ecclesiastical ecclesiastical institute. The only way in which the two bodies could be reduced to unity would be to mount up to some higher genus; for example, ordinance of God. But in the same way the Church and the State are reducible to unity, for each of them is an ordinance of God. Surely not in this way would the attempt be made to collect into unity two bodies, each of which receives the denomination, church. But the secular and non-ecclesiastical body is, in this theory, denominated the church. If it be urged that they are brought into unity upon the principle of numerical coincidence, as the persons who compose them are the same, that plea is excluded; because it is distinctly affirmed that they differ in matter—that is, the persons who compose them are not the same.

Secondly, the church, as a visible institute consisting of men in the flesh, must be temporally supported. But deacons, according to this theory, are restricted to the care of the poor. It is, therefore, not the deacon's business to look after the means by which the temporal existence of the church is to be sustained. It must, consequently, depend for its temporal maintenance upon a related, but essentially different, organisation, which is secular in its matter, nature, orders, offices, functions, and ends. The church could not support itself; it would be a parasite upon another institute purely secular in its nature and appointments. If, in rebuttal of this, it be again said that the personal components of the two bodies are the same, the position is abandoned that the two differ in matter. But if it were admitted that they are the same in matter, why affirm an essential difference between them? In that view the difference would be only specific and formal, and it is conceded that the church, as one, performs acts which are specifically and formally different from others, according to

its relations, to the object matter of its functions, and to the ends which are contemplated.

Thirdly, the supposed secular corporation would, of course, wield the power of the purse. It would hold the property, and collect and manage moneys for the support of pastors and for defraying current expenses. Now, as it is contended that this organisation differs materially and essentially from the ecclesiastical, its whole power might be used to influence and control the election and dismissal of pastors. The ungodly element might dominate the godly. If it be replied that this would be impossible since the persons composing the secular are the same with those comprised in the ecclesiastical organisation, the position is again relinquished that they differ as to matter. But grant that the church, as ecclesiastical, possesses the power of the purse, and the difficulty vanishes.

Fourthly, as the two supposed bodies differ, according to the theory, materially and essentially, the only attainable relief, in the event of a difference between them, as to the management of funds, which would be incapable of other settlement, must be sought by the ecclesiastical body through a resort to courts of law. But, in that case, the ecclesiastical body would be under the necessity of performing an act which, according to this theory, is, as secular, foreign to its genius, which is purely spiritual. What then? Why, it must either suffer wrong which might be legally redressed, or it must violate its spirit and constitution by seeking legal protection for its rights. The only answer to this is, that the two bodies are materially the same; and that would confess the inconsistency of the theory, since it affirms that they are materially different.

3. As to orders and offices. Not much need be said touching a difference as to orders. If there were two materially and essentially different bodies, the one ecclesiastical and the other secular, it would necessarily follow that the officers of each would partake of its nature, and in the sense of different kinds of officers would belong to different orders. That we admit. But, if, as it has been shown, there cannot be two materially and essentially different bodies coming under the common denomination of the

church, the question about different orders becomes useless. Besides, there is great danger of a confusion of terms arising from their being employed in different senses. But the question deserves consideration and is easy of apprehension, What follows from the position that a body which is not ecclesiastical, but purely secular, appoints, for the benefit of the church, officers other than church-officers? For the benefit of the church, we say; for the very existence and operations of the supposed secular society confessedly contemplate that end.

First, if this body which appoints secular officers who are not presbyters and deacons, as such, be in any sense the church, then the church would appoint officers whom Christ never authorised in his word, and whom, therefore, it has no right to create. It is said that these officers are appointed by the church, not as the church, but as a secular body. That, we reply, involves a contradiction. The church is essentially ecclesiastical, and to say that it acts not in its ecclesiastical capacity is to say that it acts when its essence has ceased to exist; which is the same as to say that the church acts when it has ceased to exist. It is not the church which acts in such a case: it is an entirely different body. To maintain that the church may act, but not as church, is to maintain that it can act ecclesiastically and non-ecclesiastically at the same time; which is a contradiction.

There are cases in which the members of the church act out of their ecclesiastical capacity. When, for instance, they assert, against a mob, their right peaceably to meet, by an appeal to the law of the land, they act simply in the capacity of a convention of citizens, and not as a church. When the congregation resisted with arms the assault of the dragoons at Drumclog, they acted not as a church, but as a body of citizens maintaining their natural and civil rights. The difference is clear between the church and a collection of citizens who happen to be members of the church. Such a body is not the church acting not as church, but is in no sense the church. And if an organisation is supposed to exist side by side with the church, which is purely secular, appointing officers to perform functions looking to the temporal maintenance of the church, and the temporal furtherance of

her enterprises, this is not the church conceived to be acting not as church, but is not the church at all.

It is urged that the church may, by the light of nature and in the exercise of Christian prudence, appoint permanent officers of a secular character to compass temporal church-ends. We freely admit that this would be both legitimate and necessary, if the church were not furnished by its Head with officers who are precisely suited to discharge these temporal functions. But it is provided with such officers. Deacons must be proved to be unsuited or incompetent to perform these temporal acts, before the church can resort to her discretionary power to use its natural judgment within the sphere of "circumstances common to human actions and societies." To say that deacons will not answer because business men are needed, is to assume that deacons cannot be business men.

Secondly, if, as must upon this theory be consistently held, the body which appoints these secular officers who are not presbyters or deacons, as such, be a non-ecclesiastical and purely secular body, the following consequences inevitably result:

(1.) Those who make collections during church-services, and hold and distribute them, must be officers appointed by a secular body which is not the church. The proof of this is plain. Upon this theory, the deacon is confined to the care of the poor. Granted, that he may therefore take and distribute the collections for the poor, he is debarred from taking and distributing collections for any other purpose. Upon this theory, also, the presbyter includes the deacon and may do deacon's duty. He, then, may discharge functions contemplating the case of the poor, for they are diaconal functions. But he is, as deacon, equally with the deacon proper, excluded from taking and distributing collections for any other purpose. Who, then, are alone entitled to make, hold, and disburse collections for Foreign Missions, Home Missions, Publication, and every other benevolent object apart from the care of the poor? Officers appointed by a secular body which is not the church. That is the answer enforced by this theory, and it is sufficient to refute it.

(2.) It follows that the officers who manage the Foreign Mis-

sions, Home Missions, and Publication funds, under the care of the General Assembly, must be appointed by a purely secular corporation. Upon this theory, the presbyter includes the deacon and may therefore discharge his functions. Consequently, presbyters may administer the Invalid and Education funds; but since, when they act as deacons, they can only deal with poor funds, they are, by an invincible logic, debarred from administering the Missionary and Publication funds. Who, then, could alone administer them? Again the inevitable answer is, officers appointed by a secular corporation. This point we must insist upon; for as the question before us has a practical bearing upon the administrative policy of the Church, this theory would necessitate a change, the report of which would make both ears tingle. And yet it is maintained in opposition to any change whatsoever in that policy! Be it spoken with deference to the ability with which the theory is enforced, but we are compelled to say that it cannot escape the charge of being unconstitutional and radical,—unconstitutional, for it contradicts the provision of our Constitution by which deacons are empowered to make and distribute collections for other pious uses than the sustenance of the poor, and which declares that it is proper that the management of the temporal affairs of the church should be committed to them; radical, for it involves the appointment, by a secular body, of secular officers for the accomplishment of spiritual ends.

4. We come now to the last alleged elements of difference between the supposed ecclesiastical and secular bodies—namely, functions and ends. The pith of the theory under consideration is, that the church is wholly ecclesiastical and spiritual, and is therefore excluded from discharging secular functions. These must be performed by a secular body wholly different from the church. The functions and ends of one body are ecclesiastical and spiritual; of the other, secular.

Now, first, shall we gravely affirm, that we not only concede, but contend, that the church is wholly ecclesiastical? As a matter of course, an ecclesiastical body is wholly ecclesiastical—the church is wholly the church! All her functions, whether spiritual or temporal, are ecclesiastical functions for the simple

reason that she performs them, and performs them for ecclesiastical ends, some of which are proximate while others are remote. When she preaches the word and administers rule, the proximate end is confessedly alike spiritual and ecclesiastical. When she distributes alms to the poor, the proximate end is the sustenance of the body and therefore temporal, but the remote end is ecclesiastical. So, when she provides herself with houses of worship and adopts means to preserve them, the proximate end is temporal—namely, securing shelter for the bodies of her members and convenient places for their meeting to attend upon ordinances; but the remote end is ecclesiastical. The object-matter of the function of distribution is money, and that is temporal, but the remote end is ecclesiastical. The object-matter in the building and preserving of church edifices is material things, but the remote end is ecclesiastical. It is submitted, that it is not the object-matter and proximate end of a function which furnish its regulative conception in this relation: it is the remote end which gives it. To take the ground that, because the object-matter about which a function is concerned and the proximate end which it contemplates are temporal and secular, therefore an ecclesiastical body cannot legitimately perform it, is to maintain that, because the deacon's function terminates on money as its object-matter and seeks the relief of the body as its proximate end, an ecclesiastical body cannot legitimately discharge it. The church cannot perform diaconal functions because their object-matter and immediate end are temporal and secular. But if it must be admitted that this position is untenable, the principle is conceded that the church, as ecclesiastical, may discharge functions which, although temporal and secular as to their object-matter and proximate ends, contemplate higher ends which are ecclesiastical.

The reviewer strenuously contends that the church by virtue of her very nature and constitution is debarred from the management of secular interests which brings her into relation to the civil magistrate; "she," as wholly ecclesiastical and spiritual, is "not of this world." And yet, immediately after, when speaking of her secular side, he says: "She is simply a corporation in

the world, and, like similar secular bodies, has business which brings her before the civil magistrate." She is a wholly ecclesiastical and spiritual organisation; she is also a secular corporation. She dares not go before the civil magistrate; she has business which obliges her to go before him. Let us understand. Does the pronoun *she* represent one and the same body, or two essentially different bodies? The exegesis is too tough for us. If the secular corporation be "she," it is the church; and if it be the church, it is ecclesiastical, for a non-ecclesiastical church is a contradiction in terms. If it be not "she," it is not the Church. Then say so, and do not speak of it as "she"—the church.

But should the principle be adopted, for which the reviewer seems to plead, and should it be put into practice, a revolutionary change would be effected in our existing administrative policy, in comparison with which what we suggest would sink into insignificance. We mean the principle that the church should, as ecclesiastical, be debarred from holding property and managing secular interests which may have civil relations. Let us see. Funds which are given for the support and advancement of the benevolent schemes of the church, with the understanding that they shall be invested and the interest accruing from them devoted to that end, must be managed by committees appointed by the church through its organ, the General Assembly. These ecclesiastical agents are directly responsible to the court which appointed them. Boards of Directors of Theological Seminaries are appointed partly to invest and manage funds contributed to the endowment of those institutions, and are appointed by church courts, to which they are responsible for the discharge of the trusts reposed in them. A Board of incorporated Trustees is appointed by the General Assembly, and is responsible to it. In these cases, and others which may be supposed, property is held, the management of which involves civil relations, or at least makes it possible for such relations to be involved. As the persons who hold and manage the property are simply agents of the church, it is obvious that it is really the church which holds and manages it. Nor can it be denied that in this matter the church acts, as ecclesiastical, for church courts are the organs through

which she acts, and surely they are ecclesiastical. Whether, therefore, the reviewer's theory be just or not, its practical enforcement would necessitate great changes in our administrative system.

There is, unless we greatly err, scriptural precedent for the right of the church, as ecclesiastical, to hold and manage property. The record in Acts is that "the multitude of them that believed" "had all things common." "As many as were possessors of houses and lands sold them and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made to every man according as he had need." It is evident that this massing of property was not intended alone for the relief of paupers. The whole church drew supplies from the common fund. That fund represented the property of the membership. Now it was certainly held and distributed by the church as an ecclesiastical body, and that with the concurrence and approval of the apostles. Here, then, was a secular function upon a grand scale which was discharged by the apostolic church. The property, materially considered, was secular, but regarded from the point of view of the relations and ends involved, it was also ecclesiastical. It was devoted to the Lord, and so passed out of the category of secular, into that of ecclesiastical, things. The church held it, and the church administered it through deacons as her organs. And, consequently, our church has the best authority for declaring in her Constitution, that to her officers, the deacons "may be properly committed the charge" and "the management of the temporal affairs of the church." This could not be true, if the church, as an ecclesiastical body, is debarred from the charge and management of secular affairs, and ought to commit them to another body, which is in all respects different from itself, and is non-ecclesiastical and purely secular. In what has been said about the management of secular things by the Apostolic Church, we do not mean to intimate that it held relations to the civil power. That is another question. What is secular is not necessarily civil. Touching the difference between them we hope to say a few words before we close.

Secondly, the position is maintained by the reviewer that the church is wholly spiritual; that so far as she is concerned, the distinction between spiritual and temporal is groundless; and that, as wholly spiritual, she is excluded from the performance of functions which relate to secular things. But—

(1) The terms *ecclesiastical* and *spiritual* are not equipollent, nor of equal extent as predicates. All that is spiritual, so far as the church is concerned, is ecclesiastical, but all that is ecclesiastical is not spiritual. Every function which the church legitimately discharges is, from the nature of the case, ecclesiastical; but some of her functions are not spiritual, except remotely—not spiritual as to their object-matter and proximate ends.

(2) It is scarcely necessary to remark that the discussion relates to the visible Church. It would be unmeaning to speak of the officers and functions of the Church invisible.

(3) The distinction between the immaterial and corporeal aspects of the church cannot be overlooked. It is composed of bodies as well as souls. As an association of men in the flesh, the church requires temporal support. Its laborers must have the necessaries of this life—food, raiment, shelter: its pastors, evangelists, home and foreign, its agents to whom it commits the conduct of its benevolent enterprises, need subsistence. The poor, dependent on its benefactions, must have their bodily wants supplied. It must have houses in which to worship, and grounds on which they are built. As to its nature, therefore, the proposition that the church is wholly spiritual must be limited by this necessary qualification.

That the church is wholly spiritual, contemplated in respect to its origin, to its union to Christ and its subjection to him as its sole King and Head, to the indwelling grace of the Holy Ghost, to the directory of its faith and duty, to the doctrines which it is commissioned to inculcate, and to the ultimate end of all its acts; that it is wholly spiritual, in contradistinction from the governments and politics of this world, and from the societies for moral reform and the vindication of human rights, which spring from the voluntary action of man, and seek the accomplishment of purely worldly ends—that, in these respects and in these rela-

tions, the church is wholly spiritual, is a great and mighty principle, for which it has cost us labor and trouble to contend, and which, now that it has been formulated in our theory, should be steadfastly maintained in our practice. All this is gloriously true. But to go further and affirm that the church is wholly spiritual in the sense that it has no temporal side of its being, necessitating the discharge of functions correspondingly temporal, would be to affirm a partial and exaggerated statement not demanded by the potent principle of the church's spirituality. The church is not of the world, but it is in the world; and as long as it is, is under the necessity of paying attention to secular things. Otherwise, its existence in the world, and its work for the salvation of the world, would be a matter of a few days only. Neither can it be proved that Christ committed, nor that the church's common sense would intrust, the means of preserving this temporal existence to an organisation essentially different from itself. The church, under God, is bound to support itself.

Thirdly, the old accepted distinction between the spiritual and the temporal functions of the Church, as ecclesiastical, deserves to be maintained. The terms *temporal* and *secular* are of nearly equal value, and may therefore be used interchangeably—both referring to things as related to this present time or age. The technical refinement is unfounded which would discriminate between the temporal and secular functions of the Church. Consequently, the affirmation that every function of the Church, as ecclesiastical, is both spiritual and temporal, is equivalent to the affirmation that every such function is both spiritual and secular; and that involves a contradiction. A further resort must be had to definition for the sake of clearness. Proceeding by the usual method—which is the only sure one—we find the proximate genus of functions to be ecclesiastical functions, for every function performed by the Church must, from the nature of the case, be an ecclesiastical, or church, function. Now, under this generic conception are included two sorts of function which we are obliged to consider as species, distinguished from each other by specific differences. The question being, What are these specific marks? The answer is, The object-matter about which each class of func-

tions is concerned, and the proximate end which each contemplates. The object-matter and the proximate ends of one class we discover to be spiritual, of the other class to be temporal or secular. Let us illustrate by a comparison between the function of the minister of the word and that of the deacon. The object-matter about which the preaching function is concerned is the truth in the word, and that is spiritual; its proximate end is the conversion and edification of souls, and that is also spiritual. The object-matter about which the diaconal function is concerned is money, and that is temporal; its proximate end is the sustenance of the body and the care of material things, and that is also temporal. While, therefore, the preaching and diaconal functions are generically the same, since they are both ecclesiastical functions, they are specifically different, inasmuch as one is spiritual and the other temporal. One is ecclesiastical and spiritual, the other ecclesiastical and temporal. It is impossible therefore that the spiritual function should include the temporal. To take that ground is to maintain that the generic conception is temporal functions, and that the essential attribute, temporality, descends to and is included in the specific function—spiritual. That is out of the question. The generic conception being ecclesiastical functions, the essence of that kind of function is included in each of the specific sorts of function, spiritual and temporal—both are ecclesiastical; but they are distinguished from each other precisely because the one is spiritual and not temporal, and the other temporal and not spiritual. Each class of officers receives its distinctive denomination from the special kind of function which it performs. Hence, as the preacher and the ruling elder discharge spiritual functions, they are called spiritual officers; and as the deacon performs temporal functions, he is termed a temporal officer. The same sort of reasoning, *mutatis mutandis*, which has been used concerning the preacher and the deacon, may be employed in comparing the ruling elder and the deacon.

We have heard it urged, in opposition to the preceding view, that the preacher's function is partly temporal, because, in the administration of the sacraments, it is concerned about material things as its object-matter—water, bread, wine. This is a mis-

conception. The material elements—water, bread, wine—are not the object-matter about which the administrator's function is concerned: they mediate the truth which is that object-matter. One might as well say that the vocal and other bodily organs of the preacher, and the material elements of the Bible as a book, are the object-matter about which the preaching function is concerned, and therefore it is partly temporal, as say that the material elements of the sacraments are the object-matter of the administrator's function, and therefore it is partly temporal. There is a confusion of the media through which the object-matter is manifested with the object-matter itself. In the case of preaching proper, the medium is verbal signs; in that of the sacraments, inarticulate signs. In both cases, it is not the medium, but the truth mediated, which is the real object-matter of the functions. But as the truth is spiritual, the object-matter of the minister's function, both in preaching and administering the sacraments, is spiritual. Besides this, it will be admitted that the proximate end sought in the administration of the sacraments is in no sense temporal; it is spiritual. The object-matter of the deacon's function is not truth symbolised by the material element—money: it is the material element, money, itself. The distinction is therefore obvious between the object-matter of the preacher's and the deacon's functions. So when, in order to obliterate the distinction between spiritual and temporal functions, it is contended that the ultimate end of the deacon's function is spiritual, we answer: in like manner, the ultimate end is spiritual even of the trustee who, upon the reviewer's theory, is required to be non-ecclesiastical and secular. It is the proximate and not the ultimate end of the deacon's function which stamps his specific designation; and that end is undeniably temporal.

It is true that every spiritual function is performed in time, and in that sense is temporal; and in the world, and in that sense is secular. Who would dream of denying that it must be conditioned by time and place? But such conditions, belonging to every sort of act done by men in every possible relation, could not be used to mark the specific character of a church function. It is also true that the ultimate end contemplated by every tem-

poral function is a spiritual end. But neither can that fact enter into the definition of a specific function. All church functions have reference to such an end. We are shut up to the necessity of defining special ecclesiastical functions by their object-matter and proximate ends, and must, therefore, emphasise the distinction between those which are spiritual and those which are temporal. Consequently, the Church, as church, has temporal or secular functions to discharge for ecclesiastical ends which are remote, and for a spiritual end which is ultimate. So far, then, as "functions and ends" are concerned, there is no ground for holding the existence of two essentially different organisations—the one ecclesiastical and spiritual, the other secular. In all this, no reference has been had to the qualifications of church officers. They could not be treated as an element of definition, for the reason that all church officers ought to be spiritual men. But some of the deacon's qualifications are emphatically secular; they ought to be "business men." The controlling consideration, however, is that the deacon's function terminates on temporal things and temporal ends. That defines him.

It has thus been shown that the theory is untenable which postulates two essentially different bodies, coming under the common denomination of the church: one for the performance of ecclesiastical functions, the other for the discharge of secular; and that the church, as one and the same ecclesiastical body, has, besides a spiritual, a temporal, or secular, side, giving rise to temporal or secular functions corresponding with it. The reviewer's distinction is beset with difficulties which amount to positive contradictions. The true distinction is between the church, as spiritual, and the church, as temporal. Here the church is contemplated as one and the same institute, acting in different relations, as to different objects, and in reference to different ends. No contradiction emerges. When it acts spiritually it acts as the church, and when it acts temporally it acts as the church. In both cases the acts are ecclesiastical; in the one case, being ecclesiastical and spiritual, in the other, ecclesiastical and temporal.

The conclusion to which we are conducted is, that the objec-

tion created by the supposed existence of two essentially different bodies, under the denomination of the church, against the appointment of deacons, as temporal officers, to discharge purely temporal functions, in connexion with all the agencies of the church, is destitute of foundation.

There is another view, a special one, which we have known to be presented and which we must briefly notice. It is that deacons, as church officers, need not be made treasurers, since a treasurer is to be regarded simply in the light of a bank, or any similar depository of money, of a trustworthy character. But, we answer, direct official responsibility to a church court, or the body having authority to appoint, attaches to a church treasurer, which, from the nature of the case, does not to such agents as have been mentioned. The treasurer may employ such sub-agents as he may deem necessary or helpful to the discharge of his duties; but it is he who is officially responsible. And where official responsibility comes in, a church officer is the person to whom it ought to attach. As the function is temporal, the deacon, as the temporal officer furnished by Christ to the Church, ought to be assigned to its performance. We sincerely trust that this view will not prevail to neutralise a great scriptural principle—the principle that temporal officers ought to be appointed to the discharge of purely temporal functions—just at the critical point of its practical application. Of what value is a principle if it be not applied?

It will be observed, that in this discussion touching the nature of the Church, we have disentangled the two conceptions, what is secular, and what is civil. This was done purposely and warrantably, because the terms are not equivalent, and one has no right to treat them as though they were. The spheres represented by them overlap, but they are not coextensive: what is civil is secular, but all that is secular is not civil. Nor, have we done the reviewer injustice by this disjunction, because his own definition of the secular body is too narrow, and therefore inadequate.¹ He gives us “four marks” which are connoted by the word *secular*—

¹Pp. 349, 350.

“the acquisition, disposal, management, and custody of property and cash.” The secular body, then, is one which acquires, etc. But these are only specific marks. The generic mark—the essential attribute, is omitted. The connotation of marks is consequently incomplete. Now, what is the wanting generic mark? The reviewer would be obliged to answer—he does elsewhere imply—that it is the essential attribute of the Church. But that would have been to make the secular body ecclesiastical, and so his theory would have been upset by his own definition. Indeed, it is upset by what ought to have been his definition. This is not all. He further narrows this already too narrow definition by combining the four specific marks into one—relation to the civil magistrate; and that does not necessarily include all the others.

Had the reviewer confined the discussion to the Civil Relations of the Church, in temporal matters, he would have raised a fair and an important question, which we think merits consideration. The relation of the civil magistrate to the Church *quoad spiritualia* is perhaps settled among us. But it seems that, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the question is to be discussed, What is his relation to the Church *quoad temporalia*? So let it be. We trust that the distinguished reviewer may throw light on that difficult subject. But we respectfully suggest that one condition of success will consist in not identifying the secular and the civil.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

We turn aside from the mere holiday books, which at this season crowd the counters, to notice at the outset three editions of the New Testament. Two^{2 3} of them are forms of the late Revision. The other one¹ (Westcott & Hort's) is destined to become the classic form of the text in the original Greek. The Revisers had access to this collection of selected readings, and did not often deviate from them. Westcott & Hort had themselves the advantage of the completed labors of Tregelles and also of Vercellone's superb *quasi-facsimile* edition of the Vatican Manuscript, B. The Appendix by the author, and the Introduction by the indefatigable Dr. Schaff, make up the best compendium of Biblical literature. Germane to this is Mr. Merrill's account of the most important class of sources of the text. The subject of the Canon is arousing much curiosity just now. This is as it should be; and we welcome every judicious, scientific, or popular⁴ defence of the bulwarks of the inspired word. There is much to be learned from the great writers who have adorned the history of modern Judaism. Notably is this true in the field of biblical research. Ample stores, too, of information are to be derived from the Jews

¹The New Testament in the Original Greek. The Text revised by Brooke Foss Westcott, D. D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Canon of Peterborough; and F. J. A. Hort, D. D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, late Fellow of Trinity College. Cambridge, American edition. With an Introduction by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., President of the American Bible Revision Committee. Crown 8vo., cloth, \$2. D. Lothrop & Co., Boston.

²Revised New Testament. Large 12mo., \$1; morocco, \$1.50; red line, \$1.50. *Ibid.*

³The Comparative New Testament, having the Old and New Versions on opposite pages. Large 12mo., 1004 pp., \$1.50. *Ibid.*

⁴History of the Manuscripts. With *fac simile* illustrations of the various New Testament Manuscripts. By the Rev. Geo. E. Merrill. 12mo., cloth, \$1. *Ibid.*

⁵A Short History of the Bible. Being a Popular Account of the Foundation and Development of the Canon. By Bronson C. Keeler. 12mo., 120 pp., flexible cloth. 75c. Century Publishing Co., Chicago.

VOL. XXXIII., NO. 1.—14.

in the domain of speculative thought. Mr. Munk's treatise¹ is accordingly entitled to a respectful attention. The question of a Christian Sabbath² is debated, however, not by a Jew, but by a "churchly" Gentile. We think we have already strongly commended the learning and ability of Professor Riddle, who now appears before us with a valuable contribution³ to the International Revision Commentary. The book is, of course, edited by the œcumenical and relentless Dr. Philip Schaff. Commentaries abound in our time, and new ones are appearing every day. Dr. Whedon's sixth volume⁴ covers some of the most attractive and difficult books in the Old Testament, and the fruits of his past endeavors lead us to entertain favorable anticipations as to the result of the present undertaking. The "Speaker's" Commentary on the New Testament has now reached its third volume;⁵ enough has been said in these flying notes before about the character of the men who write for it. The names of Dean Howson and Bishop Alexander would alone have warranted the quality of the workmanship. It is hard to put a man down who has a mind to stay up. Ex-Professor Robertson Smith reappears before the world

¹Philosophy and Philosophical Authors of the Jews. By S. Munk. Translated by Dr. Is. Kalisch. 60 pp. cloth, \$1. Bloch & Co., Cincinnati.

²Is there a Christian Sabbath? By a Churchman of Northern Ohio. 18mo., 174 pp., cloth, 60c. Brown & Derby, New York.

³The Gospel according to St. Mark. By Prof. Matthew B. Riddle, D. D. (The International Revision Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by Philip Schaff, D. D.) 16mo., 255 pp., cloth, red edges, \$1. Charles Scribner & Sons. New York

⁴Commentary on the Old Testament. Vol. VI. Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song. Book of Job, by J. K. Burr, D. D.; Book of Proverbs, by W. Hunter, D. D.; Book of Ecclesiastes and Solomon's Song, by A. B. Hyde, D. D. Edited by D. D. Whedon, LL. D. 12mo., 557 pp., cloth, \$2.25. Phillips & Hunt, New York.

⁵The Bible Commentary: New Testament. Vol. III. The Epistle to the Romans, by the Rev. E. H. Gifford; Corinthians, by Canon Evans and the Rev. Joseph Waite; Galatians, by Dean Howson; Ephesians, by the Rev. F. Meyrick; Philippians, by Dean Gwynn; Colossians, Thessalonians, and Philemon, by the Bishop of Derry; Timothy and Titus, by the Rev. H. Wace and Bishop of London. 8vo., 630 pp., cloth, \$5.00. Charles Scribner's Sons.

in a volume of Lectures on certain topics in Old Testament Introduction.¹ We have referred to this volume before. We refer to it now again in order to state to those who happen to be ignorant of the fact that Dr. Watts of Belfast has just met this adroit attack on orthodoxy with a crushing rejoinder. Professor Smith, with extensive and profound learning, and no little acuteness, betrays a fanciful and unbalanced judgment, and is a singularly inaccurate and sophistical reasoner. Principal Douglass offers us a first rate exposition of the book of Judges.² He opposes the literal sacrifice of Jephtha's daughter, and expunges from his translation the encomium upon Jael. This last point is one worthy of further inquiry. Godet's "Romans"³ has already been barely mentioned in these brief notices. We add now that whilst the book is very brilliant, and in the main satisfactory, it favors the Arminian exegesis of Chapter VII., and defends a high governmental view of the Atonement.

The venerable Dr. Cairns is fast becoming the Nestor of the United Presbyterian Church, and is certainly a Coryphæus of Presbyterianism throughout the world. Undoubtedly, too, he is one of the great thinkers of the age. His new and elaborate work on eighteenth century infidelity⁴ has been received with just, though discriminating, laudation at the hands of all sound critics. Dr. Stoughton is another writer whose place of eminence is secure, and whose works need no advertisement. His History of Religion in England⁵ is not unlikely to become the standard authority

¹The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. Twelve Lectures on Biblical Criticism. By W. Robertson Smith, M. A. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1881. 12mo., pp. 446.

²The Book of Judges. By G. C. M. Douglass, D. D., Principal of the Free Church College, Glasgow. 8vo., pp. 96. Edinburgh, T & T. Clark. Scribner & Welford, New York. 80c. (One of the series of hand books for Bible classes, edited by the Rev. Dr. Marcus Dods and Dr. Alexander Whyte.)

³Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By F. Godet, D. D. Translated from the French by the Rev. A. Cusin, M. A. Vol. II., pp. 434. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark. Scribner & Welford, New York.

⁴Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century as contrasted with its Earlier and Later History. Cunningham Lecture for 1880. By John Cairns, D. D.

⁵History of Religion in England. From the opening of the London

on that subject. Anything that Delitsch¹ publishes is sure to be of high rank in the scale of biblical learning, and of somewhat more than moderate rank in the scale of orthodox theology. He is a Semi-Pelagian Lutheran. The *great* history of Redemption is the one by Edwards. The late Professor Diman's contribution to the Theistic controversy is an exceedingly neat volume,² and handsomely printed. What is far more, it is a masterly argument. Of all recent discussions of this subject it is one of the most opportune, most penetrating, most comprehensive, most unexceptionable. The author's rare advantages in Germany, under Trendelenburg and others, added to his personal gifts and attainments of various kinds, and his orthodox attitude, gave him a special fitness for the task of meeting the scientific scepticism that is now so rife in the country and in the world. The announcement of another work by the late Dr. Symington,³ of Edinburgh, will excite surprise as well as gladness. The theme is one which might well employ the tongues of angels.³

The notorious "shepherd," who in an American Court of Justice was proved to have starved some of the lambs of his "fold," has the boldness to attempt a vindication⁴ of his conduct. We surmise that he admits the starving, but attributes it to the want of accessible pasturage. If Mr. Abbott's History of the Church⁵ be anything like his history of Napoleon Bonaparte, it is emiparliament to the end of the Eighteenth Century. By the Rev. John Stoughton, D. D. New and revised edition. In six volumes, large 12mo. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1881.

¹Old Testament History of Redemption. By Franz Delitsch. 12mo., 213 pp., cloth, \$1.80. Scribner & Welford.

²The Theistic Argument as affected by Recent Theories. By J. Lewis Diman, D. D. Lowell Institute Lectures, pp. viii., 392. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1881.

³Messiah the Prince; or, The Mediatorial Dominion of Jesus Christ. By William Symington, D. D., late Professor of Theology in the Reformed Presbyterian Church. With a Memoir of the Author by his Sons. London, T. Nelson & Sons, Paternoster Row; Edinburgh, and New York, 1881.

⁴From Pulpit to Prison, from Prison to Pulpit. Vindication of the Rev. Edward Cowley. Printed for the author. American News Company, New York. 18mo., 72 pp., paper, 25c.

⁵History of Christianity. By John S. C. Abbott. Illustrated, 12mo., 504 pp., \$2. D. Lothrop & Co., Boston.

nently readable and thoroughly untrustworthy. We are sure Mr. Arthur Gilman has made an entertaining book out of his right royal and yet truly barbarous materials.¹ During the absence of Mr. Joseph Cook in Europe, the Boston Monday Lectures were continued by others in his room. These are now published in the same series and form with the others,² and under the same editorial care. They are ten in number, together with an introductory one by Mr. Cook himself. His coadjutors are Bishop Clark of Rhode Island, Dr. E. G. Robinson, President of Brown University, Dr. Thomas Guard, of Baltimore, Ex-President Hopkins, President McCosh, Chancellor Crosby, Dr. George A. Crooks, the Rev. Samuel W. Dike, Dr. J. W. Thomas, Dr. John Cotton Smith. It is a volume of unequal merit, but one of value as well as of diversified talent. Old Alexander von Humboldt ought never to have said that the American translator³ of Goethe had "travelled farther and seen less" than anybody he had ever met. This was only one of several ill-natured and untrue sayings which ought never to have been published. Mr. Taylor is not more distinguished by the extent of the geographical area he has traversed than by the literary tone and the faint romantic and even poetic aroma of his descriptions. He is withal an intelligent and practised observer, and an honest witness; and can on occasion give his facts as prosaically as need be. The voluminous Dr. Mathews is a pleasant writer, but relies too much on the sayings of others.⁴ Coit's History⁵ will probably take place by the side of Duyckinck's Cyclopædia.

¹Kings, Queens, and Barbarians; or, Talks about Seven Historic Ages. By Arthur Gilman. Illustrated, 16mo., \$1. *Ibid.*

²Boston Monday Lectures, 1880-81: Christ and Modern Thought, with a Preliminary Lecture on the Methods of Meeting Modern Unbelief. By Joseph Cook. Roberts Brothers.

³Bayard Taylor's Library of Travel. Consisting of Japan in our day; Travels in Arabia; Travels in South Africa, Central Asia, the Lake Regions of Central Africa, Siam, the land of the White Elephant. With many illustrations. Handsomely bound. Six volumes, sq. 12mo., cloth. \$6.00 a set, \$1.25 a volume separately. *Ibid.*

⁴Literary Style. By William Mathews, LL. D. S. C. Griggs & Co., Chicago. \$1.50.

⁵History of American Literature. By Moses Coit. 8vo., 674 pp., half leather, \$3. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The advances that have been made in our day by the Empire of Japan have few parallels in history.¹ Who knows but that Japan may yet become the gateway through which the soldiers of the cross may pass on to the conquest of Asiatic heathenism in the vast regions that lie beyond? Spain, too, is connected with the work of foreign missions, and connected with the missions of our own branch of the Church; for Spanish is the language that is written and spoken in the United States of Colombia, and in Mexico. There are however many other reasons, chiefly of a historical and literary nature, to recommend to us the octavo volume of Señor de Amicis.² One of the most powerful rejoinders to Mr. Darwin was from the pen of Dr. St. George Mivart, one of England's most eminent naturalists. We have now a book from him on the cat.³ If any body ought to know the truth about cats, it is this great anatomist and able writer, who though a real papist, is said to have half seduced Darwin himself into modifying very essentially his doctrine as to evolution.

If her royal highness, the Princess Beatrice, can make pictures that are as winsome as her own face (at least when she is smiling), her Birth-day Book⁴ cannot be wanting in genuine attractiveness. The cost of the superb quarto will unfortunately place it beyond the means of the ordinary reader. Yet the *édition de luxe* of Mr. Seguin in "Rural England" is between two and three times that price.⁵ The very name carries us away to the Peak of Derbyshire, the south-downs of Somerset, the sea-girt cliffs of Cornwall and Devon, the hop-fields of Kent, and the velvet meads of

¹Unbeaten Tracks in Japan. By Isabella L. Bird. 8vo., 838 pp., cloth, \$3. *Ibid.*

²Spain and the Spaniards. By Edmundo de Amicis. 8vo., 438 pp., cloth, \$2. *Ibid.*

³The Cat: an Introduction to the Study of Back-boned Animals, especially Mammals. By St. George Mivart, Ph. D., F. R. S. New York: Scribner & Welford, 580 pp. (illustrated).

⁴A Birth-day Book. With Designs in Water Colour. By the Princess Beatrice. Reproduced in *facsimile* by chromo-lithography and illumination. 4to. cloth, extra gilt, \$15. *Ibid.*

⁵Rural England. By L. H. Seguin. *Edition de luxe*. With over 200 illustrations on India paper. Folio, vellum, and gold inlaid, \$40. *Ibid.*

Warwickshire and Oxfordshire. Mr. Dyce has long been acknowledged one of our most learned and approved Shakespeareans. This new library edition of the dramatist seems to have left little to ask for.¹ The graphic sketches from India present us with something that is really new as well as valuable.² Everything from the author of "Footprints" is presumptively good, so far as observation, talent, style, and character go.³

We think there was a popular treatise needed like that of Mr. Perry⁴ on the remains of antique chiselling. The abundant drawings would be enough to make the volume desirable. A book of kindred but in some respects more general and more ambitious aim, in relation to certain aspects of modern art, has been written by a noted American architect.⁵ The story of the Mexican war⁶ is as stirring as many things that are confined to the pages of fiction. The sound of the names which have been given to the battle-fields in Mexico is as musical, if not so high and sonorous, as the sound of the names of the battle-fields of Amadis de Gaul or of the Cid Roderigo—Palo Alto, Resaca de la Palma, Pueblo, Vera Cruz, Buena Vista. Mexico was the camp of instruction for the veterans of the war between the States.

After Carey, and Henry Martyn, and Morrison, we think spontaneously of such names as Moffat, and Judson,⁷ Livingstone,⁸

¹Shakespeare's Complete Works. By the Rev. A. Dyce. New Library Edition, with Glossary, etc., etc. 10 vols, 8vo., cloth, \$30. *Ibid.*

²Indian Pictures, or, India Illustrated. Drawn with Pen and Pencil. 8vo., cloth, extra gilt, \$3.50. *Ibid.*

³Footprints: Nature Seen on its Human Side. By Sarah Tytler. Illustrated. 12mo., cloth gilt, \$1.50. *Ibid.*

⁴Greek and Roman Sculpture. A Popular Introduction to the History of Greek and Roman Sculpture, designed to promote the knowledge and appreciation of the Remains of Ancient Art. By Walter Copland Perry. With several hundred illustrations. Royal 8vo. *Ibid.*

⁵The Nature and Function of Art, more especially of Architecture. By Leopold Eidlitz. 8vo., 520 pp., cloth, gilt top, \$4. A. C. Armstrong & Co., N. Y.

⁶History of the War between the United States and Mexico. By John L. Jenkins. 12mo., 500 pp., cloth, \$1.75. John E. Potter & Co., Phila.

⁷The Life of the Rev. Adoniram Judson. By J. Clement. 12mo., 336 pp., cloth, \$1.75. *Ibid.*

⁸The Personal Life of David Livingstone, LL. D., D. C. L. By William Garden Blaikie, D. D., LL. D. 12mo., 508 pp., cloth, \$2.50.—*Ibid.*

and Duff have only just disappeared from the scene. The method of the missionary whose life is written by Mr. Clement was very different from that of the one whose biographical features are portrayed for us by Dr. Blaikie. The reigning school of French poetry is the romantic, as distinguished from the classic school. Such men as Victor Hugo, and De Musset, and Gautier, have long since ousted the champions and disciples of Corneille, Racine, Boileau, Voltaire. Voltaire occupies a somewhat transitional ground between the two extremes of Hugo and Corneille. The development of *lyrical* poetry of the romantic order has however outrun the corresponding advances made by the romantic drama.¹ Mr. Donald G. Mitchell has so genial a pen of his own that we stand ready to vouch, if need be, for his "old story-tellers."²

Of the three great idealists of German philosophy, Fichte,³ the first of the series, has probably exerted the largest amount of personal magnetism. Dr. John Young, in his "Province of Reason," argues hard to prove that Fichte was at heart, and in spite of his metaphysics, a good man. A similar plea is put in for Schleiermacher and even for Spinoza. This reminds one of Professor Edwards A. Park's ingenious distinction between "the theology of the intellect and the theology of the feelings." Some of our readers need not despair of living to see the canonisation of Hobbes or even of Bolingbroke. We nevertheless frankly concede the vast moral interval between such a man as Fichte and such a man, for instance, as Shaftesbury, or Gibbon.

Gottschalk, the pianist, bore the same relation to Haydn that Gautier did to Racine.⁴ It was an event of a life-time to hear

¹French Dramatists of the Nineteenth Century. By I. Brander Matthews. Crown 8vo., \$2. Charles Scribner's Sons.

²About Old Story-Tellers: Of how and when they lived and what stories they told. By Donald G. Mitchell. New edition, with numerous illustrations. 12mo., 237 pp. *Ibid.*

³Fichte. By Professor Adamson. With Portrait. Being Vol. IV. of Philosophical Classics for English Readers. Edited by Wm. Knight, LL. D., 12mo., extra cloth, \$1.25. J. B. Lippincott & Co.

⁴Notes of a Pianist. By Louis Moreau Gottschalk, Pianist and Composer, Chevalier of the Orders of Isabella the Catholic, Charles III.,

Gottschalk and Thalberg play together. Professor S. S. Haldeman is the man who is said to understand Grimm's laws of permutation better than Grimm ever did himself.¹

The history of the Jacobins in England² constitutes one of the most curious chapters in the annals of that kingdom. How is it that the amiable and self-contented Mr. Tupper ever became D. C. L. and F. R. S. passes comprehension. By far the best thing about the "Proverbial Philosophy"³ is the sound of its name. We take that back. It has the high praise of absolute moral harmlessness. The author of this vapid and disjointed poem (?) evidently "would not hurt a fly." We are gladdened by the pictures illustrative of bird-life, by Mr. Watkins and Señor Giacomelli, even if we dare not buy the book that contains them.⁴ The painting of flowers in water-colors is a pretty art that is coming into great vogue.⁵

We own to a weakness for the Dog (spelled with a big D). By the bye, the best thing we ever saw from the pen of the late edi-

and Lion of Holstein-Limburger, Member of the Philharmonic Societies of Bordeaux, New York, Havana, Rio de Janeiro, etc., etc., during his Professional Tours in the United States, Canada, the Antilles, and South America. Preceded by a short Biographical Sketch and Contemporaneous Criticism. Edited by his sister, Clara Gottschalk. Translated from the French by Robert E. Peterson, M. D. Crown 8vo., extra cloth, \$2.50. *Ibid.*

¹Word-Building. For the use of Classes in Etymology. By S. S. Haldeman, LL. D., M. N. A. S. 16mo., extra cloth. *Ibid.*

²The Story of the English Jacobins. Being an account of the Persons Implicated in the charges of High Treason, 1794. By Edward Smith, F. S. S. 188 pp., paper, 25 c.; cloth, 50 c. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., N. Y.

³Proverbial Philosophy. By Martin F. Tupper, M. A., D. C. L., F. R. S. With illustrations. Extra crown, 4to, cloth, gilt edges, \$4. *Ibid.*

⁴Pictures of Bird Life in Pen and Pencil. By the Rev. W. G. Watkins. Illustrated with full-page pictures by Giacomelli. With a number of smaller illustrations. New edition. Cloth, full gilt sides and edges, \$7.50; full morocco, \$15. *Ibid.*

⁵Flower Painting in Water Colors. With 20 *facsimile* colored plates. Carefully executed from original designs by F. E. Holme, F. L. S., F. S. A. With instructions by the artist. Interleaved with drawing-paper. Crown 4to, cloth gilt, \$2.50. *Ibid.*

tor of Scribner's Magazine, was his metrical address to *his dog*. We grant that the dog has an unfavorable record in the Scriptures. It must be remembered however that the scavenger, and the carnivorous dog of the Bible (the only kinds ever mentioned there) have little in common with the noble brute that now sometimes goes under that once dishonored name. Christianity and civilisation have united to do much for this ill-used, but capable, high-strung, and grateful animal. Dickens once said, Lord Houghton, "I lead the life of a dog." "Yes," was the first reply, "of a St. Bernard dog who spends his days in saving other people's lives." Cassell's French Dictionary will prove a great aid in understanding the *new* words and idioms.² Miss Mitford has whetted still further the appetite awakened by Tom Moore. The associated names of Mangan⁴ and John Mitchel give us a double guarantee for the volume issued by P. M. Haverty. Whatever may be said of Bayard Taylor's books of travel, there can be but one opinion as to some of his lyrics.⁵

¹Illustrated Book of the Dog. By Vero Shaw, B. A. Cantab. With 28 *facsimile* colored plates, drawn from life expressly for the work, and numerous wood engravings. Demy 4to, cloth bevelled, \$12.50; half morocco, \$17.50. *Ibid.*

²French Dictionary, Cassell's (French-English, English-French). Enlarged by the addition of nearly 200 pages. New edition. Extra crown, 8vo., 1146 pp., cloth, \$1.50. *Ibid.*

³The Poets and Poetry of Ireland. By Alfred M. Williams. With Historical and Critical Essays and Notes. 12mo., \$2. J. R. Osgood & Co., Boston.

⁴Poetical Works of James Clarence Mangan. With a Biographical Sketch by John Mitchel. Re-issue. 12mo., 500 pp., cloth, \$1.50. P. M. Haverty, New York.

⁵Home Ballads. By Bayard Taylor. With illustrations. 8vo., 62 pp., cloth, \$5; morocco, \$9; tree-calf, \$9. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

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

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

☞ All business communications should be addressed to the Proprietor, JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued until a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or after the first number of a volume is published.

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

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

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

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

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

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

Vol. XXXIII.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXXII.

No. 2.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. HOME MISSIONS—HOW SHALL THEY BE CONDUCTED? By the Rev. J. LEIGHTON WILSON, D. D., Baltimore, Md.,	219
II. A MEMORIAL OF THE LIFE AND LABORS OF THE REV. STUART ROBINSON. By the Rev. Prof. THOS. E. PECK, D. D., Union Theological Seminary, Va.,	237
III. PRESBYTERIAN GOVERNMENT NOT A HIERARCHY, BUT A COMMONWEALTH. By the late Rev. R. J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D., LL. D.,	258
IV. THE RISE AND FALL OF THE CONFEDERATE GOVERNMENT.,	290
V. THE NEW THEORY OF THE MINISTRY,	313
VI. THE REPORT OF THE LAST ASSEMBLY ON THE OFFICE OF EVANGELIST. By the Rev. D. E. JORDAN, Henderson, N. C.,	333
VII. THE PRESBYTERIAN DIACONATE AGAIN. By the Rev. J. A. LEFEVRE, D. D., Baltimore, Md.,	346
VIII. THE DIACONATE OF SCRIPTURE AGAIN. By the Rev. J. A. LEFEVRE, D. D., Baltimore, Md.,	359
IX. WHY WAS JESUS BAPTIZED? By the Rev. HERBERT H. HAWES, Farmville, Va.,	369
X. THE REVIEWER REVIEWED. By the Rev. S. T. MARTIN, Mills River, N. C.,	386
XI. CRITICAL NOTICES,	413
XII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	428

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1882.

With the address of each subscriber, we now print the date of the number for which he has paid. For example, those who have paid in the current volume—Vol. XXXIII.—will find after their names, “Oct. 1882,” which means that they have paid for the October number of 1882, and for all preceding it. If any one has paid for all past volumes, and one of Vol. XXXIII., he will find “Jan. ’82 and 25c. ;” which means that he has paid for the January number of 1882, and 25 cents on the April number. And so in other cases.

Those who have not paid for the current volume will confer a favor by forwarding the amount due to JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C.

In compliance with the wishes of many friends, it is announced that henceforth, as a general rule, the names of writers for this REVIEW will be attached to their articles, and the initials of each to the critical notices.

The REVIEW will continue to be, as it has always been, an open forum favoring free discussion within limits. More than ever it is desired to make it a representative of our whole Church, as its name imports, and a faithful exponent of the Calvinistic Theology and the Presbyterian Polity.

Communications for its pages may be addressed to JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C., or to ROBERT L. DABNEY, Hampden Sidney, Virginia, or to JOHN B. ADGER, Pendleton, South Carolina.

A more generous support by Southern Presbyterians would enable the proprietor to make the work more worthy of its name.

[Entered at the Post-Office at Columbia, S. C., as second-class postal matter.]

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXXII.

ARTICLE I.

HOME MISSIONS—HOW SHALL THEY BE CONDUCTED?

It is generally agreed among our Christian people that the work of Foreign Missions ought to be conducted under the direction and superintendence of the General Assembly. Presbyteries and Synods are fully competent to carry on the work, if they had the means and facilities, and could do it as effectually and economically in their separate character as in combination with other Presbyteries. But as Presbyteries, with few exceptions, perhaps, have not the means of themselves, and as separate action would involve a great increase of machinery as well as of expense, the work, by common consent, is committed to the General Assembly, the proper representative of the whole body. Presbyteries, in accordance with our Book of Order, in ordaining men to the work of foreign evangelisation, have agreed to transfer them to the control of the Assembly, so far as their general work is concerned, but without abdicating their right of control, so far as the moral and ministerial character of these brethren is concerned. In this view of the matter, our Church, so far as is known, is very nearly a unit.

In relation to the Home work, however, as also of Education, there is some diversity of views as to the mode in which it should be carried on. The great mass of our people hold that so far as

this department of labor is concerned, there ought to be one common treasury, out of which, according to certain rules agreed upon by the whole body, the wants of all the Presbyteries should be supplied. Others—and among them some of our wisest and best men—contend that the work of Home Missions, and also of Education, ought to be entirely and exclusively under the direction of the Presbyteries, with the single reservation that all surplus funds or certain percentages on all funds raised for Domestic Missions shall be passed over to a central treasury, under the control of the Assembly, to be used for the benefit of the poorer Presbyteries, and for carrying the gospel into destitute and frontier regions. The difference of views here is what we propose to discuss in the following pages. But before proceeding to the main subject of discussion, there are two points of incidental importance that we wish to notice.

One of these comes in the form of an objection to Committees, as such, under the direction of the Assembly. It is maintained that where there are a number of these, each having its own Secretary and Treasurer, there is danger of their consolidating their powers, so as not only to protect each other, but also so as to foil any attempt that may be made to investigate their internal affairs, no matter how urgent the case may be. This is no new objection. It is almost always brought forward, especially in the Presbyterian Church, when any special powers are delegated to any one man or set of men outside of the well-beaten track of ecclesiastical usage. Nothing is more dreaded among us than the one-man power. Nor is it strange or to be regretted that the Church, in view of her past experience, should diligently guard against the improper assumption of power, either by individuals or associations within her own bosom. Her internal affairs need, from time to time, to be closely scrutinised. At the same time, this scrutiny may be so unrelentingly pressed as to defeat the very object for which special powers are sometimes conferred. The charge of combination for mutual protection was preferred against the Secretaries at the last Assembly; and when proof was demanded, it could not be brought forward, but the speaker explained that it was to the *liability* to such abuse of power that he

had special reference. The same argument, and in almost the same form, was brought forward again in the July number of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, when the proceedings of the Assembly were under review. The writer here again exempts the Secretaries from the actual abuse of power, but inveighs strongly against the *tendency* to such abuse, and infers, as a necessary consequence, that the fewer of these Committees under the care of the Assembly, the better.

Now, the two brethren referred to have been Professors in our Theological Seminaries for many years, and one of them is still discharging the high vocation of that office; and it has been the occasion of much surprise that neither of them seemed to see how easy and natural it would be to prefer the same charges against the Professors of our Theological Seminaries. If there are any ministers in the Church who have special advantages for exerting extraordinary powers, it is undoubtedly these Professors. Now, would it be wise, simply because of the possibility or tendency to the abuse of power, that our Seminaries should be dissolved, or the number of Professors be reduced? We have too much esteem for the piety and good sense of these brethren even to suppose that they would pervert the power intrusted to them to the accomplishment of any selfish or ambitious ends.

But why should the Secretaries of our benevolent schemes, so long as no charge of usurpation of power is preferred, not stand on the same high ground of confidence before the churches? Why should the possibility, or even the liability, of their doing wrong, be paraded before the Christian public, when its only effect can be to injure those important causes which they represent? But it may be asked in a general way, what important trust can be committed to fallible man that is not liable to abuse? Furthermore, if every enterprise is to be abandoned simply because it is liable to abuse, how is the world ever to be evangelised through the instrumentality of earthen vessels?

Another incidental matter which we propose to notice, is what a writer in the October number of the REVIEW (page 616) says about the prelatial powers involved in the office of Secretary; having more special reference, we suppose, to the Secretary of

Foreign Missions. The writer is perhaps not alone in this view of the matter, and it is on this account that we deem it necessary to notice it. The statement in the REVIEW is put cautiously and hypothetically in the first instance, but the writer goes on to argue the case as if he really believed that such powers did inhere in the office of Secretary. He does not charge the Secretary, if we understand him aright, with playing the part of prelate, but that such powers belong to his office, and that they may be brought into exercise at any time the incumbent may choose to do so. In supporting his position, he quotes what Dr. Thornwell said about the Old Boards and their Secretaries ; but failed to mention, as he ought to have done, that Dr. Thornwell assisted in forming the present constitutions of our committees, and that he felt satisfied that all the objectionable features of the one had been carefully eliminated from the other. He not only approved of the structure of our present schemes, but he was an active member of one of them from the time of their enactment to the day of his death.¹ The writer also refers to the fact that Dr. Janeway, Secretary of Domestic Missions for the Northern Church, became known in the country generally as *Pope Janeway*, because of the exercise of certain arbitrary powers in distributing the Domestic Missionary funds ; but here again the writer failed to couple with the statement the important fact, that Dr. Janeway was simply carrying out the instructions of his General Assembly, and that that Assembly, and not Dr. Janeway, was responsible for those unjust and arbitrary measures. The writer infers, and upon grounds that no one will dispute, that the investing of the Secretary with prelatical powers undermines the great Presbyterian doctrine of the *parity* of the ministry. This is a serious matter, and if there was any solid ground upon which to rest the charge, the Church ought to look into the matter at

¹It would be well for brethren who quote from Dr. Thornwell, to remember that he was not the editor of his own works. Had he lived to revise them for publication, and especially those of his earlier years, he would no doubt have made important changes and modifications, which, of course, his editors had no right to do. To mention no other item, he would undoubtedly have modified what he wrote about Presbyteries conducting the work of Foreign Missions, for he afterwards approved the course now in use.

once. But how does the Secretary come by these extraordinary powers? They are not self-assumed; for he is exculpated on all hands, and by the writer as well as others, from exercising any undue or improper authority.

They are not derived from the Constitution of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions; according to that instrument, he is styled, "the Secretary of Foreign Missions," "and is the Committee's organ of communication with the General Assembly, and with all portions of the work intrusted to the care of this Committee." Surely it will require very close scrutiny to find even the germs of prelacy here. Are these powers conferred by the Executive Committee? This they could do only by abdicating all personal responsibility and devolving the whole work upon the Secretary. The writer intimates that this is the case, but we hope this was done without intending to offer an affront, as it certainly does, to the members of that Committee.

Now we wish to state here for the benefit of the writer, as well as others who may entertain similar views, that no act looking to the control or government of any part of the missionary work, is ever intrusted to the Secretary alone. The Secretary, if he was imbued with a single grain of wisdom, would not desire to exercise any authority of the kind, and the Committee could not conscientiously grant it even if it were desired. Neither the Secretary nor the Treasurer ever expends one dollar of mission money without the formal sanction of the Committee. Whatever may be the case elsewhere and with others, the Baltimore Committee is always faithful and conscientious in the discharge of all the duties that have been laid upon them; and the Church is under great obligations to them for the time and labor and thought spent by them in the discharge of those duties. No important act connected with the missionary work is ever performed by the Secretary except in conjunction with the Executive Committee. The missionary is appointed in the first instance by a vote of the Committee, and not more upon the recommendation of the Secretary than upon the testimony of others; his field of labor, as well the particular kind of work in which he is to engage, is determined in the same way; he can be transferred from one post of labor to

another only by the same authority; his salary is determined and the amount of funds allowed him for carrying on his work is always settled by a formal vote of the Committee. The vote of the Secretary counts no more than that of any other member of the Committee. Not only so, but he sometimes finds himself in a very anomalous position. He is not unfrequently "floored" by a vote in the Committee, and before he can regain his feet, he hears himself denounced as a prelate from without.

The Committee, acting as an ecclesiastical commission, does exercise general control of the missionary work, but only to the extent of the power granted by the Constitution, and which is essentially necessary to carry on the work with system and efficiency. But whilst the Committee does appoint the missionary (which is never done, however, without the concurrence of the Presbytery to which he belongs), assigns his field of labor, fixes his salary and all matters of a similar character, it never interferes with what may be regarded, in the stricter sense of the term, his *ecclesiastical functions*; for example, the Committee never undertakes to determine when a church shall be organised, who shall be received to its membership, who shall be appointed deacons and elders, or when or how discipline shall be exercised; much less has the Committee the power to adjudge a minister or to depose him from the ministry. In all such matters the missionary is responsible to his Presbytery, and not to the Committee. The Committee exercises only such powers as have been delegated to it by the General Assembly, and, in this respect, it stands precisely on the same footing with other ecclesiastical commissions, whether appointed by Presbyteries, Synods, or General Assemblies. When commissions are denounced as excrescences on the ecclesiastical system, of which we have had a notable case of late, it becomes such persons to show how any of our church courts can carry on this work of aggression without employing some such agency.

Now if the facts and principles that have been laid down are indisputable, as they undoubtedly are, where is there room or opportunity for the Secretary, or the Committee, or for the two combined, to exercise prelatival powers? Our foreign missiona-

ries certainly have no reasonable ground to complain. They are governed much more by each other, when there are a number of them on the ground, than they are by the Committee at home. In either case they have much more freedom of action and are less under surveillance than their brethren at home, and they can well congratulate themselves sometimes that they are not as closely watched or as sharply criticised as the Secretary of Foreign Missions.

But we are not yet prepared to dismiss this accusation of prelacy. It is a serious charge, and if without foundation, it ought to be effectually rebutted. When the writer charges that the office of Secretary involves prelatical powers, he means, we suppose, that the Secretary can, if he chooses to do so, act the part of a diocesan bishop in the bosom of the Presbyterian Church. If he does not mean this, when he speaks of the Secretary being the bishop of the whole Church, then we do not know what he does mean. Now we remark, in passing along, that we have no respect either for the sagacity or common sense of that man who would attempt to play the part of a prelate in the Presbyterian Church, especially in the Southern Presbyterian Church, where there are so many standing with drawn swords ready to strike even at the shadow of prelacy. If any of our younger brethren have any such aspirations, we would seriously advise them to wait until certain brethren, whom we need not name, leave the stage before they commence the play.

But to return to the question under consideration. What are the powers and functions of a diocesan bishop? In the first place, he holds his appointment for life and cannot be deposed except as the result of a tedious and prolonged ecclesiastical process. The Secretary of Foreign Missions holds his appointment for one year, and he may be set aside at any time by a single vote of the Assembly, and without even the formality of a trial. What resemblance is there in this particular between a bishop and a Secretary? In the next place, an Episcopal bishop exercises all the powers in his diocese that a Presbytery does over all the Church within its bounds. In other words, according to the Episcopal system, a prelate wields as much power in one case, as twenty,

thirty, or forty presbyters do in the other. Is the writer whose views we have under consideration, prepared to show that there is any similarity here between the office of a bishop and a Secretary? Furthermore, the bishop has control over all the pulpits in his diocese; no one can be installed as rector in any of the churches under his care without his consent; to the bishop it belongs to ordain, to instal, and to have complete control both of rectors and congregations; for the time being, he can depose any rector from the discharge of his proper functions. More than this: no person can be received into the full communion of the Episcopal Church without the act of confirmation on the part of the bishop. The bishop, when any special case arises, prepares prayers to be offered up in all of his churches, and no rector ever thinks of disregarding or setting them aside. Now this brief statement shows the utter absurdity of the charge that has been laid at the door of the Secretary. Can the writer point out one of these functions that the Secretary ever has or can exercise in the Presbyterian Church? Does he ordain; does he instal; does he ever severally or in conjunction with the Committee, adjudge a minister of the gospel? Does he direct when a church shall be organised, or who shall be received to its communion, or who shall be elected deacons or elders? The evangelist may perform some of these functions; but the Secretary has no more power in such matters than the brother who has preferred these charges. But we ask, Is it just, is it manly, and is it Christlike, to bandy charges that have no foundation in fact, when the only result can be to injure a cause that ought to be dear to every Christian heart?

But we come now to the main subject of this discussion, viz. : the management of our schemes of domestic benevolence, especially that of Home Missions. No doubts are entertained on either hand, so far as the writer knows, as to the necessity of having a Committee of some kind, under the direction of our Assembly, to manage this important department of labor. But the point where there is divergence of opinion is, whether all the funds raised in the churches for this purpose should be placed under the control of this Committee for the benefit of the whole

Church, or that the bulk of these funds should be kept in the hands of the Presbyteries where they are raised, to supply their own wants first, but leaving a surplus or percentage to be forwarded to the Assembly's Committee, to supply the wants of the poorer Presbyteries, and to carry on the work of evangelisation in frontier regions. We think we have stated the case with all possible impartiality. Much may be said on either side of the question, and it is not surprising that there should be diversity of views. But there is a real essential difference between these two modes of carrying on the general work. Those Presbyteries which give a percentage of their funds, or what surplus remains after their own wants are supplied, do, indeed, help the general cause to that extent. But those which allow all their funds to go into the central treasury, and receive back again such proportion as will place all the poorer Presbyteries, so far as this particular fund is concerned, on the same footing with themselves, are illustrating co-operation, we think, in a much higher and nobler sense. It is placing the wealthier of God's people on the same footing with their poorer brethren—which is the true spirit of Christianity, as exemplified in the primitive Church. It makes provision for the whole Church to rise and stand together as one compact united body, having the unity of a common faith, and being bound together by the strong bonds of fraternal love and sympathy. This, we think, is the broad and solid foundation upon which all Christian coöperation ought to rest; and we confidently believe that the future prosperity—not to say the permanency—of our own branch of the Church depends, under God, upon the steady maintenance of this great principle.

The writer, from the very organisation of the Southern Presbyterian Church, has always contended for coöperation, through the General Assembly, in carrying on her general schemes of benevolence. He assisted in forming the Constitutions which were adopted at that time for the execution of these different trusts. They were formed and adopted under a full sense of all the abuses that had taken place under the old Board system, and they were intended to have no sympathy or affiliation whatever with those. If the old system were still in force in our Church, and

there was no possibility of getting rid of it, we would be on the other side of the question as strongly as any brother in the Church.

According to the old programme, the Domestic Board had the home work, whether within the bounds of Presbyteries or in frontier regions, entirely under their control, and they carried on the work in either case with very little reference to the Presbyteries. They located missionaries where they thought best, assigned their work, fixed their salaries, and required them to render an account of their labors, not to the Presbyteries in whose bounds they were laboring, but to the Board. Nothing of this kind, we need scarcely say, pertains to our present system.

We advocate the plan of coöperation through the Assembly on several grounds, but mainly because of its tendency to bind the whole Church together in the strong bonds of one common brotherhood. The unity here advocated is equally removed from centralisation on the one hand, and from disintegration on the other. The true course for our Church lies between these extremes. We are, as every attentive observer must see, pretty safely guarded against one of these extremes, but perhaps seriously exposed to the other. The tendency of the times in which we live, so far as religious matters are concerned, is not so much towards centralisation or prelacy as to independency. Church authority, as such, is at a discount. There is scarcely a minister in any of our evangelical churches who does not find it difficult, if not impossible, to administer discipline. Large numbers in almost all of our churches deem it their right to walk according to the light of their own eyes ; and what can this lead to but the overthrow of all church authority ? The only check to this alarming tendency, we confidently believe, is in the revival of primitive Christianity by which we can be not only restored to pure Christian love, but be once more bound together in the strong bonds of a common brotherhood.

This strong bond of brotherhood was undoubtedly the great instrument which God employed in establishing our Church in the first instance on a solid foundation. She commenced her ecclesiastical career in the midst of extraordinary trials and discouragement.

ments. Our people were fearfully impoverished; scores of our church edifices had been destroyed; our literary and theological institutions were lying in the dust; and with a few noble exceptions, little or no sympathy was felt in our behalf by the great body of Christian believers in other parts of the country. It was in consequence of the wealthier churches and Presbyteries making common cause with their poorer brethren, that our Church was enabled to rise from the dust, take an honorable stand among the other members of the evangelical body, and make her influence felt, as she has been doing ever since, in proclaiming the gospel of Jesus Christ to the remotest nations of the earth. If any other branch of the Church has ever struggled against greater difficulties and discouragements, or has achieved grander results in the midst of almost unparalleled trials, we know not what branch of the Church it is. And this success, under God, must be ascribed mainly to that feeling of brotherhood which pervaded the Church in the earlier period of its history, and held it together in the strong bonds of unity and fraternity.

But this great principle of unity and brotherhood was not more important to the Church in the days of its infancy and feebleness, than it is at the present moment. The same element which inspired new life then is equally necessary to the preservation of that life now. In the providence of God our Church occupies a peculiar position, whether regard be had to other branches of the Church, to our own future history, or to the condition of a perishing world. Our position as a separate and independent branch of the Church of Christ, was not one of our own choosing. It was forced upon us by the providence of God. What were the precise designs of that providence none of us perhaps fully understand. It may have been intended to awaken greater life and activity among us in promoting the salvation of men. It may have been to make us the conservators of certain great principles of doctrine and polity that were imperilled by the rapid changes that were going on in other parts of the land. Or it may have been to prepare us for certain great emergencies in the future, of which we have not now the most distant conception. But whatever may have been the design of Providence, we occupy a position of great

moment—one which we ought never to abandon without as clear an indication of Divine Providence as the one which originally placed us in it.

This position can be maintained only by standing shoulder to shoulder, as one compact brotherhood, ever ready to meet in one united strength any emergency that may lie in our pathway. If we would be true to ourselves, true to the Master, and true to the great responsibility that has been laid upon us, we must cultivate with all possible diligence this great principle of unity and Christian fellowship among ourselves. Our weaker churches and poorer Presbyteries must feel the strong arm of their more favored brethren around and underneath them—not in dealing out a cold and formal charity, as is done when mere surpluses and percentages are offered them, but in having one common fund, out of which the poor and rich are to share alike. This would be alike gratifying to the poor, and ennobling to the rich. At the same time it brings into play those grander and broader principles of benevolence which not only shone out so gloriously in the life of the Redeemer himself, but which were absolutely necessary to develop the full strength and power of his Church.

But what are the objections urged against this scheme of coöperation through the General Assembly ?

The first and principal one is, that this general plan takes the appropriate work of the Presbyteries out of their hands and places it under control of the Assembly, in consequence of which the powers of the one are greatly magnified, whilst those of the other are unduly contracted. Now if this were true, the argument would be irresistible. It is undoubtedly true that Presbytery has the constitutional right to control and direct the work of missions within her own bounds. To interfere with this, is to unsettle the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, and we are not among those who would desire to countenance such interference. But we deny the assumption that our present plan does strip the Presbyteries of any of their legitimate functions or prerogatives. At the same time we have been greatly surprised to find brethren, for whose wisdom we have the profoundest respect, giving emphasis to this objection without apparently having inquired

whether it had any foundation in fact. It may be asked, then, in what sense and to what extent is the work of domestic missions taken out of the hands of Presbyteries by this general plan of co-operation? The reverse, it may be contended, is demonstrable. Instead of reducing the Presbyteries to a state of inactivity, its legitimate tendency is to stir them up to a higher degree of energy. In no other way can they keep pace with this general co-operation. But what powers or functions are taken away from the Presbyteries? If an evangelist is to labor within the bounds of a given Presbytery, by whom is he appointed? Who assigns his particular sphere of labor? Who superintends his work, and to whom does he render an account of his stewardship? Who determines the amount of salary he shall receive, or whether his appointment shall be renewed from year to year? Furthermore, if the salary of a minister is to be supplemented from the Sustentation Fund, who determines whether an application shall be made, or how much supplemental salary shall be asked? Who determines whether an appropriation shall be renewed or not? Still further, who decides when and how collections shall be taken up in the churches for the Domestic Missionary work? We go still farther, and ask, if the Presbyteries themselves do not settle the question whether they will act independently or in concert with other Presbyteries. May not any Presbytery, if it sees proper, withdraw at any time from coöperation and become independent? Now in all the above mentioned matters, as well as a great many others of a similar character, the voice of the Presbytery is alone potent. How strangely it sounds then to hear it said that the Presbyteries are stripped of their powers? The central Committee has not a word to say about the evangelist, his qualifications for the work, the particular kind of work he is to perform; it receives no reports from him, and cannot determine even what salary he shall receive, except so far as they are governed by the state of the treasury and the rules given them by the Assembly for their government. In all these matters, the Presbytery, or its Committee of Missions, is the governing power.

The only point conceded by any Presbytery is, that all the funds raised in its churches for Domestic Missions may go into a

common treasury, to be disbursed by the central Committee, under certain rules and regulations, for the benefit of the whole Church—its own churches among others. Even this much is not conceded without sufficient guarantees that the wants of any particular Presbytery shall not be overlooked in the general distribution. The central Committee in dispensing the funds placed under its control, is so completely hemmed around with by-laws enacted by the Assembly, and, of course, approved by the whole Church, that there is very little room for the exercise of personal discretion on the part of the Committee. One of those by-laws, to mention no other, empowers every Presbytery to draw as much from the central treasury as its churches may have contributed. This is seldom done by one of the stronger Presbyteries; but any of them have the right to do it if they see proper, or if their exigencies should at any time render it necessary. These rules or by-laws are so full and complete in themselves, that the Committee, even if it could be supposed that they were so inclined, could scarcely have it in their power to indulge personal partialities in the disbursement of the common fund. The power which every Presbytery has to withdraw from concerted action would itself be an effectual protection against anything of the kind. More than this. Every Presbytery has the right of representation in the central Committee in the person of the Chairman of its Presbyterial Committee of Domestic Missions. He is distinctly recognised as a corresponding member of the Committee, and when present may take part in its deliberations. When not present, he is there almost always by letter, and the Committee never fails to make such letters the basis of their action. How, in view of all these facts, any one can contend that the Presbyteries are stripped of their proper functions in acting with the central Committee, we cannot understand. With the single exception of having a common fund, to which every Presbytery may assent or not as it thinks best, not one of its functions is touched, so that the main argument for opposing the general plan, as it seems to the writer, falls to the ground. Furthermore, if the Presbyteries would adopt a system of general presbyterial visitation, by which to bring themselves in personal contact with all of their churches,

a measure alike necessary to the spiritual welfare of those churches and to the success of general coöperation scheme, they would find themselves as heavily taxed with labor as it would be possible to endure.

A second argument brought forward against the general scheme is, that the churches will not contribute as freely for the general cause as they would to relieve the destitutions more immediately around them. Now, if this were true, which we are by no means ready to concede, would it be right and proper to foster and cherish such a feeling among our people? The Master himself has commanded us to preach the gospel to every creature. Our duties and responsibilities are, therefore, coextensive with the human race. No Church, and no section of the Church, ever rises to a proper sense of its own true calling, which aims at anything less than the regeneration of the whole race of mankind. Some portions of this great work may be beyond our reach; and for this we are not responsible, except so far as our prayers and sympathies are concerned. But when we restrict our efforts to a narrower sphere of labor when a broader and more extended one is equally accessible to us, the true spirit of Christianity is necessarily dwarfed and dried up. Our true policy is to train our people to the practice of the broadest benevolence, and not let them feel that their whole responsibility is confined to a little section of country immediately around their own doors.

But the assumption above stated, and against which we are contending, is not only wrong in principle, but it is untrue in fact. The writer already referred to quotes and eulogises the statement made by one of our distinguished divines, to the effect that "a concrete case is stronger than an abstract cause," which is explained to mean that the churches of a given Presbytery will contribute more largely to promote the cause of Domestic Missions within its own bounds, than for the same cause outside of those bounds. Now there may be cases where it would not only be more natural, but might be the duty of churches to contribute more liberally for wants immediately around them. There are cases, too, where churches might, under special excitement, do more to relieve the destitutions immediately under their eyes,

than for all other causes combined. Perhaps this would generally be the case, where our emotional nature alone is concerned. But this feeling, no matter from what source, is only temporary in its nature ; and when applied to the great principles of gospel truth, especially to those broader and more elevated feelings of benevolence which have been enjoined by the Redeemer, it is not only injurious in all its operations, but is opposed to the spirit and the demands of Christianity itself. It does not come within the province of human wisdom to lay down any programme by which the world is to be regenerated. The duty of the Church lies in simply following the command of the Saviour to preach the gospel to every creature. And whilst it is true that every church, and perhaps we might say every individual member of the church, must have some sort of plan by which to carry into execution the command of the Saviour, yet it is not wise or justifiable in either to assume that this or that particular section of the race or world is to be thoroughly evangelised before the glad tidings of salvation are made known to other and more destitute portions of the earth. The measure of the liberality of God's people ought always to have reference to the nature and the magnitude of the work which is to be performed. The Church will never realise the full glory predicted of her until she comes squarely up to the work assigned her of evangelising all the nations of the earth.

But this great principle for which we are contending is not a matter of mere speculation. Brief as is the history of our beloved Church, it is nevertheless developing results that show that the separate and independent mode of conducting the Domestic Missionary work is not only questionable in point of policy, but there is serious reason to fear that it will lead to the entire overthrow of the Domestic Missionary work, and that at no very distant period. Without attempting to argue this point, we would simply ask brethren to examine carefully the Annual Report on Domestic Missions—especially what is found on the 4th, 5th, and 6th pages of that Report—laid before the last General Assembly. We have not ourselves examined all the facts and figures embraced in that Report, but we take it for granted that they are correct, and especially as no one has undertaken to contradict

them. But if they are true, then the necessary inference is, that when all the Presbyteries adopt the independent line of action, there will be no central Committee, and no central treasury to aid the poorer Presbyteries, or to carry the gospel into destitute and frontier regions; and then the further inference naturally follows, that when the general work is abandoned, the present work will follow also. No one can foresee where the retrograde movement will stop, if it is once fairly set in motion; and here, undoubtedly, lies the peril of our beloved Church. It needs strong bonds, especially in the times in which we live, to hold it together. If the one arising from sympathy between Presbytery and Presbytery is broken asunder, who can tell what will be the ultimate consequences?

We notice, but in a very brief way, another objection frequently urged against the general plan of coöperation, viz., that it is a roundabout way of doing business to have the contributions of the churches travel a great distance—sometimes more than a thousand miles—to the central treasury, and then come back again over the same road to the churches where they were at first raised. The writer, to whom reference has already been made, characterises this proceeding by quoting the old couplet:

“The king of France, with forty thousand men,
Marched up a hill, and then came down again.”

A little reflection would have convinced this brother that the mode of procedure to which he refers and which he ridicules, is common in these times to almost every department of commercial enterprise. Postal arrangements and railroad enterprise have brought the most distant parts of our land in close proximity. Money can be sent from Missouri to Baltimore without any more cost and with very little more time, than from one point in that State to another. The old king of France, it is true, went up the hill without a purpose. Not so with the contributions that are sent up to the treasury in Baltimore. They go there to be mingled with the offerings of God's people from other parts of the land, to go back over the same road indeed, but in many cases at least, in double or treble the amount sent up. Many a good and needy brother in Missouri can testify to the wisdom and ex-

cellence of the arrangement, whatever others may think or say about it.

In the foregoing statements we have aimed simply to set forth the great importance of coöperation in all the departments of church work. We have by no means intended to imply that our various schemes of benevolence admit of no modifications or readjustments. There are many minor matters, such as the location of the Committees, the mode of administering them, the persons who shall be intrusted with their execution, the salaries that shall be allowed the officers, and other matters of a kindred nature, that ought to be so arranged as to meet and satisfy the matured judgment of the Church, so far as that can be ascertained; and in such readjustments none will feel more real satisfaction than those who now hold office in connexion with these schemes.

In bringing this article to a close, the writer wishes to say that it has not been written in a spirit of controversy. It is a grief to him to have to differ from brethren for whose piety and wisdom he has the profoundest respect and with whom he can act in almost all other matters of public interest with the most hearty concert. But he is profoundly impressed with the conviction, that, if the policy he is opposing becomes prevalent, it will lead necessarily to the weakening of all those bonds which now hold our beloved Church together, and ultimately, if not restrained by the providence of God, lead to its disintegration.

More than this. We are suffering, if we do not misapprehend the signs of the times, from overmuch controversy. We do not undervalue the importance or the necessity of controversial discussion. But this, like everything else, may be carried too far. Brethren who have a natural love for controversy for its own sake, and who fancy that nothing but good can proceed from it, ought to bear in mind that there are others who are not like-minded with themselves, and who long to prosecute their work in peace and quietness. Much of our time, since the organisation of the Church, has been devoted to controversy, and, so far as can be judged from present appearance, we are about as far from the end as we were at the beginning. We have spared no pains in en-

deavoring to conform our standards to the spirit and requirements of God's word, and in this respect, perhaps, we have been more successful than almost any other branch of the Christian Church. But the question may be raised, whether in giving such exclusive attention to what may be called the scaffolding of the superstructure, we have not neglected the proper work of the Church itself. Other denominations that may be behind us, so far as Church order and discipline are concerned, are far ahead of us, so far as the great work of evangelising the world is concerned. We ought not to forget that the Church has a life as well as an organisation, a spirit as well as a body, that she needs true piety as well as sound orthodoxy, that she has a work to perform as well as a faith to illustrate, a gospel to proclaim as well as a creed to defend, a world to save as well as a Church to maintain.

J. LEIGHTON WILSON.

ARTICLE II.

A MEMORIAL OF THE LIFE AND LABORS OF THE
REV. STUART ROBINSON.

STUART ROBINSON was born Nov. 14th, 1814, in Strabane, Tyrone County, Ireland. He was the fourth son of James and Martha Porter Robinson. His mother was the daughter of a ruling elder and granddaughter of a Presbyterian minister. His father was a prosperous linen merchant. In the year 1815, he became involved in debt by becoming security for a friend; and determined to come to America in the hope of retrieving his fortune. He landed in New York in 1816, where, in the course of eighteen months, his family joined him. The elder children were sent to school, and Stuart soon attracted the attention of his teachers by his great intelligence. One of them wrote in his book: "This is a remarkable child, and will one day make his mark in the world"—a prediction which has been fulfilled in the life and labors of the man.

During his infancy in Ireland, Stuart was injured by a fall from the arms of his nurse. His right shoulder was dislocated and his arm and thumb crushed. The blow upon his head at the

same time was so serious that his physicians feared he would be idiotic, indeed gave little hope of his surviving the shock.

After several years' residence in New York, Mr. Robinson, in consequence of failing health, removed to Berkeley County, Virginia. It was here that Mrs. Robinson proved her Christian fortitude, exhibited those virtues for which her early training and education had prepared her, and laid the foundation in her son of his future usefulness and greatness. The Sabbath was a holy day in their home. Mrs. Robinson took her children to church—often walking six miles to "Falling Waters" to hear the gospel from the mouth of the Rev. Mr. Hoge.

She assisted in organising a Sabbath-school, which, at that time, was something new in that part of the country. She instructed her children in the Bible and in the Catechisms of our Church. In about four years this "sainted mother," as she was called by all who knew her, died, leaving a family of six sons.

Mr. Robinson could only look to kind friends for their assistance in the care of his motherless children. Their home was desolate, and they were scattered. Stuart went to live with a German farmer, Mr. Troutman, who soon became attached to the child. He saw, however, that the boy's crippled condition would prevent his laboring with his hands, while his intelligence and brightness fitted him for an education, and accordingly gave him up, though with great reluctance, to become the inmate of the family of the young pastor, the Rev. Jas. M. Brown, then in charge of Tuscarora, Falling Water, and Gerrardstown churches.

In this truly Christian home, the motherless boy, at the age of thirteen, was received and shielded and protected, in answer to his parents' prayers; was treated as a beloved child, encouraged to study, and obtained aid in educating himself. He ever cherished the greatest admiration for the loved friends of his childhood. Gratitude was one of the most beautiful traits of his character. To Mrs. Brown, who yet lives to mourn his departure, he gave the affection of a son. To these friends belong the honor of giving to our Church one whose young life was entirely consecrated to the Master's service, and whose subsequent career attested the sincerity of his devotion.

In his new home he began the work of his life—studying with other boys under the care of Mr. and Mrs. Brown. He was a good student and became a fine scholar. He was beloved for his many noble traits of character. Being always “full of fun and mischief,” and having a keen sensibility to the ludicrous in everything,¹ he was a very attractive companion. At an early age, he gave his heart to the Saviour, and dedicated himself to the work of the ministry. The missionary work seemed his first choice; but he waited for the leadings of Providence to decide for him.

After some time spent in preparation for College under the Rev. Dr. W. H. Foote, of Virginia, who took great interest in his subsequent labors and expressed the warmest affection for him, he went to Amherst College to pursue his studies. An extract from a letter dated “May, 1832,” when he was not yet eighteen years old, and written a few months before he went to Amherst, will serve to show the state of his mind in regard to the great concern. After giving an account of a great revival of religion at Romney, Va., he adds: “For about the last three weeks I have felt my heart at times much more drawn out than usual in love to God and the souls of my dying fellow-creatures. I seemed to be able to get near Him in prayer, and loved to pray more than formerly. I could not help thinking that God was about to be merciful to us in this part of his vineyard; and when he really did come to bless us and I was permitted to have still nearer communion with him, I then enjoyed more true happiness in one hour, than I enjoyed in six months while in a cold and lukewarm state.”

¹In this feature also, the child was the father of the man. Mr. Robinson's overflowing humor made him one of the most fascinating speakers in the country before a promiscuous crowd assembled on an occasion which would justify him in giving free course to it. Every body, cultivated or uncultivated, male or female, went away delighted. He would have made one of the greatest “stump-speakers” in the world. Yet he always abstained from everything which could offend even a woman's delicacy and modesty. As pathos and humor often flow from the same source, so, in his case, the audience often alternated between laughter and tears. We never heard a man whom we thought his equal in this respect, except the late Dr. Plumer.

• He was matriculated in Amherst in October, 1832; and finished the whole course there without returning to Virginia. He spent his vacations in teaching, in order to assist in defraying the expenses of his education. He was graduated with honor in 1836. In his class were men of great ability, and not a few of them have held posts of honor and usefulness in Church and State—among them, Rev. Dr. B. M. Palmer; Dr. Hitchcock, of Union Seminary, New York; Dr. Daman, of the Sandwich Islands' Mission; Gov. Bullock, and Dr. Nathan Allen, of Massachusetts.

The letters written by Mr. Robinson during his sojourn for four years in New England, exhibit powers of keen and discriminating observation of men and things very uncommon in men of his age. His mind was evidently revolving over these questions of sociology and ecclesiology with which, in his maturer years, he grappled with as much success as has been allotted to many other great men. He recognised the good features in New England society without reluctance, and censured without bitterness, or even severity, what he regarded as defective or erroneous. He was confirmed in his convictions as to the superiority of the Presbyterian polity over that of Congregationalism; and his zeal for orthodox doctrine was on all proper occasions fearlessly manifested. These letters, written in all the unrestrained freedom of a friendly private correspondence, also reveal his sense of the grave responsibility of a candidate for the ministry, and his earnest desire for that spiritual preparation for his work without which he could not hope to be a workman that needed not to be ashamed. It is pleasant and instructive to get these glimpses of the method by which God was fashioning for himself an instrument which he designed to make so effective in advancing the interests of his kingdom on earth.

From Amherst Mr. Robinson went to Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, in 1837. After spending a year in that institution, he went to Charleston, West Virginia, where Mr. Brown, the friend of his childhood, had become pastor; again became an inmate of his family; and engaged in teaching in order to obtain means to finish his course of professional study. In 1840 he

went to Princeton Seminary, and returned to Charleston in 1841, and was soon after licensed to preach the gospel by the Presbytery of Greenbrier.

In the little church of Malden, in this Presbytery, he began the labors of his useful life, preaching and doing missionary work among the mountains, wherever he could gather a congregation to hear the good news of salvation. As his salary was too small for the support of his family, he taught for six years in the Academy, during the period of his ministry at Malden.¹

In 1846, he was invited to supply the church of which Dr. E. P. Humphrey was pastor in Louisville, Kentucky, and spent nine months preaching to that congregation. On his return home, he received several calls to other churches, and finally accepted that of the church in Frankfort, Ky. During his residence there, he became thoroughly identified with the Kentucky Church, and labored for its advancement in truth, and the principles of a sound Presbyterianism.²

A writer in the Louisville "Courier-Journal," who professes to write from personal knowledge of Mr. Robinson's labors in Frankfort, says:

"At that time he made the impression of a man of tremendous physical vigor, thirty years of age; and even the crippled arm served to make the sledge-hammer logic of his discourses seem more powerful. Thrown into this pleasant, delightful, yet at that time no-progressive town, his keen eye descried at once what was needed, viz., a new church and a female school. He soon had both; and everything was moving forward with all the force of a steam engine. Selecting a location in South Frankfort for

¹He was united in marriage, Sept. 5th, 1841, with Miss Mary E. Brigham, the daughter of pious parents. Those who had the happiness of knowing Mrs. Brigham will remember her as a most lovely Christian woman.

²The narrative thus far has followed, almost to the very words, documents furnished by the family of Dr. Robinson. This fact is stated, because the accounts in the papers are full of mistakes. *This* account may be relied on. The facts that follow have been derived either from the memory of the writer or from authentic documents.

his school, he gathered many young ladies from the Blue-Grass region under his instruction and influence, and doubtless there are many who can recollect those happy days with pleasure. The vast energy of Stuart Robinson at this period of his life made him restless; so he waked up the sleepy denizens of South Frankfort, and represented the importance of their becoming a part of the corporation of North Frankfort. When this was accomplished, they demanded of him to allow them to select him as their councilman. He could not refuse, and so he infused a life into South Frankfort it has never lost unto this day."

"About this time a new bank was established, and prompted by public spirit to advance the city in its new life, he accepted the nominal appointment of Director. It is a mistake about his being the President of a cotton mill and a turnpike company. His duties as Councilman and Bank Director absorbed very little of his time. It is certain that he did not neglect the church. Beside the Friday night lecture, he conducted a Bible class, composed of young men, and would frequently write out leading questions the previous week. Such interest did statesmen and lawyers and officials take in his able ingenious way of putting things, that he formed them into a Bible class at one time. Among the attendants was the Secretary of State. Governors Owsley and Crittenden were attendants upon his preaching; so also Judge Simpson and others of the Supreme Court. Early in his pastorate, Mr. Robinson began his celebrated series of lectures on the Old Testament, on Sabbath nights. The congregation, from dislike at first, soon began to take equal interest in the lectures with the morning service. It will always be a matter of regret that a short-hand reporter was not present to take down these admirable lectures. They ran through the whole six years of his stay in Frankfort. The suggestiveness of Scripture and applicability to all states of society were most powerfully developed. We need just such lectures to put to shame the blasphemous scurrility of the Ingersolls." . . . "About this time he delivered at the University of Virginia his lecture on the 'Difficulties of Infidelity.' In the summer of 1849, a powerful revival of religion signalised his ministry, putting the seal of the Spirit upon his labors. Until

the close of his labors the church and congregation increased in numbers."

In May, 1852, he was called to the Associate Reformed Church in Fayette Street, Baltimore, of which Dr. John Leyburn is now the minister. This church, originally Presbyterian, had declared itself Independent about twenty-five years before, under the ministry of Dr. John Mason Duncan, a nephew and pupil of the celebrated Dr. John M. Mason of New York. The success of Mr. Robinson as a preacher in this congregation was what might have been expected from his ability, zeal, and popular gifts. His sermons and his lectures on the Old Testament History were delivered to overflowing and delighted houses; and hundreds of souls will bless him forever as the means of their salvation or of the revival of their faith and love. His burning missionary zeal, however, could not be satisfied with his success in Fayette Street. A mission chapel was opened in South Baltimore; and questions soon arose in connexion with the continued prosecution of the work in that quarter of the city, which revealed the wide and irreconcilable difference of views between the minister and his congregation as to church polity and organisation; and Mr. Robinson resigned his place.¹ A large portion of the congregation, however, determined not to part with him, and persuaded him to remain and organise another church. It was determined to build a house at the corner of Saratoga and Liberty Streets, a few squares distant from the old building in Fayette Street. While the house was building, the congregation worshipped in the "New Assembly Rooms." When the church was organised, it was called the "Central Presbyterian church."²

While Mr. Robinson was in Baltimore, he began the publica-

¹ He began his ministry in this church September, 1852; resigned 19th March, 1853; the Central church was organised immediately with eighty-five members, and Mr. Robinson was installed as pastor by the Presbytery of Baltimore at the ensuing meeting, in April. The congregation removed to their new edifice (Saratoga and Liberty Streets) in April, 1855, having grown to 205 communicants.

² The building was burned some eight or ten years ago. The congregation now worship on or near "Eutaw Place."

tion of the *Presbyterial Critic*, a journal devoted to the discussion of ecclesiastical questions mainly, and specially to questions mooted in the Presbyterian Church. "We propose a journal," says Mr. Robinson, in the opening article, "which, whilst it shall aim to occupy, in common with others, the general field of doctrinal truth and religious literature, shall be more distinctively for the discussion and elucidation of the principles of Presbyterianism, as they bear upon the efforts and measures of the Church for her own expansion." It was called the *Presbyterial* (not Presbyterian) *Critic*, because it was designed for the discussion of questions which the members of our Church courts are called officially to act upon, often without either the means or the opportunity for that mature consideration so necessary to wise and efficient action. It was called "*Critic*," in the true and proper sense of the word—a "discerner," a "discriminator," and therefore a "judge." The journal was conducted for "An Association of Gentlemen," who contributed to its pages. Among these gentlemen were Rev. Drs. R. J. Breckinridge, R. L. Dabney, B. M. Smith, John H. Boccock, C. R. Vaughan, and Wm. H. Ruffner. Their contributions were all gratuitous—not paid for. The *Critic* was short-lived, however; it was published only two years—the last year as a bi-monthly.¹ It never paid for itself. The subscription price was one dollar per annum—a ridiculously low price for more matter than is usually given in our quarterlies. Mr. Robinson assumed the whole pecuniary responsibility, and bore all the loss. The obituary notices of the dead journal, even from the brethren of the other side, were respectful. The *Philadelphia Presbyterian* said: "However much we may have disapproved of the spirit sometimes manifested, we respect them for the open and manly manner in which they carried on their warfare. No one can accuse them of disingenuousness." A friend of the *Critic* said in the *Southern Presbyterian*: "I regret the suspension of

¹ Before the second year of the *Critic* had expired, Mr. Robinson was transferred to the Professorship of Church Government and Pastoral Theology in the Danville Theological Seminary, to which he had been elected by the General Assembly of 1856; and the associate editor being unwilling to attempt to carry it on alone, it ceased to be published.

this journal, because it has been what its name imports, a Presbyterian Critic. Its discussions have related to matters of moment to the Presbyterian Church. No one can say that the work failed to answer to its title. Its columns were filled, not with vague generalities, not with useful and good things equally acceptable to all denominations of Christian people, but what it had to say concerned us especially. Again, I regret its suspension, because its discussion of these Presbyterian matters was always earnest and hearty. Never having written one line for it, I can say with the more freedom, that I always looked eagerly for its coming, and never read one number of it without having my mind waked up and stimulated. The establishment of this journal supplied a want that was real; its suspension leaves unsupplied a want not only real, but a want which I think will be felt." We quote these notices to confirm the opinion expressed by Mr. Robinson himself in his "Valedictory Note," that "these two years of editorial labor were perhaps the most efficient two years service he had yet been able to render to the Church."

Mr. Robinson, as has been said, was transferred to the Professorship in Danville Seminary, in the autumn of 1856. It was the opinion of many that he was too brilliant a man to make a good Professor; at least, that a man far his inferior in those popular gifts which give a preacher power in the pulpit, might do the work of a teacher in a Seminary equally as well as he. To this it may be replied, that he did not cease to preach; that he preached almost every Sunday. And as to his success as a teacher, his book on "The Church of God as an Essential Element of the Gospel," published in 1858, shows a thorough acquaintance with the subject; and the originality and freshness of the treatment must have awakened a lively interest and inspired an enthusiasm in those whose privilege it was to have the outpourings of his brilliant, full, and vigorous mind on a subject which had engaged its attention for many years. We feel assured that Mr. Robinson would have done great things in this department of theology if it had been the pleasure of the Head of the Church to retain him in the Seminary. But in fact he was at Danville not more than two years.¹

¹The Directors of the institution say, in their report to the Assembly

There were two capital aims in his teaching concerning the Church of God: 1. To state clearly the idea of the Church, and then to show the relations of this idea to the eternal purpose of redemption; to the manifestation of this purpose as revealed in the Scriptures; to the principles of Church Government, as set forth in Scripture; to the ordinances of worship set forth in Scripture. 2. To define with precision the spheres of Church and State, and the relations of the powers, civil and ecclesiastical. In reference to both of these, he professed to have no other guide than the Scriptures. The conclusion to which all his painful researches brought him, as expressed in the end of his book, is, that "the true organon of the service of the Church is the word of God."

The first aim only was realised in the work on the "Church of God," where he shows that the Church is "an essential element of the gospel." How admirably this was done, the reader may see by consulting the review of his book in the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW for October, 1858.

The other point mentioned—the precise definition of the relations of the powers, civil and ecclesiastical—was a favorite one with Mr. Robinson. Many discourses were delivered upon it in the large cities, and always, we are certain, to crowded houses. The substance of his teaching upon this important subject may be given by quoting some paragraphs from the Appendix to the "Discourses of Redemption," note to Discourse IV.: "Touching the distinction between the power ecclesiastical and the civil power—which latter is also ordained of God—the points of contrast are so numerous and so fundamental that nothing but the confusion of mind arising from the oppression of Cæsar and Antichrist, backed by the power of Cæsar, could ever have caused the obscurity and inconsistency of the Church's testimony in modern times. For they have nothing in common, except that both powers are of divine authority, both concern the race of mankind, and both were

of 1858: "The Board have to report, with extreme regret, the resignation of Rev. Stuart Robinson. He has felt himself constrained to take this step by peculiar circumstances in his private relations which are not within his control." (See Assembly's printed Minutes.)

instituted for the glory of God as a final end. In respect to all else—their origin, nature, and immediate end, and their mode of exercising the power—they differ fundamentally.” “Thus they differ :

“(1.) In that the civil power derives its authority from God as the author of nature, whilst the ecclesiastical comes alone from Jesus as Mediator.”

“(2.) In that the rule for the guidance of the civil power in its existence is the light of nature and reason, the law which the author of nature reveals through reason to man ; but the rule for the guidance of ecclesiastical power in its exercise is that light which, as Prophet of the Church, Jesus Christ has revealed in his word. It is a government under statute laws already enacted by the King.

“(3.) They differ in that the scope and aim of the civil power are limited properly to things seen and temporal ; the scope and aim of ecclesiastical power are things unseen and spiritual. *Religious* is a term not predicable of the acts of the State ; *political* is a term not predicable of the acts of the Church. The things pertaining to the kingdom of Christ are things concerning which Cæsar can have rightfully no cognisance, except indirectly and incidentally, as these things palpably affect the temporal and civil concerns of men ; and even then Cæsar cannot be too jealously watched by the Church. The things pertaining to the kingdom of Cæsar are matters of which the Church of Christ, as an organic government, can have no cognisance, except incidentally and remotely, as affecting the spiritual interests of men ; and even then the Church cannot watch herself too jealously.”

“(4.) They differ in that the significant symbol of the civil power is the sword ; its government is one of force, a terror to evil doers ; but the significant symbol of Church power is the keys, its government only ministerial, the functions of its officers to open and close and have a care of a house already complete as to its structure externally, and internally organised and provided.”

“(5.) They differ in that civil power may be exercised as a *several* power by one judge, magistrate, or governor ; but all ecclesiastical power pertaining to government is a joint power

only, and to be exercised by tribunals. The Head of the government has not seen fit to confer spiritual power of jurisdiction in any power upon a single man, nor authorised the exercise of the functions of rule in the spiritual commonwealth as a several power."

During the sessions of the Kentucky Convention of 1849, while Mr. Robinson was pastor in Frankfort, he had an opportunity of showing how thoroughly he understood the great principles which he afterwards expounded so clearly and defended so ably. In the Report of the Debates and Proceedings of that body (p. 630) is a memorial presented by him and the Rev. Mr. Brush against the proposition to make ministers of the gospel ineligible to the General Assembly (Legislature). It is an exceedingly well-written, compact, and conclusive argument against the competency of the civil government to define the character and functions of the gospel ministry, and to disfranchise the ministers of the gospel as such. Though the memorial was not successful, we feel assured, that such an argument could not have failed to make a profound impression upon a body so intelligent as that Convention.¹

To resume our narrative. Mr. Robinson was called, in 1858, to the pastoral charge of the Second Presbyterian Church in Louisville, which had become vacant by the resignation of Dr. E. P. Humphrey. Here he labored with the same indefatigable diligence which had distinguished him everywhere else; with this difference, however, that he was in a wider field, which made larger demands upon his time, his energies, and his public spirit. It is remarkable that in all his pastoral charges, in Malden, in Frankfort, in Baltimore, and in Louisville, a new church edifice was built for him. But the last was the greatest; and we doubt

¹It is hardly necessary to say that Mr. R. did not advocate the propriety of ministers of the gospel meddling with politics. He strongly affirmed the inconsistency of such a course with their ordination engagements; but urged that of this inconsistency the Church and not the State must be the judge. He also protested against the confounding the Christian ministry of the word with a priesthood, and above all, the priesthood of the Papacy, which has always meddled, and, by its principles, is obliged to meddle with politics. *Aut Cæsar, aut nihil.*

whether any corner in any of our large cities presents a more imposing appearance than the corner of Broadway and Second Street in the city of Louisville, where the Second Presbyterian church stands. It was a great undertaking; an undertaking which very few men could have carried through under the circumstances. But Mr. Robinson seemed equal to any work which could be done by man.

Three years after he became pastor in Louisville, the war between the States began. He had become conspicuous before July, 1862, for his protests and arguments against the commingling of the affairs of God and Cæsar. Shortly after his removal to Louisville, he purchased the *Presbyterian Herald* which was published in that city by Dr. W. W. Hill, and changed its title to the *True Presbyterian*. It was in this journal that he bore his most public testimony against the sin and madness of bringing political issues into the Church,—standing upon the same ground which was taken by Dr. Hodge and the protestants in the General Assembly of 1861, in Philadelphia, and by Dr. Breckinridge and Dr. Humphrey in the Synod of Kentucky in the autumn of the same year. He was, of course, too outspoken for the military authorities; and his paper was suppressed in 1862. In July of this year he went to Canada. He had left the city for the purpose of visiting an invalid brother; and while absent was urged by his friends not to return, if he would avoid arrest. Accordingly, he remained in Canada until the close of the war.

It would, of course, be impossible for such a man to be idle in his exile. He spent the time in study; in writing for his paper; in comforting and aiding the many Southern refugees; in preaching to large congregations, composed, in great part, of students attending the different schools and the University of Toronto. While he was here, he exhibited his characteristic fearlessness and faithfulness as a witness for the truth, by delivering, in the course of his Sabbath evening discourses on the laws of Moses, one on the subject of "Slavery as recognised in the Mosaic civil law, and as recognised also, and allowed in the Abrahamic, Mosaic and Christian Church." This discourse was afterwards expanded, its positions sustained by abundant citations from or-

thodox British and Continental biblical critics and commentators, and published in a pamphlet of ninety pages by Rollo & Adam, of Toronto, in 1865. The spirit of the man comes out in the exordium of this lecture. "You will remember that while expounding the Abrahamic covenant, I took occasion to define my position as a preacher of the word, in regard to this vexed question of slavery; that, except as the subject comes in my way in the exposition of the Scriptures, I feel that I have little to do with it, here in a country where no such institution exists; for having little confidence in, I do not wish to give countenance by my example to that sort of religion which exercises itself about the sins of other people rather than its own; and whose repentance, like the Pharisee's, having no sins of its own to mourn over, wastes its sighs over those of the Publican standing afar off. But on the other hand, having undertaken to expound this Great Book, I dare not allow the fear of having sectional prejudices imputed to me, or the consideration that I must here run counter to the almost universal popular prejudices of the country, so to restrain me that I should 'shun to declare the whole counsel of God.'" Admirably, boldly, and wisely spoken! We know of no moment in the life of our departed friend in which the nobleness, the manliness and the purity of his character, stand out more conspicuously than in this discourse delivered to an anti-slavery audience, in a British Province, and amidst the expiring throes of the Confederate States.²

It was during his exile also that he prepared for the press his "Discourses of Redemption." In reference to this work, we need only repeat some things which were said in an article upon it in the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW for December, 1866. "Mr. Robinson informs us, in the preface to this work, that it is 'the result of an attempt to give permanent form, so far as oral instruction can be transferred to the printed page, to such outline specimens of the author's Biblical Expositions in the several sections of the inspired word as might be most suggestive to younger preachers in their attempts to develop the various parts of Scripture to the comprehension of the people; and at the same time, be

²The discourse was delivered in February, 1865.

instructive to Christians and inquirers and other earnest persons troubled with doubts touching inspiration or the doctrines of the Bible.' His idea of preaching is not that of theological disquisition, ethical essay, rhetorical, persuasive, or emotional appeal, founded upon a shred of the sacred text chosen as a motto, or at best as suggesting simply the theological topic of the occasion; but that of giving the sense of Scripture, of showing the people how to read the word of God, and leading them to feel that 'this day is the Scripture fulfilled in their ears,' and that these are the words of a Jesus who not only *spoke* by holy men of old, but *is now speaking* with living utterance to the men of this generation.'

"If any man is qualified to pronounce upon the best method of reaching the popular ear, that man is certainly the author of these 'Discourses of Redemption.' He has been preaching for twenty years, to congregations variously composed, in four different cities,—to professional and public men in the capital of Kentucky, to business men in Louisville and Baltimore, to students and professors of law, medicine, and the arts in Toronto, and everywhere with large crowds hanging upon his lips. Now what has been the secret of his popularity? He is not a 'star preacher,'—to use the miserable slang of the day,—a pulpit harlequin or buffoon, amusing his audience with jests upon things sacred and profane, making the Church and the ordinances of Christ the instruments of gain to himself, or prostituting the awful office of a preacher for the mere display of his own gifts and for the admiration and applause of the crowd. Nor is he a 'political' preacher, trimming his sails to the breeze of popular passion and partisan excitement, accepting his doctrines from the caucus or the convention of the party to which he belongs, and preaching the preaching which *it* bids him, the poor slave of the majority of the hour. No! He is a preacher who stands before the people with the conviction that he is the anointed ambassador of the King of kings, commissioned to deal with his rebellious subjects upon questions no less awful than the majesty of his throne and their own eternal destiny; authoritatively setting forth the divine terms of reconciliation, and praying men, *in Christ's stead*, to be reconciled to God. Wonderfully gifted indeed, and capable of interesting men in anything, yet, as

a preacher and ambassador, confining himself to his written instructions, he has demonstrated that the people need no other attraction to draw them to the house of God than a simple, rational, and practical exposition and illustration of the Bible. He has never needed advertisements in the Saturday newspapers of sermons on this or that sensational subject, or any other theatrical clap-trap, to get an audience. The secret of his popularity is his aiming to make the Bible a living message from God to men, by translating it into the current forms of thought and speech. And we doubt not that men of far inferior natural gifts, if they would *study* to approve themselves unto God as workmen needing not to be ashamed, in the orthotomy of the truth, while they might not have such unbounded popularity as Mr. Robinson, would yet have a larger number of sinners to hear the glad tidings from their lips than they now have."

"The theme of these Discourses is Redemption in the broad sense of that term, including not only the sacrifice of Christ, which is the centre and foundation of the whole scheme, but the whole work of Christ and the doctrine of the Church. These great topics are discussed with a perspicuity and an unction worthy of all praise. We had the pleasure of hearing many of these discussions from the pulpit; and now, after years of darkness and blood, we return our hearty thanks to the author for the high privilege of possessing them in a permanent form, and of refreshing ourselves in the reading of them. It is a matter of wonder to many that a man of war like Mr. Robinson, incessantly battling for the truth against overwhelming odds; an exile from his country and the object of a venomous and unrelenting persecution from men who, having no conscience themselves, cannot conceive of a life governed by a higher conviction of duty, should be able to write a book like this. To us there is no wonder in the case, any more than there is in Bunyan's writing the Pilgrim's Progress in Bedford jail, or in Luther's translating the Bible in the Wartburg, or in Rutherford's dictating his Letters in prison-bounds at Aberdeen. 'Out of the eater comes forth meat,' and the fragrance of the 'Saints' Rest' and 'O mother dear, Jerusalem,' is due to the bruising of Baxter and David Dickson. Per-

secution and exile have been 'Christ's Palace' to our friend. While we could not but be burdened with his afflictions, we now thank his Master and ours for this precious fruit. We hail this work as the first-fruits of a religious literature which will make our Southern Church a blessing to the world."

"It is a book of principles, of *semina rerum*, which, if lodged in the mind, will germinate and bring forth fruit; a book which shows the author to be one of the leading thinkers, as well as one of the most popular preachers, of the age; a book which none of our young men who are in training for the ministry of the gospel can afford to be without; which every plain Christian, who would have the word of God to dwell in him richly, can study with profit and delight."

But to return to our narrative. Mr. Robinson returned to Louisville in April, 1866, in opposition to the earnest solicitations of the numerous friends he had made in Canada, who, it is said, offered to build a church for him there if he would consent to remain with them. From the time of his return to a few months before his death, he continued the active pastor of the Second Presbyterian church. In addition to his pastoral work, he took a prominent, generally a leading, part in all the great questions which were agitated in the Presbyterian Church in the United States, or in the Synod of Kentucky, and in the measures adopted by the people of Louisville for the relief of distress, or for the promotion of the temporal interests of that fine city. Scarcely anything was undertaken for these purposes, in regard to which he might not have said truly and with pardonable self-congratulation, *quorum magna pars fui*.

The publication of his paper was resumed under the title of the *Free Christian Commonwealth*; and, as this title implies, he continued to devote himself to the defence of the independence of the Church and of the royal prerogatives of Jesus Christ as her only Head and King. He was a commissioner to the General Assembly (Northern) of 1866 at St. Louis, and had the honor of being stigmatised by that revolutionary body, and of being cast out, as a signer of "the Declaration and Testimony." It was

mainly through his efforts that the Synod of Kentucky was induced to unite with the General Assembly of the Southern Church in 1869; and his hand, we think, may be recognised in the clear, sound, and forcible statement of principles presented in the Letter of that Synod to our General Assembly in 1867.¹ He was elected, by acclamation, Moderator of the General Assembly at Mobile, Ala., in 1869. He was a power in every Assembly of which he was a member, and a valued counsellor in this and other courts of the Church where he did not appear as a member. No man ever doubted, howsoever much he might differ with him in opinion, Mr. Robinson's true and ardent devotion to the Presbyterian Church.

We will mention only two other measures of general interest in which he took a leading part. One was the coöperation of the Assembly of the Southern Church with the "Presbyterian Alliance," and the other was the adoption of the Revised Book of Government and Discipline. Mr. Robinson was successful in his advocacy of both. The opposition to the first was of a much more formidable character than the opposition to the second; it was of a kind which it is seldom wise or safe to encounter. It embraced great names—the names of men to whom the Church is always ready to listen; but the opposition was vain. The friends of the Alliance, with Mr. Robinson in the front, carried it. His essays and speeches in favor of the Book of Government and Discipline powerfully contributed to its adoption. "He was a man," says a writer who cannot be regarded as particularly friendly to Mr. Robinson, "he was a man of indomitable energy and resolution. He underwent physical and mental labor from which other men would shrink. At the Assembly of 1869, after moderating the court through the day, he sat with the Committee on the Revised Book of Church Order far into the small hours of the night, and until the other members of the Committee had retired to rest or had fallen asleep over the work."

¹ See *The Distinctive Principles of the Presbyterian Church in the United States*, pp. 78, ff. (2nd edition, Committee of Publication, Richmond.)

But great men cannot live forever here: great as they are, they are but men—frail children of the dust. It was evident to Mr. Robinson's friends, two or three years before his death, that he had begun to decline in health and vigor. His decline, however, was very gradual. The stroke that robbed the Church and his family of their treasure did not fall until the morning of the 5th October, 1881. On that day he fell asleep in the arms of the Saviour in whom he had trusted and whose truths he had for so many years fearlessly defended. "He passed away," says one who was with him in the solemn hour, "he passed away quietly, unable to articulate plainly, but conscious to the last. No fear disturbed him—he had never spoken of recovery during his illness—but prepared everything for leaving his beloved church and stricken family, trusting and giving all he loved into the care of the Father for whom he had labored so faithfully and whose blessing had rested so abundantly upon his works."

Mr. Robinson was the father of eight children, two only of whom survive him, both daughters. One of his sons died in early life; the other lived to be married.

Very few ministers of the gospel have been so widely known beyond the limits of the Church to which they belonged as the subject of this imperfect sketch; and many pages might be filled with descriptions of the man and the preacher, written while he lived, and with eulogies upon the dead. We have to be content with appending the estimate of Dr. B. M. Palmer, of New Orleans, who was his classmate at Amherst College, and his steady and life-long friend. It is contained in the address delivered at the funeral service in the Second Presbyterian church, Louisville.

"What shall I say of my dead friend? He had a great heart, whose affections gushed forth, fertilising life wherever they touched, and making the earth to bloom with richness and beauty. It was a heart that throbbed in generous response to every cry of distress from whatever quarter it should come; not wasting itself in the common-places of speech, but with profuse liberality supplying the needs by which others were oppressed. His broad sympathy took hold of human life at every point, and identified

him with all the great movements for the amelioration of society at large. It overflowed into thousand tender fellowships, which knit him to the hearts of his fellow-men; but especially in the sanctuary of home the deep affectionateness of his nature softened the asperities of life to those who were the nearest to him, and made that home as much a paradise as can be found in this sinful world. With instincts so pure and so broad, he moved upon a plane far too elevated to indulge a mean thought, and spent a life of toil and sacrifice for the benefit of mankind.

“God also gave to him a massive intellect. Beneath that ample brow lay a capacious brain which did much and mighty thinking through an active and laborious life. His was a mind comprehensive in its grasp of ultimate principles which he could co-ordinate and arrange into great systems of science, philosophy, and religion. It swept freely through the whole gamut of human knowledge, touching every note from the highest to the lowest, and harmonising them all in one complete system of knowledge and of faith. He was a man preëminent for his loyalty to the truth, and was one of those who had the courage of his convictions. What he believed was wrought into the very texture of his being, and became part of the blood and bone and muscle and sinew of his entire intellectual and moral nature. The most sacred thing on earth, next to God himself, is the truth which springs from the infinite mind, and bequeathed to man as the furniture of the soul for time and eternity; and the grandest spirit that lives is the spirit that can feel the truth through every fibre of its own being and stand to its defence against all adversaries, whether they be many or few. Hence it was, this man, with a heart as tender and gentle as a woman's, was ever found in the thickest of the fight, brave and sturdy as a lion, contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. Yet this mind, comprehensive and grand in its sweep, was not absorbed in the abstract and secluded speculations of the student; it was as practical as it was profound, and could descend into all the details of the economy of life. This intense practicalness which enabled him to apply abstract principles to the regulation of human conduct ren-

dered him a wise counsellor in all the business relations of men, and constituted him the strong pillar upon which the interests leaned in every community in which he lived. Added to all this was an indomitable will. It is easy to point to men in whom the power of will stands even for intellect itself; but when united with rare benevolence and the highest grade of practical wisdom, it makes a man a safe and mighty leader. The men who make history are always the men who do the things that can't be done. By the power of a strong faith they project themselves into the future while it is yet distant; or rather draw that future up to themselves until they are fairly abreast of it, and plant their fame with the generations that are to come. Such a will was his, forcible and persistent, which drove itself like a wedge through all complications and achieved the impossible. With this was united a marvellous power of physical endurance which rendered labors which would be oppressive to other men like a feather's weight upon his herculean arm. Often through days full of distraction and care which would have dissipated the energies of feebler men, that poor crippled arm would, through the weary hours of night, trace those rich contributions which he made to the press and literature of the time. Labors, alas! which too severely reacted upon his physical strength, and laid, perhaps, the foundation of what we mournfully regard this day as a premature old age."

"Passing around the circle of his intellectual and moral powers, there was not one in which he was not singly great, but his glory lay chiefly in the wonderful combination of them all; his peculiar strength lay in the harmony and proportion of his powers, which enabled him to range over the breadth of a zone."

In conclusion: let all the ministers of the glorious gospel of the blessed God, whatever may be their gifts, however inferior in strength, brilliancy, or variety to our departed brother's, resolve while they gaze upon "the bright track of his fiery car," to imitate him in what is imitable, his diligence, his fidelity, his courage in doing the work of the Lord, his Lord and theirs.

THOS. E. PECK.

ARTICLE III.

PRESBYTERIAN GOVERNMENT NOT A HIERARCHY,
BUT A COMMONWEALTH.

This article is a republication of the substance of an argument delivered by DR. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE in the Synod of Philadelphia, met at Baltimore, on the 20th October, 1843. He followed it three days after by another argument intended to evince that *Presbyterian ordination is not a charm, but an act of government*, and maintaining the right of ruling elders to lay on hands in the ordination of a minister.

These arguments, of the greatest intrinsic value, and of special interest at the present time to our Church, have long been and are now out of print, and therefore inaccessible to our ministers and elders. The Editors of this REVIEW consider that they will render an important service by presenting them again nearly forty years after their original delivery. With the leave of Providence, the second argument shall appear in our next number.¹

¹To the Rev. Dr. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE:

SIR: The undersigned, Elders of the Presbyterian Churches in the city of Baltimore, being exceedingly desirous that a more general knowledge on the questions in reference to Ruling Elders, discussed in Synod at its late meeting in this city, should be diffused amongst the Elders and members of the Presbyterian Church generally, in this country, respectfully request that you will write out your speeches on these questions, delivered in the Synod, and cause them to be printed for circulation.

Such of the undersigned as were present in Synod at the discussion of these agitating questions, beg leave respectfully to tender you their sincere and grateful thanks for your very able and eloquent defence of the rights and privileges of Ruling Elders, which they deem to have been invaded by the late General Assembly.

MAXWELL McDOWELL,	}	<i>Elders of the 1st Presbyterian Church.</i>
W. L. GILL,		
DAVID STUART,		
DAVID B. PRINCE,		<i>Elder of the 3d Church.</i>
JOHN McKEEN,		<i>Elder of the 4th Church.</i>
JOHN WILSON,	}	<i>Elders of the 2d Church.</i>
K. J. CROSS,		
ROBERT BROWN,		
JOHN FRANCISCUS,		
J. HARMAN BROWN,		
PETER FENBY,		

BALTIMORE.)
November 3, 1843.)

ARGUMENT FIRST.

My regret, Moderator, that the gentleman who has just taken his seat (*Kensey Johns, Esq.*) should be found contending against the rights of that class of officers of which he is an ornament, is mixed with admiration of his frank and kind demeanor—contrasting so strongly with the course which leading ministers of the gospel in this body have considered it their duty to pursue. If the advocates of that preposterous dogma, so current amongst us, that by ordination men transmit the essence of the offices they hold, could only prove that in the same manner they may transmit the spirit which actuates them, I, for one, sir, would infinitely prefer to be ordained with the imposition of the hands of a body of ruling elders, like my friend from Delaware, to the most unimpeachable descent through Popery, Prelacy, or New-Schoolism, which can be boasted by any of those who find themselves in positions which should entitle them, as they appear to suppose, to control these questions in this Synod. As to the proposition which the member has read,¹ and which he proposes to offer at a future stage of the business, I am glad to see that it distinctly repudiates the miserable sophistry put into the mouth of the last Assembly, and proclaims the duty of the churches to send up ruling elders, and that of the elders to attend the Presbyteries.² I must say, however, that the notion of a quorum of a church court being established by those gracious promises of our Saviour that he would be present where two or three are gathered in his name, and that if two would agree what they ask shall be done for them, seems to me in the last degree fanciful: or if there be any weight in the argument of the minute, then it is too manifest to need proof, that on this ground *two* officers, whether they be preachers or ruling elders being wholly immaterial, may constitute every church court authorised by Scripture, and therefore the Assembly, and the constitution of the Church are as far wrong, as the persons against whom the member has

¹See it, p. 614, *Spirit of the XIX. Century*, for November, 1843.

²Compare Chancellor Johns's paper with the Assembly's *Answer*, &c., p. 201, Minutes of 1843.

levelled his paper. But in truth these divine promises settle the quorum of a prayer meeting, or at most of a church, and have no relation to the present subject.

It is unfortunate that the question before us appears to be so minute. In point of fact, the ultimate principle involved is one of the most important and comprehensive that could be submitted to the people of God. In deciding it, we virtually decide whether our church constitution establishes a government under which the final power and the actual authority are in the hands of the preachers as preachers, or of the body of Christian people to be exercised through officers regularly connected with them; and as we confess that our constitution derives its binding force from its accordance with the word of God, the question at last is, between a divine hierarchy and a divine commonwealth. It is a question whose fearful scope is manifest upon every page of the history of Christianity; and the members of this Synod who have made so great efforts to strangle in the birth this effort to examine it, are unjust to themselves, and inattentive to some of the most portentous indications of the age.

There are many great, general, and precious truths upon which I will not venture to doubt that we are all agreed, and which yet seem to be decisive of the present subject. I cannot therefore omit to state the more obvious of them; and yet I ought not to consider it necessary to prove them, since they are explicitly held forth in our ecclesiastical standards. Such are the propositions, that God has established a kingdom in this world; that this kingdom is wholly distinct from all secular kingdoms, and entirely independent of all civil magistracies; that the visible Church of Jesus Christ is that kingdom, and he, the Lord Jesus, its only Head and King, its sole Lawgiver, its sole Priest, and by his word and Spirit its only infallible Teacher; and that the only safe, certain, and entire rule of faith and practice, is contained in Sacred Scripture. That to this kingdom, thus set up, held forth, and guided, the Lord Jesus Christ has given an outward government and permanent officers, our standards clearly teach (*Conf. Faith*, ch. xxxi. sec. 1); but the immediate application, as well as the great importance of these two principles, require a more particular notice of them.

That church government is in the hands of *assemblies*, congregational, classical, and synodical, and not of church officers individually considered (Form of Gov. ch. viii. sec. 1); that the church is governed by *judicatories*, not by officers acting personally, (*idem* ch. xiii. sec. 1), is the explicit doctrine of our constitution. This principle is fundamental and vital to our entire system, and constitutes one of the most striking characteristics by which Presbyterianism is separated from Prelacy on one hand, and Independency on the other. For our government is not in the hands of individual officers, and therefore is not Prelacy; neither is it in the hands of the whole brotherhood of each separate congregation as an independent body, and therefore it is not Independency: but it is in the hands of *assemblies*, of assemblies, too, which are classical and synodical as well as as congregational, and which even when congregational, are delegated and not popular. It is a Christian commonwealth; it is not a hierarchy; it is not an aggregation of many petty democracies. And such is the constant doctrine of the soundest Presbyterian Churches in every age, and of the greatest expounders of our system everywhere. "It is lawful and agreeable to the word of God that the church be governed by *several sorts of assemblies*, which are congregational, classical, and synodical," is the language of the Westminster Assembly, adopted by the venerable Kirk of Scotland nearly two hundred years ago; language conveying a sentiment held from the first dawn of the Reformation. Four years before the Scottish Kirk approved the "Form of Presbyterian Church Government," agreed on at Westminster (which it did in 1645), indeed, two years before the Westminster Assembly convened, the General Assembly of 1641, in a formal paper addressed to the Parliament of England, "with universal consent," as they declare, pleading that "the Prelaticall Hierarchie" might be "put out of the way," adopted the following remarkable language: "For although the Reformed Kirks do hold without doubting, their Kirk officers, and Kirk government by assemblies higher and lower, in their strong and beautiful subordination, to be *jure divino* and perpetual: yet Prelacie, as it differeth from the office of a pastor, is

almost universally acknowledged by the Prelates themselves, and their adherents, to be but an humane ordinance," &c.¹ And still earlier, the leading mind in the Church of God during the illustrious era of the second Reformation in Scotland, the Solemn League and Covenant, and the Westminster Assembly—the most brilliant epoch of modern history—had set this whole subject in precisely the light in which I am now endeavoring to present it, as a matter absolutely inherent in the very nature of Presbyterian polity, and distinguishing it precisely from a government by prelates. In a paper drawn up by *Alexander Henderson* in 1640, and submitted by the Scottish Commissioners in London (of whom he was one.) to the "Lords of the Treaty" who were endeavoring to draw closer the bonds of union between Scotland and England, "unity in religion, uniformity of church government, as a special means to conserve peace," being the general subject of the paper—and the utter hopelessness of unity, uniformity or peace, while Prelacy remained the established, exclusive, intolerant state religion of England, being one of the special points argued in it, that wonderful man uses the following explicit language: "They (the prelates) have left nothing undone which might tend to the overthrow of our Church, not only of late, by the occasion of these troubles whereof they have been the authors, but of old, from *that opposition which is between episcopal government and the government of the Reformed Churches by assemblies*;" and again, "The Reformed Churches do hold without doubting, their church officers, pastors, doctors, elders, and deacons, *and their church government by assemblies, to be, jure divino, and perpetual*, as is manifest in all their writings."² It cannot be questioned, sir, that all those churches, strictly called *Reformed*, did once hold with unanimous consent, and that their standards of faith, order, and discipline do still everywhere teach, that the government of the church of God is, *jure divino*, a free commonwealth, a government by assemblies; and it would be the idlest affectation for me to labor in a body like

¹See *Printed Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland*, 1682, p. 130, Acts of the year 1641.

²See this remarkable paper in *Hetherington's Hist. Westminster Assembly*, Appendix 1., pp. 300—7.

this, to prove that, this being granted, every thing which cannot, both in principle and in practice, be made to accord with this grand truth, is contrary to the revealed will of God and to the general sentiment of the Reformed Churches, and necessarily tends either to the disorganisation of the church or to tyranny in it.

The manner of constituting these assemblies and the officers who compose them, are stated in the clearest manner in our standards. "The ordinary and perpetual officers in the church are Bishops or Pastors; the representatives of the people, usually styled Ruling Elders; and Deacons." (Form of Government ch. iii. sec. 2). The church session consists of a pastor and ruling elders, (*idem* ch. ix. sec. 1:) a Presbytery of ministers and ruling elders, (*idem* ch. x. section 2:) a Synod of bishops and elders, (*idem* ch. xi. sec. 2:) and the General Assembly "of an equal delegation of bishops and elders." (*Idem* ch. xii. sec. 2.) These are the ordinary assemblies of the Church; these are the officers who compose them; these are the assemblies and these the officers composing them, into whose hands God has committed the government of his visible Church—according to our covenanted faith. And with us agree the Reformed Churches in general. The *Second Book of Discipline* of the Scottish Kirk, drawn up by *Andrew Melville*, a man heroic as Knox and learned as Calvin—a system formally adopted by the Scottish Assemblies of 1578 and 1581—deliberately sworn in the national covenant, and revived and ratified afresh in the memorable Assembly of 1638, and not only confirmed by many acts of other Assemblies, but made the basis of the laws which settled the church-government of Scotland in 1592, 1640, and 1690: this clearest and noblest monument of church order not only fully bears out the statements of our own constitution,¹ but declares, concerning ruling elders and their relations to the Church Courts—which are the special subjects of this discussion—that, "*Their principal office is, to hold assemblies with the pastors and doctors, who are also of their number, for establishing of good order, and execution of discipline.*" (Ch. vii. last section, *Duncan's Coll.*, p. 77.) And the Scottish Assembly of 1647, in

¹See *Second Book of Discipline*, chs. vi. and vii. *passim*.

one of the most emphatic public documents ever put forth by a church court, bearing a solemn, and, as the paper asserts on its face, a unanimous testimony "against the dangerous Tenets of Erastianisme and Independencie," delivers itself, in these words, "6. That Ecclesiastical Government is committed and entrusted by Christ to the *Assemblies of the Kirk, made up of the Ministers of the Word and Ruling Elders:*" and this, along with seven other heads of doctrine, "the General Assembly doth firmly believe, own, maintain, and commend unto others, as solid, true, orthodoxe, grounded upon the Word of God, consonant to the judgment both of the ancient and the best Reformed Kirks." And again, say *Henderson* and the Scottish commissioners to London in the paper before cited, "Much is spoken and written for the limitations of bishops; but what good can their limitation do to the church, if ordination and ecclesiastical jurisdiction shall depend upon them, and shall not be absolutely into the hands of the assemblies of the Church."² Now, sir, here is testimony just as conclusive as that on the former point, that ruling elders are by divine right and by inherent necessity a component part of every assembly in a settled church state; that this is the general doctrine of the Reformed Churches as well as of our own constitution; that the right and necessity of this presence of ruling elders in church assemblies, distinguishes Presbyterianism from Erastianism and Independency, as well as from Prelacy, as completely as the existence of the assemblies themselves does; and that the usurpation by bishops of the two grand powers residing in these assemblies, called by *Henderson* the powers "of ordination and ecclesiastical jurisdiction," must at last place the Church, as such a usurpation always heretofore has placed her, helpless and prostrate at the feet of a hierarchy; just as inevitably as the usurpation of the same powers by the State subjects her to the civil power; or the usurpation of them by the brotherhood in each congregation disorganizes entirely her whole constitution. Sir, these truths are as obvious as their operation is irresistible; and it is incomprehensible to me how any man who is qualified to sit in any assem-

¹See *Acts of the Scottish Kirk*, pp. 365-7—Anno 1647.

²*Hetherington ubi supra*, p. 305.

bly of our Church, can have a doubt in regard to them. They are truths which are infinitely fruitful as well as transparently clear; and their careful consideration would settle many questions now disputed amongst us, and correct practices neither few nor harmless which may one day become too strong for reason. I will not, however, follow them at present beyond the scope of the question before us.

The exact accordance of these two fundamental truths with Holy Scripture, will not, I presume, be openly questioned here. Not only is the general scope of God's word constantly relied on, but the particular passages are always cited in our own and in all the standards of the Reformed Churches, by which it is judged that every proposition asserted, is divinely sustained: and then it is confessed in the most unqualified terms that where God's word does not bear us out, either by its express language or or by its necessary intent, there we have no authority to define any thing or to enforce any thing—except it may be in some circumstances common to the Church and to human actions and societies, and even with regard to these the general rules of the word are always to be observed. (Confession of Faith, ch. i., sec. 6.) It must also be well known that questions of church government, and these questions touching assemblies and ruling elders in particular, have been more largely and elaborately discussed than most others; and that the purest Reformed Churches, and especially those standards from which ours have been chiefly taken, are clear and positive, in asserting the *jus divinum* of Presbyterian government. A *jus divinum* of the same character as that asserted for our system of doctrine; requiring in both cases a simple and faithful adherence on our part, and requiring in neither, harshness or intolerance towards those who differ from us; asserting in both cases the duty of God's people; but denying in neither that his people may be gathered into true churches, though neither their doctrine nor their order may seem to us scriptural in all respects. Such, I venture to believe, is the view of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; and as regards the present aspect of this argument, there are none here, I suppose, who will openly question that if our

standards teach that jurisdiction is in the hands of the Presbytery, they do so on the authority of God's word; if they teach that none but presbyters may be component parts of Presbytery, and that ruling elders are presbyters and therefore are component parts of Presbytery, they teach this also on the same authority. That these standards and those of the Reformed Churches in general do thus teach, I think I have clearly shown; and when it shall be questioned that this teaching is in accordance with divine truth, I will endeavor to make good this ground of our common faith.

It would appear, then, that the case is clearly against the decision of the last General Assembly, that in our Church a Presbytery can be regularly constituted without the presence of ruling elders. And it may be said, with all proper respect, that the circumstances attending the progress of this question through the Assembly, furnish ground for surprise and regret. It seems to have been taken up by the Committee of Bills and Overtures without any order from the house; to have been laid before that committee by a single individual; and to have occupied in its entire consideration only a part of one session of the Assembly. It does not appear that there was difficulty in the Church upon the subject, or any call for sudden action in regard to it. The committee which reported it consisted of two ruling elders and six ministers, and of these six ministers three were from one Synod (New Jersey), and three only were pastors; and in the Assembly itself, which struck this deadly blow at the office of ruling elder, there were above forty more ministers than elders; and this excessive disproportion was aggravated by the fact that an unusual number of the leading ministers of the body were persons not engaged in the regular work of the ministry of the word. Of the eighty-three persons who voted for the minute which passed the Assembly, sixty-three were ministers; of the thirty-five who voted against it eighteen were ministers; demonstrating that unhappy and dangerous prepossession which seems to characterise the feelings and opinions of our ministers upon every question touching the position and rights of the ruling elders, and to threaten the Church with the terrible ca-

lamiy of the permanent subjugation of these last named officers, and, as must inevitably follow, the overthrow of the freedom of the Church itself.¹

Now, Moderator, what is pretended—what is alleged to justify such a decision, under such circumstances? Let any man read the formal justification of the Assembly,² and, if he is able, pronounce it satisfactory. What, sir! are idle professions of respect an adequate compensation for a fatal decision impeaching the fundamental truths that our church government is one by assemblies, of which ruling elders are a constituent part, and this *jure divino*? Is it true, sir, in point of fact, that according to our constitution, congregations are not required to send delegates to Presbytery? Is it true, that “a Presbytery has no authority, whatever, to compel the attendance of elders?” If these are the real sentiments of the Church, the idea of our possessing any government at all, in the proper sense of that word, is utterly absurd—except so far as that government is for ministers and in the hands of ministers; which can result in nothing but an irresponsible clerical domination. If these are not the sentiments of the Church, let us vindicate at once the sacred principles which we profess to have received from God himself, and uphold in its integrity that noble spiritual commonwealth, in which, being divinely called, we bear offices for whose proper exercise we must account both to posterity and to Christ.

But, it is argued, the constitution itself bears out the decision of the Assembly, and provides that a *quorum* of a Presbytery may be formed without the presence of ruling elders. The Assembly decided, “that any three ministers of a Presbytery, being regularly convened, are a quorum competent to the transaction of all business.” (Minutes, p. 196.) The constitution of the Church on the other hand declares that “Any three ministers, and as many elders as may be present belonging to the Presbytery, being met at the time and place appointed, shall be a quorum competent to proceed to business.” (Form of Government, ch. x. sec. 7.) The thing to be proved is that these two propositions

¹See *Minutes of the Assembly for 1843*, pp. 196, 190, 170.

²*Idem*. pp. 201—2.

contain one and the same truth; a thing which never can be proved, while words retain their proper signification, and the great principles of our church polity remain unchanged. And until it is proved, the decision of the Assembly is erroneous and destructive, and it is our manifest duty to labor for its reversal. What is required to be disproved, is the agreement of these two propositions, and of consequence the erroneousness of the one pronounced by the Assembly. This I now proceed to do.

What, sir, is a *quorum*? Gentlemen talk and write, as if it were a fifth court of the Church; or rather a sort of sub-court to every church assembly. If ruling elders are essential to the composition of a Presbytery, and a quorum of a Presbytery is actually and potentially a Presbytery; then by the terms of the proposition, ruling elders are essential to the formation of this quorum. If a quorum of a Presbytery is not a Presbytery, actually constituted and competent to proceed to business, then to assert that it can do all the business of a Presbytery is utterly absurd and self contradictory; or else it is the erection of a new court, which can do all the business of a Presbytery, without being a Presbytery—which is contrary to common sense, to the constitution, and to the Scriptures. And yet, sir, it is upon quibbles and evasions like this, that men having a character in the Church, are content to rest the defence of acts and principles subversive of the order of God's house! It ought to be, and I suppose is, well known to the members of this court, that many law processes take their names from the first or other prominent words in them. Thus we say, *habeas corpus, capias ad satisfaciendum, fieri facias, venditioni exponas, venire facias, &c., &c.*; designating by these terms writs in common use and well understood. Such is the origin of our use of the word *quorum*; the king by his writ appoints certain persons to particular duties or offices, of which persons (*quorum*) he specifies in his warrant certain individuals or a certain number as competent to act, or required to be present. The rule of common sense, and universal practice, in the absence of any such specific provision, in regard to deliberative bodies at least, necessarily is *lex majoris partis*—the law of the greater number; less than the majority not being, in the eye

of reason, the body itself, and the majority being capable of determining the question, even where all are present. Thus taken, the two provisions determining the composition and the quorum of a Presbytery, put together, read as follows: A Presbytery consists of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation within a particular district; of whom (*quorum*) any three ministers, and as many elders as may be present, shall be competent to proceed to business, (Form of Government, chap. x. sec. 2 and 7;) and the question is, Are any elders at all required to be present? I answer, Yes: 1. Because every instrument of writing is to be so construed as to be consistent with itself; this instrument declares ruling elders to be a component part of all church assemblies; and therefore it cannot here mean to say this assembly is not composed in part of them; for in that case a quorum of Presbytery could be no church assembly at all. 2. Every law must receive such a construction, if such can be fairly given to it, as will make it consistent with fundamental constitutions which the makers of the law recognised as paramount authority, and which they are not to be presumed to violate, unless they plainly do so; but the makers of this provision of our church constitution admit the paramount obligation of the word of God, and admit that by it elders are a component part of all church courts; therefore, as they do not here expressly say they are not, they must not be presumed to mean that they are not: for if they do, they must mean that a quorum is a mere nullity, which is absurd. 3. In construing every instrument, the parts that are doubtful must be explained by the parts that are clear: but it is absolutely plain that by this instrument elders are a component part of all church courts; therefore this doubtful sentence cannot mean that they are not a component part of this particular church court; and if a quorum of Presbytery is not a Presbytery, and so a Church court, there is nothing to argue about. 4. The words about the presence of elders must have some meaning given to them, if there be any meaning they will bear; to say they mean that elders may be members, if present, is idle—for that is already provided for in the second section; to say they mean it is not material

whether they be present or not, is absurd, as is already proved—for other parts of the instrument settle, that, *jure divino*, they are a component part of the body; there is nothing else they can mean except that *some* must be present, but *how many* is immaterial; this therefore is obliged to be the sense of the words—and this is, indeed, their obvious sense. 5. The copulative, *and*, plainly shows that others besides the three ministers were designed to be present; if three ministers make a quorum, that is clearly expressed in the definition of the General Assembly; but the constitution adds another clause about elders and couples it conjunctively; therefore it must mean more than the Assembly means—and elders must be those meant; or if not, who are the others meant in the clause? 6. This is the more clear when it is considered that the Presbytery, being composed of two classes of persons, different in many important respects, something more than a mere indirection must be necessary to exclude one entire class; and above all where the class thus to be excluded is the very one from which the particular court and the entire denomination derive their name, the very one which is by eminence invested with the right to exercise government and discipline in all church assemblies. 7. It is said *may* be present never can be made to mean *must* be present; and therefore there must be implied a condition and a discretion: I answer *many* can never be made to mean *none*; and as for the condition, it applies to the *number* present, not to the *fact* of presence; and as for the implied discretion, I deny it, for it is the duty of Session to send the elder, it is his duty to go, and it is the duty of the Presbytery to make him come and to receive him when he arrives. 8. Suppose the same phraseology were used as to the ministers necessary in making a quorum as is used in regard to the elders, thus, “A Presbytery consists of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation within a particular district, of whom (*quorum*) *as many ministers and as many elders as may be present* shall be competent to proceed to business;” in this case would any human being doubt that both ministers and elders must be present? If not, then it is manifest that the present phraseology requires some elders to be pres-

ent. 9. It is the settled doctrine of our Church, and of all other Reformed Churches, that the right to convene in church assemblies, both stated and *pro re nata*, is divine, inherent, and altogether independent of the civil power;¹ by our constitution, a meeting of Presbytery *pro re nata* cannot be convened unless two elders, and they of different congregations, sign the requisition for it along with two ministers; and these four persons, with the presiding officer, being convened upon their own call, may do the business thus specified, but no other. Now will it be pretended that the power to meet and act *pro re nata* has a different origin or nature from that to meet stately? that the power to do some special and it may be immaterial business, is more hedged about than the power to do that business and all other business besides? If not, then it follows, that in this provision we have a clear and explicit statement of what our constitution intends by the quorum of Presbytery. 10. I consider all arguments drawn from the possible inconvenience that might result, in extreme cases, from the establishment of the construction here contended for, as being entirely fallacious, beside the question, and unworthy of the subject; and all such as are based on alleged danger from the possible inattention, perverseness, or revolutionary spirit of ruling elders, leading them to defeat or break up meetings of Presbytery, as being insulting to the ruling elders, and disreputable to those who employ them. 11. If it be urged that as the Presbytery is one body in which two classes of members are amalgamated, and vote and act jointly and not by classes, and therefore the presence of any members of the class of elders is not indispensable; I reply, this argument is inconsistent both with the general principles of the constitution, and the express words of the clause under consideration, for if it were true it would prove that a sufficient number of either class might make a quorum, but the words expressly preclude this sense. I answer further, that upon this argument it follows inevitably that ruling elders thus amalgamated must have the right

¹See *Confession of Faith*, chap. xxxi. *passim*; *Form of Government*, chap. x. sec. 10; also the *Act of the Kirk of Scotland, adopting the Westminster Confession*, *Duncan's Coll.* pp. 266-7.

to impose hands in ordination with other members, which is denied by those who use this argument, and who thereby show their want of confidence in their own theories. 12. If it be said that inasmuch as in extreme cases the Session may be constituted without the presence of a minister (Form of Government, ch. ix., sec. 4,) it follows that in extreme cases a Presbytery may be constituted without elders; I answer, that as the first is by express law, the second must be also, and there is no such law; further, that the existence of clear law for the former, and the total want of it for the latter, is conclusive against it; and further still, that the argument contradicts itself, since it argues from the plenary powers of elders to their total want of all power; from their paramount importance in a parochial presbytery to their utter insignificance in a classical presbytery; from their ability to act without ministers in one assembly to the ability of ministers to act without them in another assembly—all which is absurd.

It is upon such grounds as these, sir, that I am led to conclude that this clause about a quorum affords no pretext whatever for constituting a Presbytery, under our constitution, out of three ordinary ministers of the word, without the presence of ruling elders. How far the exercise of such a power might be justified in a forming or unsettled Church state; or how far it could be successfully maintained in relation to evangelists, who are admitted by all the Reformed Churches to be temporary and extraordinary officers; nay, how far ruling elders alone would be justified in very extraordinary cases, in transcending the boundaries which we have established between parochial and classical assemblies: all these are questions in regard to which there is no necessity for me to express at this time any other opinion than this—that such powers are to be established in a manner very different from inconsistent and strained constructions of an incidental clause in a church constitution. And, sir, I earnestly beseech you to consider how easy it would be to subvert the principle that our Church is governed by assemblies, after subverting that which establishes the composition of those assemblies. Surely it would be a task of small difficulty to find some plea upon which the potential authority of the assemblies themselves

might be irregularly exercised, after succeeding upon one so miserable as the best of those we have yet been favored with, in establishing the monstrous proposition that ecclesiastial jurisdiction is complete in three ministers without charge, without the concurrence of the body of Christ's people, or the presence of their immediate representatives divinely called to the exercise of this very function. Or can it be that it is the want of any adequate impression that the Church of Christ has really a divinely ordained polity, which makes it so difficult to prevent her own ministers from transgressing some of her plainest principles; her own courts from lawing violent hands upon some of her most precious defences, at the same moment they are devolving on secular corporations some of her most sacred obligations? I desire to speak with tenderness and respect; but unless I greatly deceive myself, the issue of these questions involves interests which we cannot handle with too much sobriety.

It has appeared to me, Moderator, that there is a fundamental error pervading most of the reasoning which I have heard and read against the rights of ruling elders, which has great influence in fostering the opinions against which I am now contending. It seems to be supposed that ministers of the word are more essentially and permanently members of our church courts, than ruling elders are; indeed, that they are, somehow, more immediately and sacredly officers of the Church of Christ. Such notions are altogether wrong. These offices are both alike ordained of God; the persons who fill them are equally supposed to be called and qualified from above; the gift of ruling is as real and as distinct a gift of God as that of teaching; and though the teaching elder is entitled to double honor if he both rules and also labors in word and doctrine, the ruling elder is also, by the same divine word, entitled to double honor if he rules well; and by the same law the teaching elder who does not labor in word and doctrine, is entitled for all his ruling to no honor at all, for he has forsaken the most important part of his calling; and the ruling elder who rules ill is bereft also of the blessing, because he has neglected his only calling. Elders, they are alike—presbyters and no more, are they both; to deny which is to deny the express letter

of the word of God;¹ rulers are they both, because they are presbyters; and though one class has the superadded and more honorable function of teaching, as their main work, let them not think that for this reason they are any more rulers than other presbyters; and especially let them not think that they may neglect their work of teaching, as too many do, and strive to make up the omission by engrossing, as their main work, that which is the only work of the ruling elders; and let not this latter class fail of the reward of ruling well, by allowing their office to be despised, their crowns to be taken from them, their double honor to be rendered nugatory. The work of teaching, and the work of ruling require gifts entirely distinct from each other; they are works not only separable, but actually separated in our church—in which our ruling elders have no pretence of a right to be public teachers; and it is as rulers and not as teachers, that the officers of the Church are invested with its government. It is not because our ministers of the word are invested with the right to preach and administer ordinances that they are invested with the power of rule; but it is because they are ordained church rulers as well as church teachers, that they hold and may exercise jurisdiction. Preacher and ruler are the furthest possible from being synonymous words; elder and ruler are strictly synonymous, as the Scriptures every where teach.² Seeing, then, that our ministers of the word exercise spiritual jurisdiction simply and exclusively because they are elders themselves, upon what ground soever the notion may have arisen that they are in any way or to any degree more competent to rule than other elders, it is utterly untenable. And seeing it has been proved already that all church rule is in the hands of assemblies, it follows that preachers,

¹See 1 Tim. v. 17. Also, "*The True Nature of a Gospel Church*," by the great John Owen, especially chs. iii., iv., vii., viii., in the 20th vol. of his works, edited by Orme; also *Dr. Miller's Essay on the Ruling Elder*, especially chs. ii., iii., iv., v., vi., vii.; also the first article in the *Spirit of the XIX. Century*, for December, 1843, which, there can be no impropriety in saying, is from the pen of *Prof. Thornwell* of the College of South Carolina.

²Acts xi. 30; xv. 2, 4, 6, 22; xvi. 4; xx. 17, 28; xxi. 18. 1 Tim. v. 17. 1 Pet. v. 1. 2 John i. 3. John i. Rom. xii. 8. 1 Cor. xii. 28. 1 Tim. iii. 5, &c.

as such, can have no relation to such assemblies that can give them any power to rule, but must derive that power from the fact that they are elders—presbyters; the very fact upon which ruling elders rest theirs. No man has the right to rule as minister at large, even though he be both teaching and ruling elder, as all admit; but he must be pastor of such or such a church to give him any power in it; and he must belong to such or such an assembly to give him any power there; his membership, and not his right to preach, being the immediate ground of his power, and his office as elder, not as minister of the word, being the final ground of it.

These distinctions are impregably established by the very nature and distribution of Church power. It is held with a universal consent amongst us that the power of the Church and of all its courts, is merely a ministerial and declarative power; a power to declare the sense of God's word, and to execute it; moreover, that it is a power strictly and exclusively moral, to be exercised only over the souls, the minds, the consciences of men; a power therefore not absolute in us, but in God only, and to be exercised by us, simply as a spiritual trust and upon the authority of Christ, and by no means as an inherent power; and again, that its whole force is spent upon those only who are voluntarily the followers of Christ, and through their own act fellow-citizens with the saints. The light of nature and the word of God alike teach us, that such powers can never be exercised except by officers bearing a double relation to God and to the household of faith: it is by the authority of God, but it is also by the consent of God's people, that every spiritual officer is to be appointed and every act of authority exerted. Every kind of power that can be exercised, is either a joint or a several power. Ecclesiastical power that is *several*, is defined to be *potestas ordinis*—the power of order; that which is joint, *potestas jurisdictionis*—the power of rule.¹ To the former class belong all such

¹See *Second Book of Discipline of the Kirk of Scotland*, ch. i., sec. 6, which is full and explicit on this subject: see also *Owen's Gospel Church*, ch. vii., vol. 20, p. 473, works; also the *Collections of Steuart of Pardovan*, p. 38, B. I. t. ix., sec. 1.

powers as any church officer may exercise personally, singly—and by right of his order—*ex officio*; as that a minister of the word may preach, administer ordinances, &c., or that an elder may counsel, rebuke, &c.; to the latter class belong all powers that can be exercised only in assemblies of the Church, all which are joint and corporate powers, without exception. It follows, inevitably, that to suppose the possession of certain rights which are *several*, that is, rights of order, gives a peculiar, inherent, permanent, and sacred right to the exercise of powers which are *joint*, that is, powers of jurisdiction, is absurd; and that the notion that one sort of *several* power to wit, preaching, gives this right more sacredly or really than another kind, for example, rebuking, is also absurd; but that all the possessors of the *joint* power have an equal and the very same right to its joint exercise, and of course to membership in the assemblies where alone it can be exerted. And it cannot be too often noted that the *several* exercise of *joint* powers, is Prelacy and not Presbyterianism; for, as Henderson has well said, in the remark already cited from him, if ordination and jurisdiction, both of which are, according to our system and to divine truth, joint powers, depend on bishops, all other limitations can do the Church no good. And what is it, but a tincture of Prelacy, for ministers of the word to claim, if not indeed an exclusive *several* right to the exercise of all joint powers, at least a superior, more permanent, and more sacred right founded upon the peculiar nature of their *several* powers, to exercise even to the exclusion of elders, powers which are purely joint?

Let it be further observed, sir, that it is a total illusion to suppose, as many seem to do, that any church courts—our Presbyteries for example—are radically composed of ministers of the word. Presbyteries are properly composed of parishes, congregations, particular churches, not of ministers of the word. The grand reason assigned for the necessity of Presbyteries is, that “The Church being divided into *many separate congregations, these need mutual counsel and assistance,*” and therefore, the importance and usefulness of a body in which they may act by their ministers and elders. (Form of Government, ch. x.,

sec. 1 and 2.) The keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed into the hand of those who are officers of churches; and all synods and councils, in a settled church state, are assemblies which "it belongeth to the overseers and other rulers of the particular churches to appoint." (Confession of Faith, ch. xxx. secs. 1—2, and ch. xxxi. sec. 1.) The General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, in acts passed during the noblest era of that illustrious Church, has settled this point in the same manner, over and over. In an Act passed December 20, 1638, they say, in terms, "Presbyteries are composed of sundry Parochins."¹ In an Act passed June 3, 1644, "for the present entrie of the new erected Presbyterie at Biggar," and which seems to be in the common form, twelve particular churches are named and erected into a Presbytery, and then all the ministers and ruling elders of the said named churches are empowered to meet in Presbytery and exercise the power and jurisdiction belonging to such a body.² And in the important Act approving the Westminster Confession of Faith, passed on the 27th of August, 1647, the Assembly expressing its sense of ch. xxxi. sec. 2, of that Confession as it passed the Synod of Westminster, expressly say, that it is only in churches "not settled or constituted in point of government," that the civil magistrate may call synods which are even properly composed, or that "*the ministers of Christ without delegation from their churches* may of themselves, and by virtue of their office meet together synodically;" and that "neither of these ought to be done in Kirks constituted and settled;" for, proceeds the Act, the magistrate may always consult, in a settled church, the assemblies "of ministers and ruling elders meeting *upon delegation from their churches*;" and these assemblies "are always free to meet as well *pro re nata*, as at ordinary times, *upon deputation from the churches*, by the intrinsecal power received from Christ."³ I therefore take it, sir, to be indisputable, that, according to our constitution, and according to the general principles of the case as understood by the purest

¹Printed Acts of the Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland, p. 6.

²*Idem.* p. 217.

³*Idem.* p. 352.

Reformed Church in her purest day, ministers not only do not compose Presbyteries or other church courts, by virtue of their office as ministers; but in a settled Church state they are not in strict right entitled even to appear in them as constituent members, except as they are ministers of the particular churches which make up the Presbytery. Whatever force may be derived from a contrary practice in our Church—allowing ministers as such, to sit in Presbytery—is spent upon the mere fact of that practice; and that far, in the past and existing condition of the church, might appeal to the sound discretion of the Church; but even in this case, every act and record of our Church tolerating such a practice, proceeds on the assumption that such ministers are at least engaged in the cure of souls as their main work.¹ But now, when a claim is set up, as of right, and is enforced by a fatal act of the Assembly, which not only places every minister simply as a minister, and in total disregard of his having forsaken his covenanted calling, in full possession of the amplest powers belonging to a church ruler; when it is alleged, as of divine right, that men of this description are more inherently

¹The reader will observe that there are here four associated but distinct questions: (1) The formation of Presbyteries. (2) The meetings of them without elders. (3) The sitting of ministers in them, who are not pastors or evangelists. (4) The sitting of such ministers who have forsaken their calling. As it is *law*, not *practice*, that I am discussing, and this question of practice is both uncertain and extensive, I leave it, just now, upon the general statements of the speech, which contain the conclusions I have arrived at. The main points here argued, will be found to be borne out by the great mass of the Acts of the Assembly and of all our Synods constituting Presbyteries, which are essentially *geographical*, making the Presbyteries consist of certain churches and their ministers, or certain ministers and their churches, or a certain district of country, or certain ministers and a certain district; but very rarely, of ministers only; and then against the law and the sense of the Church. The principle of *elective affinity*, was thoroughly a New School principle and was utterly repudiated by the Church. The point of the argument is that Presbyteries are not composed of ministers *alone*, nor of ministers *as such*; and a careful examination will show this truth to be deeply imbedded in the acts as well as in the constitution of the church. My view of a loose practice is that the law ought to correct it, not it subvert the law.

church rulers than those whose sole duty it is to rule, and that they may rule independently of them, and if need be to the exclusion of all participation of authority by them; it is high time to recur to first principles, and to set the whole subject upon its true and scriptural basis. Thus considered, nothing is more clear, than that the rule of the whole Church is lawfully and righteously in the hands of the rulers of the particular churches; and to assert the contrary is to contend for a government which is irresponsible, incompetent, without warrant and without delegation; a kind of government equally repugnant to the light of nature and the word of God.

I will now, sir, advance a step further, and show that the act of the last Assembly is contrary to the clear and well settled construction of the law of the case; that it is directly contradictory of the established construction of our own and of the Scottish Constitutions upon this important subject. The whole matter is *res adjudicata*; and the decision of our last Assembly is as completely aside from the whole current of decisions, as I have shown it to be of fundamental principles. According to the settled law of the Scottish Church, every church court in which ruling elders do not sit, is illegal, and all its acts are null. *Steuart of Pardovan* declares that neither the Constitution of the Church nor the law of the land in Scotland "do authorise any other ecclesiastical judicatory but Assemblies, Synods, Presbyteries, and Kirk Sessions, or their committees, consisting of ministers and ruling elders;" that "no ecclesiastical judicatory, or committee thereof, can be lawful," "without consisting of both ministers and elders;" and he expresses a doubt whether the State would recognise or correspond with any bodies not thus composed.¹ The Assembly of 1638, the most memorable except that of 1843, that ever met in Scotland, annulled as utterly illegal no less than six preceding, and, as they called them, "pretended Assemblies;" to wit, those of 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, 1617, and 1618. Amongst the reasons assigned for this immense stretch of authority, in five out of six cases, one reason is that there were no ruling elders in these Assemblies; in some, none being lawfully commissioned, in others,

¹Collections, p. 68. Book I., Tit. 15, Sec. 29.

none lawfully sent.¹ The Assembly of the following year in an elaborate statement entitled "Causes and Remedie of the by-gone evils of this Kirk," addressed to the King, assign as the fifth cause of past troubles, the six fore-cited Assemblies, which they pronounce to have been corrupt, null and unlawful—amongst other chief reasons, because they were "called and constitute quite contrary to the order, constitution, and uninterrupted practice of the Church ever since the Reformation, by all which ruling elders did rightly constitute a part of lawful General Assemblies."² The law as laid down by Pardovan extends even to commissions and committees of the church courts; which differ from each other in this, that the former may examine *and conclude*, while the latter can only examine *and report*; and I have discovered a very curious fact strongly illustrative of the subject now before us, in which the Commission of the Scottish Assembly of 1643, in appointing a special commission of itself, had its attention directed to the very principles for which I now contend, and fully recognised them in one of the most interesting acts, and in its issues one of the most important, ever performed by a church court. It was on the occasion of appointing the Scotch Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly. Baillie, who was one of them, tells us that he moved, in the meeting of the Commission of the Assembly, that some elders should be placed on the Commission about to be sent to Westminster; but, he adds, "I gott not a man to second me; yet the absurditie and danger of such ane omission pressing my mind, I drew up reasons for my judgement, which I communicat to Argyle and Warristone; and when they had lyk'd the motion, I went so about it, that at the next meeting it was carried without opposition."³ These "reasons," more fortunate and effectual than reasons usually are, have come down to us, and are worthy still to be pondered. The one which is immediately pertinent to my present argument is in these words: "4. The excluding of ruling elders from a Commissione of this nature,

¹Printed Acts of Scottish Assemblies, pp. 8-14; Pardovan, p. 57, Book I., Tit. 15, Sec. 1.

²Printed Acts, p. 75, Assembly of 1639.

³Baillie's Letters and Journals, Vol. II., p. 55, Edinburgh, 1841.

may call in question the validity of the Commissione: may hazard the approbatione of it by the next Generall Assemblie; may give just offence to all ruling elders; may make all the actions of these ministers more unpleasant, and of lesse authoritie with the bodie of any nation."¹ The result was the recognition of the universality of the principle, that ruling elders must regularly be members of all assemblies whose constituent parts are preaching and ruling elders, and even of all commissions and sub-commissions of them, whether general or special; and three ruling elders, the Earl of Cassilis, Lord John Maitland, and Johnstoun of Waristoun, were united with the ministers Henderson, Douglas, Rutherford, Baillic, and Gillespie, as commissioners on the part of the Kirk of Scotland to the Westminster Assembly. All this is the more remarkable, when we compare the phraseology of the Scottish standards with that of our own, and the construction of the language with the construction adopted by our late Assembly. In the Printed Acts of the Scotch Assemblies, I have before me repeated acts of the successive Assemblies from 1638 to 1649, appointing their standing "Commissione for the public affairs of this Kirk." These acts name first a large number of ministers, then a large number of ruling elders, who are directed to meet on a day certain at a place fixed, and afterwards "as they shall think good;" and then "gives and grants unto them, or any fifteen of them, there being twelve ministers present, full power and commission, etc."² Here is a case far stronger for the exclusion of elders, who are not even named as a part of the quorum, than can be produced out of our Standards; and yet of such cases as this, Pardovan asserts that unless elders are present the commission is illegal;³ and Baillie informs us, that in this identical commission of which he was a member, so many ministers, "*and three elders, made a quorum.*"⁴ In regard to the quorum of Presbytery, the case is even more striking; for "to perform any

¹Baillie's Letters and Journals, Vol. II., p. 479.

²Printed Acts for 1643, p. 209; see also pp. 147, 223, 318, 361, 434, etc., for the commissions of other years, where the same phraseology is used.

³Collections, p. 68.

⁴Letters and Journals, Vol. II., p. 97.

classical act of government or ordination, there shall be present, at least, a major part of the ministers of the whole classis," says Pardovan; and yet, says the same authority, this very Presbytery is illegal, unless ruling elders be also present.¹ That is, by the Scottish standards, in the quorum of a Presbytery there must be at least the major part of all the ministers of the body—nothing being said in this relation, of elders; but seeing it is a fundamental principle of the whole system that elders enter into the composition of every court, they are, upon that principle, held to be indispensable here, and are so adjudged to be. But our standards fully recognise and assert the same general principle, and moreover particularly name elders in the special clause about a quorum, as members presumed to be present; and yet our Assembly concludes that they need not be present at all! The State-Church of monarchical Scotland, with rules less manifestly clear for the rights of the especial representatives of the Christian people, declared steadfastly and clearly for those rights, ages ago; while the free Church of republican America, with every general principle and every special enactment of its Constitution strongly and manifestly for those high and important rights, decides, even at a time like this, earnestly, yea, indignantly, against them; nay, a storm is raised against the presumption of vindicating what are stigmatised as Brownist, radical, and revolutionary doctrines, and even many of the elders themselves are amongst the very foremost in destroying their own sacred liberties! Surely these things are calculated to arrest the public attention, and to create a profound anxiety in the minds of all those who know how difficult it is to preserve the purity of free institutions, and to maintain the spiritual liberties of mankind.

This extraordinary decision of our General Assembly, and the violent efforts made to uphold it as just and wise, are the more surprising, when it is remembered that it is contrary to former decisions of our Church. From the earliest period of this Church in America, the *Collections of Pardovan* have been its rule of discipline, and the general principles therein embodied recognised as essentially our own;² and that work was made the basis of a

¹Compare Book I., Title xiii., Sec. 1, p. 44, with Title xv., Sec. 29, p. 68.

²See printed Minutes of the Presbyterian Church, p. 519.

portion of our present standards when they were compiled.¹ Although, therefore, it may have been true, in the forming and unsettled state of the Church, and especially amid the difficulties created by a bloody and protracted national struggle for freedom, in which our whole Church embarked with the country as one man, that occasional departures from strict rule were unavoidable, yet these irregularities could do little harm so long as the law remained unaltered and clear against them, and the sentiment of the Church was right, as the places I have cited clearly prove it was, up to the period when our present standards were compiled, fifty-five years ago. Upon the law of those standards, as written, I have already spoken fully. That law, as expounded, presents little or nothing to countenance, and a mass of proof against, the interpretation of the last Assembly. Even the early and monstrous violation of the Constitution by the formation of the *Plan of Union* of 1801, so far respected reason and truth that no pretension was made that the contemplated arrangements were either regular, constitutional, or permanent. That plan, as it relates to the present question, virtually abolished the office of ruling elder; and if there is one point upon which this Church has pronounced an irreversible judgment, it is that that Plan was utterly null and void from the hour of its inception up to the declaration of that nullity thirty-six years afterwards, by the Assembly of 1837. It is true the controversy which resulted in this decision involved other questions—questions of doctrine, and questions of practice, as well as questions of Church order; and I am ready to admit that in all my efforts—and no man made more—to reform the Church at that period, the question of order was never considered by me the paramount question. But the fact is recorded palpably and beyond denial upon all the proceedings of that period, civil and ecclesiastical, that the controversy was settled mainly on the point of Church order. There were great irregularities and there were great heresies, no doubt, to be removed; but these could not make the *Plan of Union* unconstitutional—they could only make it improper. But the Assembly of 1837 annulled that Plan as unconstitutional, and then de-

¹*Idem*, p. 535.

clared the four Synods out of our connexion for the reason that that they were illegally constituted and illegally continued, by and under that void Plan. In what respect, sir? Why, sir, the churches, the Presbyteries, and the Synods, were declared to be not Presbyterian mainly upon the very point this day involved. They had no ruling elders, and therefore were not Presbyterian. And whoever will carefully study the acts of the Assembly of 1837, its answers to protests, its official letters, the whole current of its proceedings, will find the stress of the whole question laid upon Church order, and the hinge of the whole case, in the question debated before you this day. Upon this ground, more than upon any other, it was triumphantly carried through that great Assembly, through the Church at large, and through the civil tribunals of the country. Sir, I was an actor in all those scenes. I have personal knowledge of what I assert. The records of the Church and of the country, bear me out in what I say. And I now tell you, I tell the Church, I tell posterity, that if the decision of the Assembly of 1843 is law, the decisions of the Assembly of 1837 are not law. If it is law that ministers without charge make a Presbytery, a Synod, and an Assembly—for the decision covers all this—then it was illegal, it was monstrous, to separate four entire Synods from the Church upon the pretence that even ministers with charge cannot, without the presence of ruling elders, constitute church courts which can constitutionally belong to this Church. They might deserve, upon other grounds, to be separated from us; but it could not be true, that for this defect they never were with us, or of us, if this defect is no defect. It is vain to say, the disowned Synods had no elders appointed in any of their churches; the fact is otherwise—there were elders, more or less, in many churches; and as it regards the Presbyteries and Synods, the fact of presence, not the fact of existence, is the sole fact in the case. For my part, sir, I stand by the reform of 1837—by its principles, and by its acts. I pronounce the decision of 1843 a counter revolution; and I unhesitatingly denounce it as at once compromising the character of the Church, subverting the fundamental principles of its polity, pros-

trating the rights of the elders, and endangering the spiritual freedom of the people.¹

Moderator, if I am capable of feeling the force of truth, I have now proved these propositions: that in our Church the government is in the hands, not of a priesthood, nor of the brotherhood, but of assemblies; that these assemblies are composed, regularly, of ministers of the word and of ruling elders, and these two fundamental principles are revealed to us from God; that a quorum of Presbytery, which is nothing more nor less than a Presbytery constituted for business, is to be composed according to the two preceding rules, and that the fair construction of our Constitution can lead us to nothing else; that it is so far from being true that ministers of the word are more sacredly the rulers of the Church, and the organic members of our church courts, by virtue of their office as teachers, than ruling elders are, that the fact is precisely the reverse, and that the ministers are members of any of those courts simply because they are elders themselves, and therefore rulers; that this whole view of the subject is fully established by the acts and decisions both of the Church of Scotland, after

¹ It would be perfectly easy to show by citations from nearly every important paper of the Assembly of 1837, and from the elaborate report of the trial at law growing out of the acts of Assembly of 1837-38, that both the Church and the civil tribunals allowed this great controversy to go off mainly on the point of Church order, and that the question of Church order turned essentially upon the illegality of the Plan of Union, and that illegality upon its provisions allowing elders to be superseded entirely or supplanted by committee-men. The length to which this would protract this argument, and the general acquaintance which must exist in regard to matters so recent and so important, induce me to omit the detailed proof. It is also worthy of serious reflection, and is a strong collateral support to my general principles, that the German and the Dutch Reformed Churches in this country, both in principle and practice, adopt the view contended for by me, in this speech. In the former Church it is extremely common for an elder to preside in consistory, the pastor being present. And it is well known that the Classes and Synods erected in England under the advice of the Westminster Assembly, consisted of twice as many elders as ministers, and that no act was valid except a certain number of the former class approved it: a point not embraced in the advice of the Assembly, but submitted to by those holding *jure divino* principles.

which we have copied most, and by those of our own Church from its origin, and especially in recent and memorable transactions. I think, sir, I have also proved that, according to the well settled principles of the whole subject in its widest extent, and according to the clear judgment of the ablest men, and the purest Churches which have handled these great questions, any serious departure from the positions I have established, leads by inevitable necessity to Prelacy or to Independency; and, sir, I could easily show, if it were required, that in all past time, whatever clear thinker or learned man, or gathered Church, has held other opinions and stopped short of Prelacy or Independency, has seriously doubted or wholly denied the *jus divinum* of the office of ruling elder. It is apparent then that some of the most important considerations which can ever be presented upon the subject of Church order, must be carefully weighed before we can render a safe, an intelligent, or a just decision in the matter before us. And if gentlemen can find any pleasure in scoffs at old books, the very outsides of which they confess they never saw until now, and at that patient and minute search into the past, which they are pleased to consider, as its fruits are laid at their feet, a useless display of learning irrelevant to the questions we are to decide; I am so far from presuming to rob them of any part of that gratification, that I can only lament my utter inability to take up knowledge by absorption, to decide intuitively what God has revealed or ought to reveal, to divest myself of all reverence for the judgment of great and good men who have devoted vast powers of thought and investigation to subjects I desire to understand, or to bear as a light and easy thing the responsibility laid upon me by my calling and my vows, to seek for, to cherish, and to maintain truth.

It does appear to me, sir, that principles of the deepest importance are involved in this subject, and that practical consequences of the gravest character would be likely to follow the final confirmation by the Church, of the hasty and ill-considered decision of the Assembly of 1843. The most terrible calamity which can befall any government is to separate it either in feeling or in reality from those who are subject to its authority; as the most obvious proof that any community is already subjugated, is that

that the government is paramount to the state itself. Shall we bring upon ourselves both these disasters? All spiritual authority, from its very nature ought to be, and with us happily is, submitted to only as the voluntary act of those who obey it. The government of the Church of God was made for the Church, not the Church for it; its officers given to the spouse of the Lamb, not placed as lords over her. The church courts are not the Church; but preachers and elders are alike, and are only, a *ministry*—a body of servants given by the ascending Saviour to the body of his redeemed. Shall the ministers of the word become a close corporation, self-perpetuated, and in effect irresponsible, connected with the Church only by an undefined dominion over it, not being, if we dare credit the last Assembly, even members of it?¹ Or shall they continue to be helpers of the joy instead of lords over the consciences of God's people, their great and paramount function being to teach the world the religion of Jesus, and their less important office to join with those whose special duty it is to rule, in the gentle and divided authority which the representatives of Christ's people, in Christ's name, exercise over them? Are the ruling elders of our churches to continue the honored and chosen guides of the particular flocks, the authorised and immediate representatives of the people in the assemblies of the Church, an integral and necessary portion of every assembly to which jurisdiction appertains? Or are they to occupy a position altogether equivocal, accidental, provisional, humiliating, and become an appendage to the ministers; yea, an appendage adding nothing when they are present that did not equally exist when they were absent, and taking nothing when they depart that is essential to be retained? Are our congregations to look for direction to Presbyteries composed of teaching and ruling elders selected by themselves, participating in all their feelings, efforts, and wants, and distinctly acquainted with their whole estate? Or are they to be ruled by three ministers without charge, who, it may be, have forsaken their covenanted calling, and who presume to exercise the powers of government over ministers, elders, and people, with none of whom they hold more than a purely

¹ Printed Minutes, p. 175.

nominal relation? Sir, it cannot be denied that these two Church states are immeasurably distant from each other. One is a hierarchy; the other is a Christian commonwealth.

For my part, there is but one course which I can adopt. It does not satisfy my conscience to be told that the construction which is to work this destructive change was adopted by a great majority of the Assembly; that it is approved by the leading men and institutions of the Church; that learned civilians pronounce it correct; that foreign ministers have been consulted and have acceded to it. It does not deter me to be threatened with the pains of an incendiary, and the penalties of a Church disturber. It does not remove from my path one ray of light, nor shake in my heart one firm resolve, to have predicted defeat and threatened ignominy set before me in the most distinct and appalling forms. I have borne much in the service of this Church; I am willing to endure more. I have stood for the truth, when fewer stood by me, than I can count to-day. Make this cause as desperate as you please, as degraded as you can; make the danger to me and to the Church as imminent as the most confident of those against me can desire, or the most timid of those with me can dread; and still I will take the risk and meet the peril. When the army of the king of Babylon beleaguered Jerusalem, the very prophet who in the face of death itself, and with the brand of a traitor upon him for his fidelity, denounced the doom of the wicked city, paid down in the very courts of his prison the price of the field that was in Anathoth, and subscribed the evidence, and called witnesses, and with all precision and formality redeemed the spot, it may be, on which the victorious army of the Chaldeans was encamped; for he knew that houses, and fields, and vineyards, would be possessed again in the land of Israel. Sir, I will take courage from this sublime example. Let this Synod say the Church is not a free commonwealth established of God, but is a hierarchy, which my soul abhors, and I will meekly, I trust, but yet resolutely deny that the Synod utters God's truth. Let the great institutions which rule the Church, and the great men who conspire with them, assert with one accord, that we are a hierarchy, and not a free commonwealth, and I will still lift up my humble voice

against their loud and unanimous cry. Let the General Assembly of the Church, if such be the will of God, angry at us for our sins, adjudge for a hierarchy and against a commonwealth; and while I must respect even the errors of that venerable court, I will set my poor name against its adjudication, and let posterity decide betwixt us. Let the ruling elders themselves, overborné by the clamor or seduced by the caresses of the ministers, prove insensible to their calling and negligent of the sacred trust reposed in them by God and God's blood-bought people; and even this fearful apostasy shall not shake my immovable purpose to defend the spiritual freedom of the Church, while there remains one inch of ground on which I can plant myself. For surely I trust in God that this sudden, amazing, and wide-spread stupor which has seized the officers of the Church and blinded them to the true character of our institutions, and under whose baleful influence a line of conduct and a course of observation so remarkable have been adopted in this Synod and elsewhere, cannot be perpetuated; and that, sooner or later, the Church must return to her ancient landmarks, the distinguishing and vital principles of her polity.

It is therefore, sir, with a profound conviction of its truth, and a deep sense of its timeliness, that I submit to the Synod the following minute, praying God, if such be his will, to grant it favor in your sight:

Whereas it is the explicit doctrine of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, that the kingdom of Jesus Christ erected in this world, is his Church (Form of Gov., ch. ii., sec. 1); that the said Church in its earliest and purest form was, and in accordance with Holy Scripture should be, "governed by congregational, presbyterial, and synodical assemblies" (*Idem*, ch. viii., sec. 1); that all these assemblies are regularly and scripturally composed only of the regular and scriptural officers, appointed of Christ to bear rule in his Church, to wit, in the ordinary and settled state of the Church, of preaching and ruling presbyters, commonly called pastors and ruling elders (*Idem*, ch. i., sec. 3 and ch. ii., sec. 2); that every church court or assembly, congregational, presbyterial, or synodical, consists of both sorts of the aforesaid officers (*Idem*, ch. ix., sec. 1; ch. x., sec. 2; ch. xi., sec. 1; ch. xii., sec. 2; and Confession of Faith, ch. xxxi., sec. i); and whereas the General Assembly of 1843 has decided "That any three ministers of a Presbytery, being regularly convened, are a quorum competent to the transaction of

all business" (Printed Minutes, p. 196), although not only the conclusive force of the divine ordination of a Presbytery, composed not of one but of two classes of presbyters, is directly against this decision, but the explicit doctrine of the Church is that the quorum of a Presbytery is not "any three ministers," but "any three ministers, AND as many elders as may be present," etc. (*Idem*, ch. x., sec. 7): Now, this Synod believing the principle here involved to be practically the question between an aristocratical hierarchy and a free Christian commonwealth, and judging the word of God and the Constitution of the Church to be against the former and for the latter, we do, therefore, according to the power inherent in this Synod, and so declared to be in our Form of Government (ch. xi. sec. 4), "propose to the General Assembly," by way of overture, the repeal of Overture No. 20, adopted on the 30th of May, 1843, by yeas and nays 83 to 35, in the last Assembly, as being in its doctrine contrary to Scripture and to the standards of the Church, and in its effects subversive of the office of ruling elder, and of the rights and liberties of the Christian people; and the adoption, in its stead, of a declarative overture, to the effect that, by the Constitution of the Church, no assembly of the Church, whether it be congregational, classical, or synodical, can be regularly, legally, or completely constituted without the presence of ruling elders as members thereof.

ARTICLE IV.

THE RISE AND FALL OF THE CONFEDERATE
GOVERNMENT.

The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government. By JEFFERSON DAVIS. *Prosperum et felix seclus virtus vocatur.* D. Appleton & Co., New York: 2 Vols., 8vo. Pp. 707 and 808.

The natural theologian observes that God, in his providence, governs men on a vicarious principle analogous to that on which he redeems them. He who would deliver his fellows, or bestow on them any succor under their dangers and miseries, must usually do it by enduring for them the burden of those evils. The loftier the sphere of effort to which the leader or philanthropist is called, the more awful does he find this law in its demands upon his heart. The President of the fallen Confederacy has been required, doubtless, to meet this solemn law, in the full force of its bitterness. In addition to the anxieties and fears of the indi-

vidual citizen, and father, and patriot, he was required to bear, during the pendency of the great struggle, the vicarious cares and troubles of the whole people whom he represented. He was obnoxious to his individual portion of the animosities and reproaches of the enemies of his people, and to a large share of the passions directed against them. When his people were overpowered, the malice they had provoked pursued his person, while they received their amnesty. During the long years of oppression and obloquy, the anguish of every patriot has come into his soul, multiplied by the sense of his high responsibility. The bitterest part of this pain has doubtless been from that tendency, so natural to men defeated, and yet so cowardly and unjust, to cast the blame of their calamity on their leader. This long agony Mr. Davis has borne with a dignity, calmness, and courage, which must, in every fair mind, reinforce that respectful sympathy which is felt for him. Now, after years of reflection and careful study, he presents his people and the world, in this history, an account of his stewardship. On every principle of justice, he has a right to be heard by all the civilised world, but especially by the sons of those for whose liberation he toiled and suffered so manfully, if vainly. As head of the Confederate movement, and a head so active, devoted, and influential as to be better informed of the whole struggle than any one else, he is entitled to speak for his cause at the bar of history. The overthrow of that cause will unquestionably be judged in future in its effects on human destiny, as the most momentous secular event in Christendom, since the fall of the first Napoleon in 1815. To every educated man in the world, then, ignorance or misjudgment of this grand catastrophe would be an opprobrium. To the sons of Confederate sires, it would be a shameful disgrace. Their duty to themselves, as well as to the memories of their country, requires them to possess themselves of this plea for the Confederacy, by this farther reason, that the enemies of the cause are so diligent in misrepresenting. The claim which Mr. Davis lifts up, *Audi alteram partem*, amidst this huge torrent and flood of slander and falsehood, by which truth and our fathers' honor are

sought to be drowned, comes, therefore, to the people of the South with a high and sacred right.

He has been fitted to make this plea for his "lost cause," not only by statesmanship, wide knowledge, and eloquence, but by his providential position. He has stood absolutely aloof from *post bellum* politics. He has known, all along, that for him this arena was forever closed. Hence he has been able to tell the story of Southern rights with unfettered candor and boldness. Other great leaders in the Confederacy, who have resumed their careers and hopes as politicians, find the jealousy of that divinity, the "majority," in whose hand is the breath of the American public man, an inconvenient obstruction. It is but natural for them, therefore, to speak for their former cause "with bated breath." Mr. Davis has finally removed his plea from the lower tribunal of the populace to that of the future of history, and of God. Hence, there is no restraint upon his assertion of all those facts and principles, in their full breadth and authenticity, which once all manly Southerners were wont to assert with him. The other providence seems no less remarkable: that the ennobling poverty to which he was so honorably reduced by his sacrifices for his country, was relieved so unexpectedly, when it threatened to obstruct his task; and that, by the thoughtful generosity of a Southern lady. But this pleasing fact coheres with the whole tenor of our struggle, in which the women of the South ever proved themselves the truest and bravest. It is with eminent fitness that Mr. Davis dedicates his history to them. Doubtless he had in his mind another reason: that amidst all degrading and debauching influences of subjugation, the best hope for the propagating of truth and manly sentiments in the future is in the inculcations of the mothers of the land. He would provide the topics and the evidences for this fireside instruction.

When we thus claim a hearing for him by the right of his position, we by no means imply that he is not able to support this title by the merits of his own statesmanship and authorship. These are of a high rank. The great mass of his materials is digested into lucid order with a masterly hand. His narrative is eloquent, animated, and perspicuous. His forbearance towards

those with whom he had to differ is dignified; his only heat is against the assailants and traducers of his country. His argument is weighty and intelligent. And while he stands before the world as the impersonation of the "lost cause," there are few in the South clearer of the blame of its loss than Mr. Davis. While others were precipitating collision, he was conscientiously striving to postpone it. But when it came, none met it more promptly, wisely, or courageously. He would doubtless be the first to acknowledge that his plans were not infallible. But so much may be claimed for his administration, that had others high in office, had the Confederate Congresses, had the States, had the soldiers and the people, all done their parts as wisely and well as Mr. Davis did his, the Confederacy would be now free. The energy and skill with which he created the resources of war out of nothing, and organised victory, were the wonder of the world. And there is this striking attestation to his part of the struggle, that to the day the Southern people wearied of fighting, he had left no lack of weapons and ammunition with which to fight.

Mr Davis candidly declares that it is not his design to write a detailed military narrative. Of the events of the war a clear and judicious outline is given; but the main design pursued is to present in a just light the constitutional claims and the diplomatic history of the Confederacy. With full resources of statesmanship and historical knowledge, he asserts the rights which the Southern States attempted to defend, in a logic which we here only recite, without asserting it. The positions which are argued and implied are such as these:

That throughout the controversy, the Southern States were not factious, or sectional, but stood upon the defensive, only claiming in the federal association such rights as were equal, and the demission of which would have relegated them to the place of conquered provinces.

That when this equality was refused them, peaceable secession was the unquestionable right of the States, and their most moderate remedy; conceded by all the fathers of the Constitution; expressly left to the States by that instrument itself; never dis-

puted by any respectable authority or great party; asserted in theory from time to time by all parties and by nearly every State, North as well as South; conceded even by the assailants of the South, up to the very verge of hostilities, and then only impugned by the after-thought of an unblushing and inconsistent passion. A powerful presumption is raised in advance for this truth by the extreme unlikelihood that our revolutionary fathers should or could have been so unwise as to submit their rights, just so hardly bought with blood, to another consolidated and irresponsible power. They had just before found themselves compelled, in order to escape political slavery, to grasp deliverance by the perilous means of *revolution*; becoming rebels in order to be free, and contending for their natural rights with halters over their heads. This right of revolution had always been the recognised resort of the oppressed; but a resort only accessible through fearful difficulty and peril, and at the dear cost of civil war. Is it credible that these clear heads, just escaped from British halters, designed to bind their children so soon under another centralised government, from whose future usurpations the only deliverance would be by the bitter throes of other revolutions? Did these sagacious men imagine that the tendency and likelihood of power to usurp further prerogatives, and reënslave the people, could be sufficiently restrained by mere paper bands? Every argument and every enactment show that they did not. Did they construct a free Federal Government on principles new to the whole world, with the intention of securing for liberty no advancement; of providing for invaded rights no defence cheaper, readier, more beneficent, than the old one of bloody revolution? This is incredible. No; they thought they were providing, instead of the fearful ordeal of force, the appeal to free consent. They thought they were securing for the liberties they had bought so dear, the prompt and easy defence of a reserved sovereignty, the re-assumption of which, when liberty was imperilled, should peaceably take the place of revolution, and so open an easy and bloodless way for checking usurpation and rearranging powers found too liable to abuse. To suppose that they voluntarily merged their States into a Union, from which, however fatal to their

rights, there could be no egress except through the blood of other revolutions, is to suppose that they deliberately threw away for their children the very prize they had won for themselves.

Accordingly, Mr. Davis argues, every fact and every stipulation shows that they did not design to construct such a consolidated and irrevocable union. The thirteen States had compelled the recognition of their separate and individual independence by the mother country. Beyond all doubt they stood at the end of the war thirteen sovereignties—thirteen little nations, allied together. In making their amended Union, they exercised the right of seceding, of their own movement, from the previous one. They expunged from the new Constitution the pledge of perpetuity expressed in the old one. They expressly refused to the central government the power to coerce the continued adhesion of any State. They did nothing more than invite the voluntary accession of States. Three States, in acceding, expressly stipulated the right to secede, and there was no demur. The first act of the common government was to accept a solemn amendment, in which the States reserve to themselves and to their people every power not expressly granted to the general union.

Mr. Davis argues, again, that all publicists and lawyers, of all parties, including such New Englanders as John Quincy Adams and Webster, confessed—what cannot be denied, without moral obliquity—that a compact, such as that which grounded the General Government, if broken on one side, was broken on both sides ; so that the aggrieved parties to it were fully released from its obligations. But Mr. Davis holds that the enactments passed by the most of the Northern States, repudiating the fugitive slave law, and the election of a sectional President pledged to an immediate assault on that equality in the federal family of States guaranteed us in the Constitution, and pledged, only a little more remotely, to an assault on our lawful property, were a clear violation and repudiation of that federal compact. But the grounds on which the South claimed the right of peaceable withdrawal have been so ably argued in a recent number of this journal, that a recital here is needless.

Mr. Davis also contests the truth and justice of every one of

those sophistical "catchwords," which, taken as arguments, did so much to inflame the passionate minds of his adversaries. In every case, he shows, that the popular cry was the opposite of the reality. Thus: the secession of the South did not "threaten the life of the nation;" first, because *there was no nation* to have such a life, as is clear from the act of the Constitutional Convention, erasing the words "nation," and "national," wherever they had been proposed by its committee; and second, because the Confederacy gave, from the first, every proof of a pacific desire to let their late partners be a "nation" if it suited them, and "live" any way they pleased, uninjured and unmolested in every just right.

That the story, perpetually repeated to this day, that the Southern people were inveigled into disunion by a few ambitious leaders, was and is a sheer falsehood. For the leaders, like Mr. Davis, were behind their own people in the movement. The secession was wrought by the clear good sense, and honest, manly spirit of the masses at home, against the dissuasions of their leaders, and far in advance of their expectations. This all well informed men here know to be the truth.

That it was the North, and not the South, which really "appealed from the ballot to the bullet." For when the Confederate States withdrew from the Union by a peaceable "ballot," in the very same form in which they had "balloted" themselves into this Union, it was the North that flew to arms in order to obstruct the ballot.

That Mr. Lincoln's prettexts for beginning war, for the professed objects of "repossessing" Federal property of which the laws made him guardian, and of dispersing insurgent assemblages of individuals resisting the laws, were as obviously false, as truculent; because there stood the Commissioners of the Confederacy offering to pay for every penny's worth of the property belonging to the United States; which would have met Mr. Lincoln's pretended object without the cost of a drop of blood. And he knew that the bodies he stigmatised as insurrectionary assemblages of individuals, were, in fact, sovereign States, performing the acts in question, with every feature and form of Statehood, and

sovereignty, and validity, by which they had at first become members of the general government.

That the South did not "begin the war" and "fire on the flag." But while she was anxiously offering peace, the flag fired on her, by arming fortresses, and sending a fleet and army within her borders, to which her resistance was purely defensive.

That it was a mere sophism to argue there was no tyranny in coercion, "because the North only required us to live under the same laws under which they lived themselves." Practically and virtually, their requirement was, that the minority should obey, in points vital to their rights and even existence, laws made by a majority who had no concern at all in those points. Should the pastoral dwellers on the mountains say: "We do not go to sea in ships: therefore the maritime dwellers on the coast shall not go to sea in ships;" we should have just a parallel mockery of "equal laws."

That slavery was not the cause of secession or war on the Southern side, but only the occasion. That the choice of Northern fanaticism and usurpation was to attack slavery as our vulnerable point, which circumstance rendered it the occasion of strife. But the end pursued by the South in her secession was to preserve her citizens from political slavery, and not to perpetuate the domestic slavery of the Africans; a point with which the Confederate Government had no concern whatever, either way, as that of the United States rightfully had none.

That had Southern slavery been anything more than a pretext of Northern greed, for sectional strife; had it been a real cause; all sectionalism would have ceased when the South absolutely and finally surrendered slavery. But sectionalism, instead of ceasing, is now more embittered than ever, on the part of the North.

That the South did not "go to war for the extension of slavery." For, properly speaking, she did not "go" to war, at all, but was driven into it, against her choice, by the North. And that the policy claimed by the South would never, if conceded, have really "extended slavery," by the addition of a single bondsman, inasmuch as the South forbade the only mode of its further extension, by

the importation of additional Africans, even more stringently than the United States had done.

That every charge of "treason" and "rebellion" on Confederates, was insolent nonsense. For the sovereignty of the States being the original one, and that of the general government being only derived from, and deputed by, the States, the rebellion of a State was as impossible as that of a father against his own child.

That the only "treasons" and "rebellions" perpetrated within the Confederate States were those to which the United States incited the so-called "Union men" in them, in levying war against the sovereignties to whom their allegiance lawfully belonged. The establishment of the so-called State of West Virginia, for instance, by force of arms, was a literal rebellion and treason against the State of Virginia and against the Constitution of the United States expressly forbidding such formation without Virginia's consent. For, that the pretended assent to the partition, wrung from the "Peirpoint government," was a contemptible farce, is plain from the total lack of the attributes of a State in that petty imposture, and from the further fact that the general government soon after set aside that pretended State government as invalid, by its own act.

That the plea of "necessity" for assuming, in consequence of a state of war, powers not conferred on the general government, was, as usual, "the tyrant's plea." That a government founded on and created by a constitutional compact, and only possessing such powers as this conferred, should usurp other powers under the pretext of *upholding the Constitution*, and especially, should usurp these powers against States its own constituents, is simply monstrous. This is simply that the constable should go a-stealing, to execute the law against theft. The Constitution gave a certain war-power to the general government; thus teaching it what, and how much war-power, it was intended it should exercise. If this measure of war-power was found insufficient for the successful prosecution of a war against States, then the only possible inference was, that the government had no power to make such war on States; for the Constitution had said, that every power

not granted was thereby reserved to the States or their people. He must be blind indeed, who does not see, that if a state of war is to justify the usurpation of unconstitutional powers, the people have, in a Constitution, no guarantee for their liberties ; because a state of war may at any time be brought about by action which the people do not wish, and cannot prevent. Such a people must ask their enemies' leave to remain free.

That the Washington government was responsible for the horrible and multiplied barbarities of the war ; because they were, in most cases, either commanded by that government, or the perpetrators of uncommanded crimes against the laws of war were usually applauded and rewarded for them by the government.

That the whole responsibility of the sufferings and death of prisoners, on both sides, lay upon the Washington government ; because the Confederacy always fed its prisoners of war as well as its own soldiers ; and in every case, the breaches of the cartels for exchange came from the North. The Confederacy treated Federal prisoners with far more humanity than the Washington government ; because, notwithstanding the cruel scarcity at the South, the blockading of medicines, and the more sultry climate unfriendly to men in confinement, the Confederacy only let less than nine per cent. of the Northern prisoners die ; while the Washington government let more than twelve per cent. of the Confederate prisoners die. Its motive for letting its own soldiers thus perish in a confinement imposed solely by itself, was, to keep Confederate veterans from returning to their own ranks. This was confessed by Gen. Grant at the close of the war. But, in order to infuriate the Northern people, every false pretext, and every measure contrary to the laws of civilised war, were coolly employed, in order to make the apparent blame of arresting exchanges rest on the South.

That the European powers, and especially England, while pretending neutrality in the struggle, construed every important question with a shabby unfairness, in favor of the aggressor. Under the pretence of not undertaking to decide between the right of secession on the one side, and of coercion on the other, she practically and efficiently sanctioned coercion. She had laid down for

herself, and all other nations, the rule that a blockade should not exclude the ships of neutrals, unless efficient. Yet, just when the decision was most injurious to the Confederates, she recognised a paper-blockade. She had invited the United States, in 1856, to join her in delegalsing privateering, hitherto employed as a legitimate means of war. This invitation the United States had expressly rejected; thus retaining the use of, but also making herself liable to, privateering, in future wars. England accepted this as the result of this refusal; yet she effectually shielded the United States from this, her own elected mode of warfare, by excluding Confederate privateers from British ports and maritime tribunals; under the illogical pretext that Britain had disclaimed privateering for herself.

Mr. Davis also argues, that the pretended legislations of the Washington government, in organising spurious State governments, contrary to the Constitution, within the territories of Confederate States and without their consent, out of pitiful minorities of Tories or rebels against their own States, were all illegal and void *ab initio*. But these *simulacra* of States, and that too, under duress, were the bodies which nominally abolished slavery in the States, and nominally ratified the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments. Hence, to this day, there has never been a legal and valid emancipation of the Africans, or enactment of these articles. They rest, to this day, on no better basis than the right of conquest. But this is a ground which cannot be righteous or valid for a power which solemnly declares that "all just government rests upon the consent of the governed."

He concludes, finally, that the real overthrow, which the Northern people, in their lust of aggrandisement and fury, inflicted by force of arms, was not only of the Confederacy, but of the whole liberties of themselves and their children. That the equitable, constitutional, and federal government, created by the Fathers, has been annihilated, and is replaced by a consolidated democracy, which, under the name of a "Republic" is in fact a virtual oligarchy of demagogues and capitalists.

He shows that the so-called "reconstruction measures" were the crowning and most violent usurpations of all. For the

Washington government had declared all along, that there was no way under heaven by which a State could cease to be a member of the Union; that the States called Confederate had been in and under the Union during the whole time of their attempted secession, and at and after the end of the war. The presence of the States in the Union had been recognised in every way, and the forms of their State governments were those imposed on them by the United States. But these State governments, declared indestructible, and this membership in the Union, declared inalienable, were annihilated by the United States Congress two years after, without any crime or offence of the States, or of a single person in them. While there was not a hand lifted against the United States, but the conquered populations were submissively obeying all even of the illegal laws, the States were thrust out of the Union, every magistrate and citizen in them was disfranchised without trial, or even indictment; and all were stripped of the inalienable rights of trial by jury and *habeas corpus*, and thrust under bayonet government. No invasion of human right, so monstrous and sweeping, over so many millions of human beings, was ever before perpetrated, in time of peace, by any usurper, military emperor, or arbitrary conqueror. This crime, committed by a democracy, under universal suffrage, proves that this government of a popular majority now dominant in place of the Constitution and the States, is capable of just as enormous outrages as any other despot, and as much needs the restraints of distributed powers and restricted construction. For the usurpation was not wrought to enforce submission to any existing law, even of the latest innovation, nor to abolition, nor coercion, nor any other professed claim, even of the conquerors; the whole population thus disfranchised being perfectly quiet and docile at the time, and ever since their surrender, to all these claims. But the crime against human rights was done simply to perpetuate the partisan grasp on power of the most disreputable faction ever known in American politics. And the cost at which this end was gained was the permanent fastening on the South of State institutions utterly opposed to the will of its people, alien to their history, and almost ruinous to the public morality and prosperity.

Of course every clear mind sees, that if these views of President Davis are just, the current boasts as to the results of the war are precisely the reverse of truth. "That the war has forever settled the question of unity," etc. Rather has the war forever unsettled the unity of the country, as well as every other institution. For, just as soon as any section feels again the pressure of a grievance and consciousness of any power to escape it, that section will of course pronounce—what everybody knows to be true in fact—that the war of 1861–5, substituted a government of brute force for one of right and popular consent; that force, as everybody but robbers confesses, settles no question of morals, and grounds no claim of right; and that the domination of the Washington government has therefore always been illegal and invalid ever since the fraudulent "reconstruction;" whence any section has a right to reject it, whenever strong enough to do so. This unanswerable argument is not heard, indeed, just now; because the country is now arranged into only two sections: the one, recently conquered, exhausted, and helpless, and the other, still enjoying the triumphs and spoils of conquest. But this arrangement will in due time be changed by the movements of population and business. And he is a very short-sighted man indeed, who does not see that the inference above stated will certainly be resorted to, just as soon as the occasion exists. Mr. Davis closes his narrative with the pious prayer for the Union, *Esto perpetua*. If his doctrine be true, this petition must be, like that of the martyr Stephen, rather the expression of his Christian charity, than of his hope.

Such are the claims he makes, as to the rights of the Confederate States he governed, and such the logical inferences from them. To assert or deny their correctness may not be the proper function of this REVIEW, which seeks not to propagate a school of politics, but to chronicle and to estimate the literary movements of the country. It is useless to conceal the fact, that these positions and conclusions of Mr. Davis together form a tremendous indictment against the conquerors of his country. But they of course profess to regard the whole as a heap of absurdities and extravagances. For the very deeds which Mr. Davis attempts to

prove enormous crimes, they are in the habit of arrogating to themselves great merit. It was, on the one hand, inevitable that so utter a difference of claims and doctrines should result in such a war as Mr Davis describes. But it is equally clear to the discriminating mind, that the holding, however blindly, of two creeds of right so opposite, involved great criminality on the one side or the other. As it is obvious that whichever side was wrong was enormously guilty in fighting for its wrong instead of repenting and forsaking it, so it must be inferred that, since the fighting for its creed was the natural result of the passionate holding of it, the first crime was in having adopted it. The wicked theory was wicked, because the natural mother of a multitudinous progeny of crimes. The issue to be tried before the tribunal of history is, on which side the initial crime lay. Mr. Davis claims to have cleared his side by arguing that the theory of the Constitution on which his side acted was the one held by the makers of the Constitution, claimed in turn by nearly every State, and by all leading parties, admitted *in thesi* by all, contested by no decent authority even up to 1860, and admitted even by those who so soon after, by an inconsistent revulsion, became its assailants.

Foreign notices of Mr. Davis's great work, from the most competent sources, admit the power of his plea. It is evident that it is destined to carry great weight with future history. This impression cannot but be deepened, when such observers note the contrast between the ponderous historical facts and arguments of this book, and the replies of its American critics. The staple of them is chiefly the tossing of abusive names, and the favorite remark that Mr. Davis is a "Bourbon who learns nothing, and forgets nothing." Now, of course, the very nervous desire of oblivion, implied in the frequency of this complaint, that the ex-Confederates "forget nothing," is very natural for men who are conscious of having done so many things the memory of which will be infamy. But we presume Mr. Davis will deem it a natural reply, that *he is writing history*; and the very business of history is to remember and record; and that while the rights and institutions which he describes are "things of the past," the gigantic consequences,

and the solemn retributions are still to come. And these will be much! Impartial readers cannot fail, again, to remark further, that the logic of Mr. Davis's opponents, abating a few hackneyed sophisms and oft-exploded historical falsehoods, resolves itself, when rendered into plain English, only into a disdainful rejection of the idea, that a great people should be expected to keep faith and respect their own covenants, at the expense of their own convenience and interests. This, indeed, is Mr. Davis's unpardonable insolence, that he should, at this time of day, urge so antiquated a claim—a claim as old-fashioned as the Bible. - This, of course, makes him a Bourbon indeed!

But they ask: Does Mr. Davis design, by reasserting at this time the claims of the dead Confederacy, to revive them? Does he seek to incite the Southern mind to a second secession, and a new attack on the power of the conquerors? We presume that nothing is farther from his thought than to seek to disturb the North in its victory: he only aims to do justice to the memory and principles of the departed; a duty in his eyes as substantial and sacred, as it is idle and useless to others. While he does not think that brute force reverses truth and right, he doubtless sees a solid security for the triumph of the conquerors, in a far deeper cause. The Northern people resolved that the differences of the Southern civilisation and social life from theirs, should not be tolerated, although conservative, beneficent, and complementary to their own, instead of hostile. They resolved that we should be like themselves. They have made us like themselves. And therein is their security against another secession. While men are men and live on different soils and under different skies, they will always have differences of sectional interests. But in the future prosecution of our sectional interests and rights, the South will never again use the measures of the Confederates; rather those taught by her masters. The conquerors may be absolutely secure that there will be no more Southern slave-holding, States' rights, secession. Our demagogues will have learned from theirs the wondrous advantages—to the demagogue—of corrupt and ignorant suffrage. They will find it much more to their interest to have the many negroes for voters than the few for servants.

They will find that it is a much easier way to utilise federal institutions for the oppression of others, than to disclaim them when perverted to their own oppression. Probably it will be found that the happy assimilation of the sections has already gone so far, that Mr. Davis's assertion of our fathers' principles seems as importunate and untimely to many of us as to the Northern people; we do not wish to have our politicating and money-getting, under the reconstruction, jostled for any such shadowy objects as the substantiating of historical truth, the assertion of right principles, or the clearing of our own fathers', mothers', and brothers' memory from the amiable charges of "barbarism," "rebellion," "man-stealing," and "treason." Surely this should comfort our conquerors!

No; the last resort to Confederate principles has doubtless been made by the South, and future rivalries will be pursued only in that way which the North prefers. The "New South," taught by her, will hereafter prosecute, not constitutional *rights*, but *interests*. It has been taught by its fathers' defeat, and will not be so foolish again as to rely on righteousness and constitutional covenants, but on material strength, numbers and money. And these it means to have, and will have. The land echoes with the cry: "These be thy gods, O Israel," and not the departed gods of our fathers. The grand cry is: "Develop, develop." The old North has had its development, and that of the Northwest is pressing fast upon the snows and the deserts. The South, say they, "is undeveloped;" and here the future growth will be. While the "Empire State," replete with human life, is at a standstill, the "Empire State of the South" will grow to her five millions. Old Virginia will become a Pennsylvania; Tennessee an Illinois. The Mississippi, cleared of its obstructions, will again be the highway of the continent, and its great city the vast *emporium*. The great Delta, from Cairo to the Gulf, will be drained, and yield more than the wealth of the Euphrates and Nile to a multitude outnumbering that of Egypt and Assyria. That titanic Southern energy and resource which extemporised the means of a gigantic war so as to amaze the world; which endured and outlived such plunderings and exhaustion of the war,

and the worse war in peace which followed, as would have sunk any other land into famine and depopulation; which raised the crop of its great staple to seven millions of bales, and at the same time opened a thousand new channels to wealth under the ponderous and polluting *incubus* of "reconstruction;" what will it not effect in the next half-century? And, as it grows rich and strong, how will other sections come bowing to it: the great prairie-States, beholden to it for an outlet and a market; the new States to be in the empire of Texas, and that are to grow on the line of the Southern Pacific Railroad? Thus, the time may come, when the South with its natural allies, and not the North, will be dominant at Washington. Then it will talk no more of States' rights and secession, nor permit the North to talk such "treason." It will practise the lesson learned from its present master, to wrest the common powers of the general government for expoliating the labor of the feebler section for its own aggrandisement, and to punish all evasion from their yoke as "rebellion."

Such is the fertile ingenuity the South has shown under subjugation, that it may be hard to predict the precise forms in which it will apply the principle taught it by the conqueror. Doubtless its expedients will be marvels of "'cuteness." Perhaps tariffs will then be manipulated so as to transfer profits from New England pockets to Georgian, and to ensure the concourse of immigration, capital, and votes in Southern centres. Perhaps the principle of "taxing luxuries" will be applied by an internal revenue law to the fine cutlery, lawns, silks, laces, watches of Northern manufactories; while the plain cottons of Southern looms, and tobaccos of Southern fields, will go free as "necessaries." Then, it may be, instead of a fishing-bounty to fatten New England ports, every cod-fish will be made to pay an internal revenue. Then, the national debt created in crushing the South, and owned in the Northeast, will be held, like the property in the West and South, liable to a heavy taxation. Then, the vast Southern ports will have too much carrying trade to tolerate present navigation-laws; these will be swept away, and the same European competition admitted to the coast-wise com-

merce, which has already swept Northern ships from the ocean. Then the dominant section may demand at least an equal expenditure of national wealth on its highways, and especially its great water way; and as there will be no more public lands to lavish, the hundreds of millions for the future railroad kings must be wrung from the people by taxation. Then, the shrewd sons of the North will desert her inhospitable soil, no longer fertilised with Southern gold, and will flock to the Yankeed South, leaving factories and cities to decay, and New England hills to lapse to their original nakedness.

Does one exclaim: Surely the constitution-asserting South will never have the face to announce so inconsistent a purpose! We reply: Not at all; she will very decently disclaim the purpose, while steadily pursuing its execution, just as her master and teacher did as to her subjugation. But surely these honorable old Confederates, now so influential in the South, will protest against so shameful an inconsistency! Doubtless they will protest; but the North now requires that their principles be decried and their influence destroyed. The North will have been obeyed in this also: the "New South" will whistle them down the wind as "abstractionists," "Bourbons," and "old fogies." The oppressed North will appeal to the Constitution? But, when it was dominant, it had decided, in 1861-5, that *the preference of the majority is the proper Constitution* of America; and the South with its political allies will be that majority. Fifty years before, the North had made *the majority sovereign*, instead of the Constitution and the States; it need expect no sympathy when it begins to whimper under the pressure of its own elected king. "But the vote of our grateful and faithful allies, the freedmen, will defend us," says another. This also will fail: this great and increasing negro-vote, invented by the North to be a marketable commodity, will then have a better market nearer home. The "New South" will have more money to buy with than the old North. And the freedman, the more he is "educated," will but read the more clearly, that political gratitude was a quality so unknown by his liberators, that it would be a mere impertinence for

him to ape it. Would he deem it good manners thus to condemn by his example his liberators of Ohio and Illinois, for instance, who repaid their mother, Virginia, for the free gift of the fat soil on which they fattened, by rending her vitals? No; the proper thing for the freedman will be to imitate his benefactors, and return evil for good.

In a word: the great North, reassured by its complete success in assimilating the South to itself, may calmly tolerate Mr. Davis's reassertion of a dead system. It may be certain, that in all future rivalries, the South will eschew Mr. Davis's remedy, peaceable secession, and will employ only the methods which the North prefers, and which must therefore always be acceptable and grateful to her. As good citizens, and especially as Christian journalists, we feel a justifiable complacency in giving this assurance of the future peace of the country, and, in the very act, contributing our mite to that good end.

A topic still more appropriate for us is presented by the moral and religious aspects of the great struggle Mr. Davis records. Northern Christianity deservedly claims a foremost place among the causes of the war. Religion chiefly animated its abolitionism. Its pulpits hastened to bless and sanctify the invasion of the South, and emitted the most stirring calls to war. Its church-courts set the first example of defining as "treason" that State secession which no great political party or tribunal had before ever dared to call illegal. Its Bible was made to assume a new exposition in order to condemn the South. The war was, therefore, eminently the expression of the Christianity of the North. Now, Southern Christianity did, indeed, behave in exactly the opposite way, in not intruding into politics and secular rights. Yet, as it expressed itself in the convictions and acts of individuals, it distinctly sustained the rights of the South. Every man was devoted to them just in proportion, usually, to the intelligence and sincerity of his religion. The few Southern Tories were found usually among prejudiced aliens, or debauched political hacks, or men of desperate reputations and fortunes. The most venerable of the clergy, the most godly of the citizens, the purest Christian women, were ever found, the strongest in supporting

the rights of their country. Southern Christianity, then, through the legitimate expression of the right of private judgment by individuals, gave as decided a sanction to the Southern cause, as Northern Christianity gave to coercion and subjugation. But between the two lay a great issue, which must involve, for the one or the other, enormous error of judgment, and fearful guilt.

It may not be the proper place to decide here, on which side this guilt falls. But one inference is unavoidable: the Christianity of the South and the North must have been very unlike, even opposite, things. Professed creeds and external forms may have been alike; but they must have been held in widely different spirits. For the working of the two was antagonistic: the one attacking precisely what the other defended; the one glorifying in actions which the other conscientiously abhorred as stupendous iniquities. Another inference is equally clear, that a Christianity boasting so much as the American, so many pulpits and Bibles, such purity of creed, scripturalness of order, and mental culture, ought to have been able to "keep the peace" between the rival sections. The questions in strife were just such as the Bible ought so have settled: Should covenants be kept by the stronger party to them as well as by the weaker? Does God ever allow a Christian man to own the labor of a fellow creature? That this boastful Christianity should have miserably failed, then, to clear these points of Christian ethics for the mind of the country, and even to keep down the hands of brethren seeking each others' throats; that it should, instead, have only inflamed the quarrel, cannot but be a mark of spuriousness upon it. It is hard to conceive how the shortcomings of any of the effete and apostate Churches, recorded in history, could more effectually convict them of hollowness. Must not Churches so branded with impotency be expected to signalise their disease by a regular course of decadence and corruption? On which side should this indictment lie? Shall we wait for the future to decide, watching which of the two religions verifies its title by the blacker career? This test may be wholly inconclusive. For the conquerors assimilate their victims to themselves; and therefore should Southern Christianity become as corrupt as Northern, it will still remain to

decide whether this corruption was not the result of the conquering type they are forced to assume, rather than of the old type they bore when free.

This suggests the other religious and moral aspect of the great struggle. The coercive party loudly claimed to be the "Party of Moral Ideas." Its charge against the South was, that slavery was immoral and demoralising. Its professed mission was, to purge the South, and lift it up to its own moral plane. Well; it has had the most sweeping success imaginable. In the sphere of military operations, its opponent was not only subdued, but destroyed. Every resisting commonwealth was literally annihilated, the human beings who had composed them dissolved into a helpless mass of individual slaves, divested of every right and franchise, at the absolute will of their conquerors; and the new commonwealths were reconstructed absolutely according to the theory and philosophy of the conquerors, with hardly a voice of dissent to "mutter or peep." But more. The ethics and politics of the coercive party are now the professed creed of all parties. The "opposition" headed by Hancock and supported by the "solid South," declare in their platform that they believe in consolidation, that they repudiate secession, that they have done with slaveholding and delight in immediate abolition, that they approve universal negro suffrage, that they are devoted to this Union as now founded on force. Indeed, had this identical Hancock platform been announced to the Lincoln party in 1860, the only objection it would have made would have been that the platform went much too far, and was too radical for the "Party of Moral Ideas." So that, in every way, this great party has had an absolute success in its harsh tuition: it has taught its pupils the whole lesson it professed, and assimilated the "New South" completely to itself.

But is the teacher satisfied? So far from it, the party of moral ideas now brings heavier charges of demoralisation against the South than ever before. It is complained that this miserable and degraded South now defiles itself with kuklux-isms, with persecutions and murders of the freedmen, with fraudulent ballots and counts in elections, with bribery and corruption, with repudiation of

private and public debts; in a word, with every abomination of public and private immorality. This, then, is the strange thing: that the great "party of moral ideas" should have so demoralised its victim, by having precisely its own way with him! Two facts must be placed alongside of each other. One is, that before 1861 the South presented the best moral *status* seen in this sinful earth. Business morals and domestic purity were confessedly equal in it to those of any other section. No Southern State, no representative Southern party, had ever, in the whole history of the country, defaulted to any federal obligation, or attempted to warp any federal action to any unfair sectional advantage, or repudiated any State debt, or constructed any system of electoral fraud, or been convicted of any legislative corruption. We challenge an exception to this glorious record. Such was the South in 1861. The other fact is, that the party of moral ideas now says that, since the war, the South is corrupt and treacherous. Such, according to its own testimony, is the moral effect of the victor's tutelage and principles!

Again we say that it may not be seemly for this journal to affirm or dispute this adverse testimony. It may not become the servant to contradict his master. But if this accusation be true, then the *rationale* of the way the mischief was done is clear. *Everything has been done to the South* which was calculated to ruin the morals of a people. Experience says that few men can pass through a bankruptcy without resistless temptations to tarnish their principles. The North, not only by a war waged in defiance of civilised usages, but by a universal confiscation and ruthless overthrow of our industrial system, has inflicted bankruptcy on nearly every property holder in the South. Every thinking person knows how perilous it is to a man's or a woman's integrity to break down his *point of honor*. The point of honor of the South was studiously prostrated by putting an alien, barbarous, and servile race over us. All the Southern States, cities, and counties, were forced to repudiate the payment of all those debts which, to any but scoundrels, must ever rank as the highest, most binding, and sacred—money borrowed to defend their soil and their hearths from violence, arson, and rape. When the

people have been compelled to embrace the infamy of dishonoring such debts, how natural that they should cease to be scrupulous about loans made for the sordid purposes of business and gain ! Then, the season of universal distress and debt was selected for enacting a bankrupt law, which invited to innumerable frauds. The free can resist intolerable oppressions by manly and open strength ; and in resistance not only be delivered, but ennobled in their virtue. The subjugated, while crushed under unendurable wrongs, have no escape except chicanery. Reconstruction began, as we saw, by making every man a slave ; they must either endure, or resort to the slave's weapons—concealment and deceit. The subjection of the property, intelligence, and virtue of the land to the servile barbarism of the land, stimulated by the greediest and vilest adventurers from the North, was an engine of torment for estate, heart, and body, which inflicted a more chronic agony and ingenious torture than was ever experienced under an inquisition. Was it in human nature to lie and suffer on this rack of torment ? The alternative was, to see the civilisation of the South absolutely perish, or to learn from the conqueror some of those arts of evasion which the free South had disdained. To crown all, the example has been steadily urged on her, of systematic defamations and falsifications of history, in which the teachers of Christianity have been most active ! of usurpations ; of world-wide venality, extending to the highest places ; of a universal "spoils-system," wresting public trusts to purposes of private plunder. Here is a system of instrumentalities, applied to the South by the "party of moral ideas," whose ingenious fitness to debauch the principles of a people could not be surpassed by the inventive malice of Satan. Our conquerors say, that it has had its natural effect. If it does not have that effect, if the conquered people escape the resultant pollution, it must be by reason of two causes : that they entered the ordeal fortified with the strongest *stamina* of moral health and virtue ; and that the salt of Southern Christianity proves the purest and most saving on this sinful earth. If the present charge of our conquerors be true, then in this demoralisation of subjugation they will have inflicted on us an evil, compared with which,

invasion, the slaughter of a quarter of a million of men, and the destruction of billions of wealth, were small. Those miseries afflicted us for the once; the woe of this moral debauchery would repeat and propagate itself in the distant future.

Now, to the religious journalist, the crowning wonder of the history which Mr. Davis records is, that the most eager advocate and patron of this Satanic school for our tuition in degradation has been all along Northern Christianity! These measures of spiritual debauchery, some of them first suggested and urged by Church-courts and pulpits, have all along found their warmest, steadiest support from the Churches. From pulpits, religious journals, and divines, the teachers in the school have always received the loudest applause. It is from the religious opinion of Northern people, that the relaxation of these measures would meet with most opposition.

In view of this fact, is it surprising that all intelligent and faithful Christians in the South, wishing well to their fellow-citizens' souls, should resolutely shun intermixture with such a Christianity?

* * *

ARTICLE V.

THE NEW THEORY OF THE MINISTRY.

A Report, in three sections, to the Synod of South Carolina, with three other papers on the Diaconate, by REV. JNO. I. GIRARDEAU, D. D., Professor of Theology at Columbia Theological Seminary.

“Man’s chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy him forever.” The obligation involved in this statement extends to every act and every power of the human will. But what course of conduct must be adopted in order to promote the divine glory in the highest degree, the great Ruler has, to a very large extent, left to be decided by our own discretion.

This liberty of discretion is the occasion of one of the most

delicate and important duties devolved upon us. We are required, on the one hand, so to defend it as that God shall have his glory as the One Law-giver; and on the other hand, so to use it as not to put a stumbling-block in the way of the weak. Nearly all that is painful to read in the history of the Church, forms one cumulative proof that we are bound by everything sacred to defend the free play of human discretion against human efforts for its contraction, and that the discharge of this duty is attended by the danger of failing, and by the certainty of seeming to fail, in respect to the demands of brotherly love.

It is clear, however, that when the claim of final authority is made, either for a person, or a doctrine, erroneously, we are bound to declare our independence, in whatever way is best suited to secure its integrity, and to commit to God the ordering of the result. To yield in such a case would be to suffer the human to be exalted to the honor of the divine, and to encourage the pretensions and invite the encroachments of error in a way tending to result in the disappearance of God's law, and the establishment of man's prejudices, as the rule of faith and practice; nor would it avail to plead that these prejudices had been exalted under the guise of divinity. The true doctrine then, touching liberty of discretion, and efforts to impose upon us, under any pretext whatever, as final law, that which God has not declared to be his will, is, not that we may, but that we must, reject what without Scripture warrant is insisted on as duty.

Presbyterians believe that God has, through apostolic example as well as precept, given us laws for the organic union of Christians in one body; dictating the method by which the Church is to ascertain and recognise her divinely called officers; determining the nature of the peculiar ministry received by these, as such, and directing them how to care for the Church's purity, comfort, and faithfulness; and that the obligation to obey these divine rules rests upon the very same ground which sustains the authority of what we denominate the moral law. Hence, when the Presbyterian Church in the United States is charged with infringement, in the exercise of human discretion, upon territory every inch of which is the subject of God's specific and most

minute instructions, and is most solemnly enjoined to contract the play of reasoning power to narrower limits, and is required to accept as binding the conscience a comprehensive rule which exempts from its rigid demand nothing that comes within the sphere of its scope, but which had hitherto escaped the observation of the most prayerful and diligent students of our heavenly code—when our whole Church is thus charged and admonished and called to repentance touching a newly discovered duty by one whom, as being a shining light of the greatest brilliancy, it has, by the action of its highest council, placed in one of its two loftiest candlesticks; every Southern Presbyterian is compelled to take heed, lest he be led into the bondage of error by accepting as divine the mere product of a human mind, swayed, perhaps, by its own peculiar taste or repugnance in relation to Church work; and, on the other hand, lest he fail to recognise and obey the law of God in every particular in relation to which he has spoken. Thus do the deliverances touching the office of the deacon, iterated and reiterated again and again, from the most commanding position, during the past two years, by one of our Professors of Theology, and solemnly concurred in by the other, make it the duty of every member of the Presbyterian Church in the United States to do all that in him lies to determine when, if at all, discretion may rightfully be exercised, and how far, as utterly excluding its use, the law of God extends in relation to the work and methods of the Church; and to promote or resist, to the utmost of his ability, the claim of obligatory force made upon us in favor of this professed discovery of inspired law, according as he finds that it is, or that it is not, expressly declared in the word of God, or by good and necessary inference deducible therefrom.

Less than five years have passed since Southern Presbyterians rejoiced in the belief that, by a great expenditure of thought and time, and a considerable risk of unity, a statement had been purchased as nearly perfect as piety and learning and earnest diligence, belonging to a militant state, could be expected to accomplish, and in obeying which we hoped to be sustained by the comfortable assurance that now we had respect to all God's commandments touching the government and economy of his Church.

But alas, it turns out that this feeling of relief it was for a little while so pleasant to indulge, was but as the joy of a soldier's dream of peace, who has fallen asleep on the battle-field, to be soon awakened by the responsive roarings of opposing cannon. For, to the general rules and regulative principles, in which the solemn action of adopting the Revision, concentrating so many years of presbyterial labor and prayer, declared that the divine Constitution of the Church was comprised, a commandment is now required to be added, the operation of which must be utter revolution, and which was utterly unknown to all the Reformed, from the days of Knox down to the memorable meeting of the Synod of South Carolina in the year of our Lord 1877; and even then, the existence of which seems to have been only dimly suspected by one who was urged by the brethren to engage in raising money to endow the Columbia Seminary, a Church-work against which his ecclesiastical taste violently reluctated. This claim, however, is urged upon our consciences with the vehement zeal of the glowing discoverer of the new doctrine, who, with astounding eloquence and very remorseless logic, testifies that we can escape the guilt of shameful ignorance and heinous unfaithfulness, only by a speedy conformity, regardless of the cost, to this new rule, which even the Synod of South Carolina was in profound ignorance of some five years ago.

The writer has endeavored to discharge the task thus imposed upon him, as a Southern Presbyterian; and the consciousness of having done his best to find the truth prompts the thought, that the results of his study may be of some little use to his brethren, startled as they must have been by the clarion cry of fearful, self-destructive blundering, where they had most reason to expect goodly array; or saddened, perhaps, by the confident assurance of eminent doctors, that they have found the tubercles of death in the very lungs of our ecclesiastical body.

In the six long articles of the Columbia divine on the office of deacon, published in the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, from January, 1879, to January, 1882, there seems to be, numerically speaking, very few propositions that are new, and to which we could not most heartily subscribe. Having read and re-read these

large and elaborate dissertations, we find that although much of their formidable bulk is due to the expanding art—called Logic—and to the indulged freedom of hortatory fervor, yet there might be culled from them a series of excellent statements, that would clearly express almost all which the Presbyterian Church ever held as the doctrine of the diaconate. If two assertions, one positive and the other negative, were eliminated from the 194 pages of the REVIEW occupied by the author of this new agitation, in discharging his special burden, we could, as far as careful study has enabled us to know, append our cordial amen to every remaining utterance. Nay, if those laboring pages were thoroughly expurgated of their author's claim to have discovered a divine law touching the office of deacon, and correlatively the whole ministry of preachers and elders, there would be nothing objectionable left that we would deem worth seriously contending against; unless reverence for an old formula should dominate our mind, no more necessary to the preservation of the truth it was designed to symbolise, than a certain show-case in a jeweller's shop is necessary to the preservation of the jewels it was designed to exhibit.

The positive error of this extensive treatise on the diaconate is, that, understanding the phrase, "serve tables," as a metonymy, and giving it the largest sweep of meaning ever claimed for it, a bishop does wrong when, in the ordinary church state, he attends to any business of the church belonging to the category which that phrase, so understood, might serve to distinguish, and does wrong by contravening a divine commandment. The historical Presbyterian statement of doctrine, that the higher church office virtually comprehends the lower, being the direct contrary of this in all but the use of the same terms, there necessarily follows what we regard as the negative error of the Reformer, the denial of that doctrine, sustained by a very unreasonable effort to torture on the rack of mere technical logic that long accepted and convenient form of words, adopted, doubtless, for the sake of mnemonic brevity, to hold the truth, that if a man had the right to preach when a proper occasion offered, he had the right to rule under proper limitations also, and that the man who might rule

within certain limitations, might also, under similar modifications, exercise the functions of distributing alms as well as the officer to whom the appellation of *deacon* is specially given. The formula was never designed to teach that the several functions of the ministry, using this word in its comprehensive sense, do not receive modification from one another, or that a church officer has the right to exercise any function, whatever of his office at any time or any place, just as he may choose. All that was ever meant by it is, that a preacher, without any further authorisation than what he has, by virtue of his having been ordained to preach, may "serve tables" if a suitable occasion should present itself, whether in the ordinary or in an extraordinary state of the church; whether at home or abroad. But this the Reformer's newly discovered law denies. If he would only cease from disturbing the peace of the Church touching the belief of this, we would gladly accord to him perfect freedom as to the choice of the terms in which to give it expression, albeit we might prefer the "Scotch" way ourselves, to his somewhat glaringly Hamiltonian terminology. However, if the possibility of showing that the words in which any theory are expressed may be so understood as to assert something false or absurd or self-contradictory, is proof that the theory these words were used to express by the writer from whom they are taken is false, our creed must shrink to very small dimensions, and even the Bible itself will hardly retain anything in its pages worthy of respect. Language is an imperfect vehicle of thought; and hence our duty is not to inquire what an author's or a speaker's words might by another be plausibly represented as meaning, but what he meant to declare by the language that he used. Had the earnest Reformer of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW obeyed this rule, he would have escaped the suspicion of rashness incurred by charging men of long acknowledged Aristotelian judgment and acuteness, such, for instance, as the London ministers, who were the authors of the Divine Right of Church Government, with absurdity, in propounding the doctrine of comprehension, which he finds so much in the way of his new rule. They are careful to show that they mean *virtual* comprehension; and not only so, but they are careful to give all

that they insist on as the truth formulated in the language: "All the inferior officers are virtually comprehended in the superior." Some writers, holding the same theory, do not take time to affix the adjective, but yet, to the candid, leave no doubt as to what sense (and in this we only have an example of what is common in all use of language) they use "comprehension" in, and that by it they mean no more than inseparable connexion of a lower with a higher official right in the same person, which does not obtain *vice versa*, or as a virtue of the lower; and they all deny that any one holds any official right which, as to its exercise, is not modified and restricted by dictates of reason, propriety, and the word of God. Furthermore, the question now before us is not one to be settled by an appeal to the nature of things; it is not a question as to necessary truth, but as to positive divine institution. It is, Did God direct that he who has a right to preach under certain restrictions, shall, without further ordination, have a right to rule, and to distribute, under certain respective restrictions; and whether he who has a right to rule, under certain restrictions, shall, without further ordination, have a right to distribute, under certain similar respective restrictions? If any should answer, there is no moral certainty that he did, yet we would ask, is there greater weight of probability in favor of the affirmative? We think there is; and it being a case where the great aphorism, "Probability is the guide of life," is met by no reason against its application, we feel personally bound to hold and advocate the doctrine of the London ministers. Whether true or not, it certainly is not unreasonable or absurd.

Let us suppose that God had first appointed a certain rank, or row, or grade, or order of men, to do the whole office work of the Church, and afterwards another to take part with them up to a certain well defined limit, in the same great ministry, and after this, yet another set, to take part in the same great public service, but assigned to one well described department of it; suppose the part to be wholly left to the first appointees is preaching, and the part to be shared in by the second is all that is left when formal preaching has been excluded, and the part to be attended to, by the third, is the care and application of material things and

of the bodies of the saints;—suppose that he had commanded, that these several servants in his house should respect each other's rights and never jostle each other from the work specially assigned to them according to the guidance of his providence and his word—so that, although a preacher is always a preacher, he may not preach anywhere as he might choose, and so, though always a ruler and a deacon, he may not rule or serve in a sphere in which others are appointed to those functions. Now can any one pretend that the actualisation of this whole supposition is forbidden by any necessary principle, or that it involves any absurdity? It will be seen that we have found no necessity for the discussion of genus and species. We are glad of this; for since reading the last articles on the diaconate in the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW we have serious doubts whether a knowledge of those correlatives is not as far above the reach of ordinary mortals, as the mastery of the great sub and supra-lapsarian controversy and the reconciliation of sovereignty and freedom; and we always knew that this was far above and out of our mental reach; and if we had not, the confession of the greatest philosopher and theologian we have ever seen, would have taught us, that when that victory is achieved, then the greatest human teacher that will ever have appeared will bless this world with his luminous presence. But if our supposition is not unreasonable, neither is the Scotch doctrine of virtual comprehension (which may just as well be called *the Presbyterian doctrine*) unreasonable; for they present the same theory. This holds, that not a solitary count in the commission of the apostles was erased by the appointment of the seven as recorded in the sixth chapter of the Acts. It distinguishes between a right and the exercise of it, between ceasing to be a deacon and waiting for a proper occasion to act as a deacon; between authorisation in reserve and in actual assertion and employment. Though there was no *kind* of ministry to engage in which, as God's servants, the apostles had authority before the ordination (or ranking) of Stephen and his six compeers, which they had not the right to engage in afterwards, yet this appointment did modify the exercise of that authority. It would have been an infringement of the rights of

those directly called by God to attend to the work of distribution in Jerusalem, if the apostles should have taken this work out of their hands. They had the very same right to do that work which the apostles had to do any work. But if the apostles might, without neglecting the higher functions of their ministry, and infringing upon the rights of other servants of God, engage in the work of distribution, they had authority to do that thing, even in Jerusalem, regardless of the question whether the Church then existed in an ordinary or an extraordinary state. There were two imperative restrictions upon the exercise of their right to act as distributors: one, the demands of the higher functions of their ministry; the other, the rights of their newly recognised fellow-servants. These restrictions excepted or satisfied, then whether to serve tables or not, was simply a question for the exercise of prudence. It will be seen from this, that the doctrine of comprehension in no degree lessens the importance of the specific office of the deacon, but, on the contrary, contributes as much to its enhancement as can any other. When it is said, the office of general virtually comprehends that of every other officer in the army, nothing is said against the importance of colonels and captains, nor is it implied that the general has a right, at his mere pleasure, to assume the specific functions of any particular officer. Thus it appears that the doctrine of the London ministers and of the Presbyterian Church touching the inter-relation of Church officers is at least not unreasonable or absurd.

But is this doctrine taught in Scripture? We reply that it seems to us to be more than suggested by the use of the word *deacon*, or, as in our English Bible, *minister*, to express the whole work of the apostles, and also to denominate the specific work of distribution, (just as elder is applied to the whole presbyterate, and yet is used to denote the specific work of ruling,) and to be most in accord with all that the Scriptures contain bearing on the subject at all. It seems to us also that the contributions to the common fund, which we are told in the fourth chapter of Act were laid at the Apostles' feet, must have continued under the exclusive responsible management of the Apostles up to the time when the seven were elected, and ordained to be over the

matter of distribution. By responsible management, we do not mean to intimate that no one but the apostles themselves was engaged in the distribution or application of the public money, but that those whom the apostles employed were their agents in such sense, that what they did, the apostles did by them. When the management of the matter was complained of, the apostles really apologised for what, were it not for the pressure of more important demands upon their time, would have evidenced against them the charge of gross negligence; they seem to admit that had they not been compelled by the readiness of the people to hear the word of God, to leave the daily distribution to be conducted without giving it their own personal attention, they would be to blame. It is in accordance with this, that the seven deacons are not said to be appointed to do the manual work of serving tables, but to be "over this business," as the apostles seem to us to have previously been over it, and to exercise this oversight personally, as the apostles had done, so far as their higher duties had allowed them. Now there is no reason in the narrative on which to found a suspicion that the apostles were by this appointment divested of any official element that ever belonged to them. Undoubtedly they ceased to have a right to do the numerically identical thing; which these officers were specially called to do, whether the demand for spiritual work permitted or not. But the appointment of the seven, apart from other considerations, only restrained the exercise of their function of distribution to the extent of the special sphere assigned to those others by that appointment. That the two functions are in themselves repugnant to one another we do not find taught anywhere in the word of God; but it does teach that whenever the exercise of the function of distribution would keep a preacher from gratifying those who longed for and were ready to profit by his ministry of the word, he must give the higher work the preference, and not suffer anything to hinder his devotion to the direct demands of man's spiritual nature. If the circumstances afford an occasion for the expenditure of all his strength in the immediate work of saving souls, then he must not leave the word of God to serve tables, but wholly and continually give himself to preaching and to preparing for it by study and

prayer; not, however, because preaching and serving tables are repugnant to one another, but only because the higher work must be preferred to the lower, as in the case of any church officer the work assigned to him of God in the Church should be preferred to that which is his own. The utterances from which it is inferred by the Reconstructionist that the functions peculiar to the bishop and those belonging to the specific deacon are incompatible are found in Acts, sixth chapter, second and fourth verses: "It is not fit that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables But we will continue steadfastly in prayer and in the ministry of the word." Commenting on the fourth verse, Addison Alexander says: "*Will give ourselves continually*, corresponds to one Greek verb (the same that occurs above in I. 14: II. 42, 46, and there explained) meaning to *adhere* to or *attend upon* a person or a duty. We have here the apostolical decision as to the relative importance of almsgiving and instruction, as functions of the ministry," But we have no apostolic decision that any two functions of the ministry are incompatible, unless by *incompatible* it be meant that we cannot do both at the very same time. We must admit that "one cannot whistle and chew oat meal" at the same time; but the doctrine we are opposing is that if a man do one certain kind of work, he must never, as he fears God, do any other kind of work for the Church. We very cheerfully admit that, as a matter of prudence, the two functions of rule and distribution to the poor (and especially if preaching be added to the former) had generally better be discharged by different individuals; all that we care to deny is that there is any necessary, inherent, or universal incompatibility between any two functions of the ministry to make it wrong for the same officer to be vested with authority to discharge both under whatever constitutional or other restrictions. No one will deny that a pastor is bound to care for the bodies as well as the souls of the poor; and if so, how it can be wrong for him, when his duty to the souls of men does not forbid, and no one's right would be infringed, to carry to the poor, clothing or fuel or food, it is hard indeed to see; although it may be easy enough to see why it may generally be best, and why it may often be necessary, to

have this done by one called especially and only to distribute material things, and why, when people flock to a preacher to hear the word of God, he should give himself exclusively to prayer and to the ministry of the word, and not think it fit for him to leave it to serve tables or do anything else imaginable. We refer, as clearly contradictory, and we think contrary, to the new idea of "incompatible functions" to Acts xi. 30, and iv. 34-37, and vi. 2, 3, 4; 1 Cor. xvi. 1-4; Gal. ii. 9, 10; and the Epistle to Philemon. But the Reformer of the diaconate says, that, granting that our impression received from the history in the sixth and fourth chapters of Acts is correct, our inference is notwithstanding worthless, because the apostles were extraordinary officers in extraordinary circumstances. It is sufficient for our present purpose to say, that if the extraordinary element in the case does not make the passage worthless as a warrant for having deacons at all, and does not forbid us to regard it as a divine warrant for giving deacons the charge of the poor, and so does not leave us without any law at law in reference to the proper work of the deacon, then we cannot see how the extraordinary element can vitiate the inference from the passage, that the higher office virtually includes the lower. As regards those who are deducing more from the passage than any one ever did before, it ought to be enough to ask, if the extraordinary takes the passage from us, then does it not much more take it from you? What would you answer, if asked, was it not an extraordinary state of things that, according to the passage in question, made the election of deacons necessary at all?—a state of the Church so extraordinary, that not a few respectable authorities have held that it presents an apostolic example favoring a community of goods; and that it is deemed necessary by Christian ministers to be at pains to preserve the record from being wrested to the support of Communism? But surely he will not persist in denying that we may infer the doctrine of the comprehension of the lower office by the higher from apostolic example, because it was complicated with the extraordinary, who himself infers from the same example, notwithstanding the extraordinary, the inherent incompatibility of the functions of distri-

bution and preaching. Let him make good his objections to our inference, and he will give far more latitude to the exercise of human prudence, as regards church work, than the strongest opponent of his "iron rule" in our Church would have thought possible. Nay, we would rather submit to the incorporation of the new rule in our Church code, than be subjected to the sweeping latitudinarianism that would result from the doctrine that we cannot reason from apostolic example, for that was all extraordinary; more or less, to what is binding now upon the Church. But the ground assumed by the Reformer, in his direct argument, is the sufficient refutation of this objection. Had he duly regarded consistency when, tired of skirmishing, he came to make his direct assault upon the conscience itself, he must needs have spiked all his own artillery, or turned it against the opponent of ultra ecclesiastical latitudinarianism. But he forgot, and so we need not stop here to show that every argument which proves that God has given any government at all to his Church, proves that we must reason from the example of the apostles, in order to find it, and that we must reason on the principle that the preacher, being an ambassador of Christ by authority equally direct and divine as that by virtue of which the apostles assumed that appellation, there is a fountain of inference in apostolic example for the guidance of ministers, touching the nature and limits of their official duties. But while it was absolutely necessary for the inventor of the Columbia theory to rebut the argument against its claims presented in the ancient doctrine we have been defending, it is not necessary for us to prove this old doctrine to be divine, in order to show that the new doctrine is not scriptural. If the old is true, the new must be false, but the converse does not hold good. On the contrary, the new may be false, whether the old is or is not so. Grant, for argument's sake, that a bishop is not, by virtue of his being bishop, a deacon also, it does not follow that he may never do anything as the appointee of the Church which belongs to the denomination "serve tables," without violating a divine law.

The question we are now forced to confront is not as to a dictate of prudence, but as to a declaration of absolute law: whether

it is true that the word of God commands that wherever temporal interests are encountered, one who is only a deacon must be employed to give attention to them; and that, hence, *wherever* the presbyter goes the deacon must go with him; whether preaching and *servng tables*, not may be, *per accidens*, but, are inherently and always incompatible functions; whether each officer is by the direct authority of God restricted to the functions appropriate to that office from which he receives his distinctive denomination; whether, as the elder represents the spiritual interests of the Church, the deacon represents the Church with respect to its temporal interests; and whether the constitution of our Committee of Foreign Missions is a standing violation of a divine law. This statement is very little more or less in language, and nothing else in substance, than the affirmations of the Professor of Theology in the Columbia Seminary, changed into the interrogative form. Quotations will be in order if this be denied. He confesses that the whole force of presumption is wholly against him. But this acknowledgment may serve either to enhance his courage, or to magnify his rashness, according as he is found to stand upon the rock of truth, or upon the sand of error. Certainly it does not lessen the magnitude of that opposing and frowning alpine barrier towering up and extending to the right and to the left as if to forbid the Reformer's march on his path of immortality as the champion of the diaconate. The argument from presumption is in the highest degree important in the case before us, because the claim we are denying is an inference from a single passage of Scripture, which, if good and necessary, is certainly not plain, for it escaped the observation of the General Assembly which framed the Constitutions of our Central Committees, and that of our able Committee of Revision which for so many years labored under the criticising eyes of our whole Church to perfect our Form of Government.

It is hard to imagine a claim deserving to be entertained at all against which the antecedent probability could be greater than that which the Professor who takes pains to signalise the "incomprehensible element" in things, has to overcome in the matter before us. In his apology for announcing the discovery of the

revolutionary commandment, he admits that the *consensus* of the whole family of Presbyterian Churches is against him; and what seems to embarrass him more, that Thornwell in the Augusta Assembly, in 1860, spoke and voted in a way that showed he did not think it wrong for a bishop to attend to the distribution of Church money. Here the pathetic nature has been brought into service, and we have a lamentation over the fallibility of the dear Church, and the modification of his views by him whose authority, except when he had modified his views, is always final with the one who has been requested to complete the expression of that great man's conceptions. But as others might judge that any good man's modified views are apt to be better than they were before modification, we are told that in this case the modification was practical, not theoretical, and only in accommodation to the demands of an amiable expediency. We reply that mere fallibility does not suffice to account for the error charged on the Presbyterian doctrine of comprehension, and the manner in which it has been set forth by the great advocates of the Divine Right of Church Government. If the doctrine touching the diaconate as now held by our Church is an error, there must have been some strange, special, blinding influence operating for centuries, under the most varied conditions, and on the most pious and gifted minds, as the cause of the blunder which we are told is fast working our destruction. As to the venerated author of the Discourses on Truth, whose armor is not likely soon to find one to appear in it to advantage, it may be affirmed that no consideration would have induced him to propose, for the adoption of the General Assembly, the Constitution of our Central Committee of Foreign Missions, if he had ever suspected the existence of a divine command forbidding preachers and all rulers to attend to any ministry appertaining directly to temporal things. Nay, that exalter of truth is proved by the history of his actions in Augusta, in 1860, to have most heartily approved that Constitution; and so, virtually, the propriety of preachers and rulers and deacons and technically unordained members joining together in the discharge of a common ministry. Stripped of sentimentality, what the Reformer seems to mean is: "That great authority which spoke

from the chair we now speak from, is to a certain extent infallible, and to be regarded as final when it accords with our judgment of things; but when it does not, then it must be believed that something went wrong with it which made it unworthy of regard." The allegation is not true, that the question of Church Government was almost wholly left for the men of our day to discuss; it has been treated of by the very ablest men of the last three centuries, and has been a bone (and only caution keeps us from saying the *great* bone) of contention between the denominations of Protestant Christendom ever since the great Reformation; and, yet, a great law belonging to that department of divine legislation lay hid from the eyes of men, in the word of God, till it yielded itself up to the acumen of a distinguished member of the Synod of South Carolina about five years ago! Wonderful! •

How, it may be asked, is the implication that the Church's practice has ever hitherto been in direct and uniform violation of a divine law, consistent with the indwelling of the Paraclete in every Christian, and his presence and office in the Church? According to the new theory of church government, one large stream of the Church's life has run, without check or obstruction in the channel of disobedience, so far as we know from the earliest period of its history, and certainly for the last three hundred years. It will not suffice to talk about ignorance, for ignorance is disobedience, if the law was revealed; and even if this were not true, why the ignorance, when it is the work of the Holy Ghost to dispel such ignorance? Nor will the doctrine of Christian imperfection explain the apparent inconsistency; we know of no other instance in which a law of God has been absolutely ignored by the Church and the Spirit, or in which the whole Church has failed throughout centuries ever to be convicted of a certain sin, though she had lived in it all her days, in her brightest and in her darkest times. It is not to be questioned that the financial department of the Church's enterprises has, in every age and in every land, largely engaged the minds and tongues and hands of men who had been ordained to the ministry of the word. How few are the Church institutions of learning, or charity, or of strictly gospel ordinances, that now

exist, or that have ever been, in raising and managing the funds of which ministers of the gospel have not borne a part! Sometimes, indeed, their conduct in this relation may have been questioned in the court of prudence, or on the ground that it may have been inconsistent with the preference due to their higher functions, when they were called to choose in which ministerial work they would engage. But it was never charged as a plain positive violation of an absolute divine prohibition, forbidding to join together and in one man, what God has put asunder and in two men.

Furthermore, if the learned dialectician is right, it is strange that God not only should have left the Church in such a course of sin, but should never have seen fit to make a total withdrawal of mind and labor from temporal things possible to a large number of the ministers of his word, or even to the great apostle of the Gentiles; that he has so ordered in relation to many of the most pious, trusted, and useful preachers of the gospel, as that they are compelled to serve tables to a greater or less extent. If a minister of the word may not do the service of a treasurer, as the appointee of our General Assembly, then, it seems to us, the inference is, much less may a minister of the word do secular work that is not of the Church. The result would be, that we would have no ministers but such as had inherited an income, or as received from the Church a salary adequate to his family's support. Does the popular orator, whose power of elocution can hold in silent wonder an audience which does not understand one word of the incomprehensible sentences he is uttering, consider what personal anathemas and what official destruction the mighty cannon he has loaded and primed would belch forth, should it happen to be fired by the match of the Church's approbation?

Yet notwithstanding all this, and all that might be said in addition, of antecedent improbability, if the word of God legislates as the inventor declares, we must at once submit; but does it? The word of God says, by apostolic example, Do not forsake the word of God to serve tables. Does this forbid a preacher to serve tables when in doing so he would not be forsaking the word of God? when by doing so he may increase his opportunity of min-

istering the word? That would involve forsaking the word of God in the case of a Spurgeon or a Moody, which in the case of another might only show his desire for the ministry of the word; and that would involve forsaking the word of God in a time of great religious interest, which at another time might only show the preacher's desire to employ his energies, as best he can, to the glory of God. There are many preachers who could do a great deal in the way of serving tables, and not offer one prayer or preach one sermon less; there are many who pray and preach more because they do serve tables; many whose usefulness is in every respect increased by their having some table-serving to do. But again, at a time when the people flocked to the apostles for religious instruction, the apostles said, according to King James's version, which takes three words to translate one, "We will give ourselves to prayer and the ministry of the word continually;" does this teach that a minister must be always preaching, whether he has hearers or not? Well, suppose the people do not want to hear him more than once a week, and then have to be fed with milk, and the preacher's strength is not exhausted in the ministry of the word, what then? May not the man employ his spare time in serving the Church in some other department of the ministry? Surely Paul was devoted to prayer and the ministry of the word; yet Paul had time to engage in tent-making, to attend to a collection for the poor, and to settle a matter of pecuniary debt between Philemon and Onesimus. Surely, if the law had long ago gone forth from Jerusalem that a preacher should so give himself to prayer and the word of God as never to minister to men's bodies, at least as a public officer, that letter to Philemon must fall under some degree of censure.

No one doubts that a minister is bound to do all the preaching he can; but we know but few men who can get preaching enough to do to exhaust their strength or occupy all their time. Then let them employ what remains to the best advantage; and if the Church wants it in another department than preaching, let the Church not hesitate to employ it there. Such a man may adhere to prayer and the ministry as really, and for aught we can know, as acceptably, as did the apostles themselves. Even empha-

size the adverb "continually" of our English Bible, yet no one would say it precluded recreation, or even all secular care. What reason is there, then, for saying it precluded all exercise of one kind of official distributive acts? It was, with the apostles, after the number of poor had increased greatly the alternative of superintending properly the daily ministration, and then forsaking the discharge of their higher functions altogether, or appointing other men to that work, and sticking to the great business of salvation, and they spoke accordingly: and when the same alternative, or a similar one, is presented to any minister, to whatever extent it is presented to him, his choice ought to be the same as theirs.

Now, of all that we have endeavored to say, this is the sum: The apostles were ministers; that is, *deacons*, in the most comprehensive sense, from their call to the apostolate to their death; while we now have no apostles in the restricted sense, save as we have them in the Scriptures, yet there is an analogy between the ministry which appertained to Paul, for instance, and the ministry which belongs to one who is a preacher in our day, which furnishes a fountain of inference touching the nature and duties of the latter. Reasoning from this analogy, we think it probable that the office of preaching, in whomsoever it is found, is connected with that of rule and distributing alms, and the office of rule, in like manner, with the latter also. This probability is strengthened by the similar relation of preaching and ruling, and by the general specific uses of the words, *bishop*, or *overseer*, and *elder*, and also by the example of the apostles touching alms and material things generally, which appertained to the support of the ministry and the prosperity of the Church. No office-right belongs to any man in the Church to be exercised by him arbitrarily; but the servants of God must respect the rights of those to whom they have given the right hand of fellowship to take part with them in one great ministry. And the higher work must be preferred to the lower, by those who have general authority in respect to both. And although the preacher may sometimes find, that the highest success of his preaching may require him to withdraw from the ministry of discipline in a particular case, and

from almsgiving in probably more cases, yet there is no inherent incompatibility, no repugnancy in themselves, such as would make the comprehension of the two in one person absurd or wrong, either between preaching and ruling, or between one of these and giving attention, more or less, to the temporal matters of the Church. The circumstances under which the apostles spoke must have weight in interpreting their utterance in the sixth of Acts, not as indicating an extraordinary state of the Church, but as being analogous to a condition of the Church in its organised state which is very different from that in which Christian communities are generally found, and in which many preachers are not called to participate once in a life time—a state of special revival. It is conceivable that a minister's opportunities of preaching, and generally his usefulness as a preacher, may be increased by his being, for instance, the treasurer of his Presbytery, or of one of our Central Committees, and we think we know actual cases of such benefit; we cannot see that the other theory gives any more importance to the specific office of deacon than does that we hold; and finally there does not seem to us to be a pin-point of solid truth brought to rebut the tremendous force of probability opposed to the new theory. Therefore we conclude that our beloved Church has no cause of alarm in her theory of Church government, or in the constitution of her Executive Committees; and that she may devote herself to her work, only confessing the need of more grace, that love may fill the channels of her bounty with larger tides of liberality, and that faith may fill her heart with hope in God, that will prompt more prayer and more preaching. We thank God for the order of his house, which we inherit; but one of the most important lessons to be learned from the Acts of the Apostles is that holy zeal can avail to promote the glory of divine grace in the highest, even when the demon of disorder is permitted to make havoc of all that would seem to man necessary to the growth and success of the Church. It is the disorder of covetousness, which is idolatry, within our hearts, we should most seek to cast out. It is our earthward affections that we should retrench. It is the incompatibility of serving God and mammon we should learn, the exclusion of selfishness we

should mostly preach and practice; and the reformation that would come by the pouring out of God's Spirit is that for which we should give ourselves continually to prayer. † † †

ARTICLE VI.

THE REPORT TO THE LAST ASSEMBLY ON THE OFFICE OF EVANGELIST.

The General Assembly which met at Louisville, in 1879, appointed a Committee "to report on the office and powers of the evangelist, his relation to the General Assembly and the Presbytery at home, his relation to the Church gathered among the heathen, and his relation to his fellow evangelists in the same missionary field." They were directed to report "by a proposed additional chapter to our Form of Government or otherwise."

In 1880 the Committee was continued and enlarged by the addition of other names. As finally constituted it was composed of the following names: Dr. Palmer, Dr. Adger, Dr. Woodrow, Dr. Lefevre, Dr. J. L. Wilson, and Dr. Stuart Robinson. This is a Committee of learned and able men; their names carry weight, and any dissent should be offered with diffidence.

Indeed, the just authority of these names impresses the feeling that dissent should be twice weighed before it is expressed. But after careful review of their report to the General Assembly at Staunton last year, we find ourselves unable to agree with some of its leading positions; and though the authority of the Committee is reinforced by that of the Assembly—the report was adopted—we venture this expression of objection and disagreement.

I. The report declines to offer any amendment to the Form of Government for the reason that "the doctrine of the evangelist is set forth with sufficient clearness in Chap. iv., Section 2, Arts. i. and vi." If this is true, it furnishes reason enough for the Committee's decision.

But is it true? Perhaps it is; yet the report claims for the evangelist power to ordain other evangelists; while, on the other hand, there are not a few in the Church, ministers, ruling elders, and private members, who can find neither in these articles nor elsewhere in our Form of Government any such authority. The opinion of most of these persons is that authority to bestow such power ought to be given by law to the Presbytery, but has not been given; and that inasmuch as the Constitution expressly authorises the grant of power to ordain ruling elders and deacons, and does not include ministers of the word, the failure to do so is to be interpreted as a refusal.

The full text of the only Article in the Form of Government touching this point is here given: "When a minister is appointed to the work of the evangelist, he is commissioned to preach the word and administer the sacraments in foreign countries, frontier settlements, or the destitute parts of the Church; and to him may be intrusted power to organise churches, and ordain ruling elders and deacons therein." (Chap. iv., Sec. 2., Art. vi.) Nothing is here said of ordaining evangelists, and it may be argued that this power, not being expressly granted, is not granted at all. And this is the more plausible from the special mention which is made of ruling elders and deacons. Indeed the argument has been already made. Whether it is sound or unsound may for the present be left undetermined. The point of attention is that many persons hold it to be sound, and believe that the law as it now stands gives no authority to any court of the Church to intrust to evangelists power to ordain any officers but ruling elders and deacons.

On the other hand, the Committee and the Assembly say (Minutes of 1881, p. 387): "He may organise churches and ordain to all the offices required to make them complete; and also with a view to the extension of the Church, he has the power to ordain other evangelists, both native and foreign." It may be agreed among us that he ought to have this power; but it is by no means agreed that it is in the Constitution, or can be deduced therefrom by good and necessary consequence. And most of us hold that extra-constitutional power is unconstitutional. Ought

not so important a grant of power to be too plain for debate? The Committee and the Assembly have left no room for mistake as to their meaning. Why might not the Book be equally clear? One clause added to the Article already quoted would put the doubt away.

There is another question which needs to be set at rest. The Constitution does authorise the grant of power to the evangelist to organise churches and ordain to office therein. How does it come to pass that this joint power of jurisdiction may be put into the hands of a single presbyter? And why not to pastors as well as to evangelists? Is it because of any inherent power in the office of the latter? The Committee and the Assembly seem to think it is. We cannot agree, for reasons which will be stated in another part of this paper. But it may be said here, that Presbyteries do habitually send pastors, sometimes one and sometimes more than one, to organise churches at specified points. It is true that this case differs from the other in this, that the grant of power to the pastor is specific, while that to the evangelist is general, but it is of the same nature, differing only in extent; and in each case the warrant for its exercise, and even for its existence, is found in the grant of the Presbytery. In the case of the pastor, this is clear enough, for it is never done except by express authority. It ought to be equally clear in the case of the evangelist, if we will bear in mind the words of the Book: "To him *may be intrusted power to organise,*" etc. This language authorises, but does not require the trust. And by whom is it to be intrusted, but by the Presbytery from whom he receives his appointment? The inference is clear, that the authority of any minister to do these things is to be found in the action of his Presbytery. And this is the opinion of all with whom we have conversed. A distinct constitutional statement of the evangelist's true relation to the Presbytery as its representative, having in his office none but delegated powers, would settle this question, and do much to relieve the Church of practical difficulties, and to prepare the way for larger usefulness hereafter.

Let it be added that one Synod has already objected to the action of the Assembly, on the ground that there is nothing in

the Constitution to warrant the claim that the evangelist has power to ordain other evangelists; and on the further ground, that the adoption of this report was practically adding a new article to the Constitution. Was there not a need that an amendment should be reported and sent down to the Presbyteries for adoption?

This defective quality of the Book was seen and pointed out before it was adopted, and apprehension of evil as the result was expressed. We are at the beginning of these evils when doubtful interpretations become necessary, and powers have to be claimed and exercised which are not within the plain intent of the Constitution. We are at the beginning, only. The end is hidden; but it requires little foresight to anticipate debates, confusion, and inefficiency.

II. The report says (Minutes of General Assembly, p. 387): "The only feature that distinguishes the evangelist from the ordinary minister of the word is, that he labors to plant the gospel and the institutions of the Church in places where they do not exist." We object to this for two reasons: 1st. It assumes that the evangelist is not an ordinary minister of the word; and 2d. It makes him essentially a missionary, and excludes every other thought from our conception of his office and work. There is no evangelist who is not a missionary.

Let us examine the first of these, viz., the assumption that he is not an ordinary minister. It is suggested that perhaps it was meant to say, the only feature that distinguishes him from *other* ministers is, that he labors, etc. This would represent him as an ordinary minister engaged in one of the great departments of ministerial work. We cannot think that this is a true interpretation. It is not the meaning of the words employed; and if the accomplished author of that paper had intended to say this, it is not likely that he would have missed the mark so widely. We know no master of the English language whose words are more fitly chosen than his, or better fitted to the thought. And if there had been found in him a defect of this kind, there is not a member of the Committee who could not have supplied it and corrected the error. Add to this, that they claim for this office

extraordinary inherent power, and we are obliged to conclude that they have represented their thought correctly, and that they do hold that the evangelist is not an ordinary minister of the word ; that his place and his power are alike extraordinary.

We deny that this is the doctrine of our Church. We are well aware that there is a small body of men among us who hold that this office is not a permanent one in the Church ; that it was intended to meet a temporary need, and then expire. But it is evident that this is not the opinion of these brethren. Their statement of the distinguishing feature of the office represents it as set to supply a need of which the claim will be urgent and clamorous till the great commission of the Master to his Church has been fully executed in every land and among every kindred and nation under the whole heavens. This shuts us out from the supposition that it might have been intended to represent the office as temporary, and renders it needless to consider here the questions raised by that theory.

And now, following the report a little further, we find it saying that in some cases "the Constitution recognises as *inhering in his office* all the powers that are necessary to constitute the Church. He may organise churches and ordain to all the offices required to render them complete." If these powers do inhere in his office, he is not an ordinary minister ; for ordinary ministers have no such inhering powers.

We deny, again, that this is the doctrine of our Church. It is worthy of note, that the report declares that "when his field lies within the territory of the Church as already organised, his powers are circumscribed within those of the court having jurisdiction of the same ;" and then these extraordinary functions can be exercised only when expressly delegated to him by the court. But why are his powers thus circumscribed ? The answer is furnished by the report. "The Constitution assigns the power of forming new churches and of ordaining to office to a court." Again, why ? Is there not a principle underlying this provision of our Book ? The act of forming a new church, or of ordaining to office, is an exercise of jurisdiction ; and jurisdiction is not a several but a "joint power," to be exercised by presbyters in a

court. And it is to be so exercised because it is a joint power. For the same reason, no one among the presbyters constituting the court can have a right to it, unless it be lawfully delegated to him. This can be done only by the court having jurisdiction.

When an evangelist is sent beyond the territory which the Church occupies, the action of the Presbytery is to be interpreted as giving him authority to do the work with which he is intrusted, *i. e.* to plant the Church in his field and prepare it for its work. This includes organising churches and ordaining to office. Further than this, when he is sent beyond the jurisdiction of the court, being the only presbyter in the field, there is no one to share his authority, and by consequence whatever church power is there, must be in his hands. If there is any power to receive members, to organise, to ordain, or to administer discipline, it is to be exercised by him. And it is delegated to him by the act of sending. On any reasonable principle of construction, this must be our conclusion. For all this, nothing extraordinary is demanded. The power of the Presbytery and the authority of the office of presbyter are sufficient.

There is yet another point in this connection to which it may be well to give a moment's attention. The report says that when his field lies beyond the territory which the Church occupies—there being no court to discharge these functions, “the constitution recognises as inhering in his office all the powers that are necessary to constitute the church.” And though claimed as inhering in the office, it is declared that “when his field lies within the territory of the church as already organised, these powers can be exercised only when expressly delegated.” Now if they do inhere, they belong to the office wherever employed, and the exercise of them in any field will be lawful, unless expressly forbidden by competent authority. We will not stop to discuss the question whether such authority can be found. We only call attention to the inconsistency of a claim of inherent power which habitually fails to inhere. The claim compels the inconsistency. For if these powers could exist and be exercised “within the territory of the church as already organised” then it would not be true that “jurisdiction is a joint power,” and this constitutional principle would be a mere delusion.

While speaking of the power of this office, it may be well to bear in mind, that it is not an office which is conferred by ordination. In this sense there is but one office in the ministry of our Church. Ministers are not ordained pastors or evangelists but presbyters, and are assigned to duty in pastoral or evangelistic work. The act of ordination does not in any degree determine the special character of their work. The ceremony of installation is indeed joined in our Book with that of ordination, but that would be a very defective analysis which should fail to distinguish between them. Whether the minister becomes a pastor or an evangelist, he is appointed to his work by the Presbytery—with his own consent of course—and in neither case is the appointment any part of his ordination, and in both cases the effect of ordination is the same. It simply makes him a minister of the word. The office of evangelist then, is not one indicating extraordinary power, but one which shows the nature of the work to be done, just as that of pastor does.

At one point the report seems to agree with us in this position, for it says that the only thing which distinguishes him, is that he labors to plant the gospel and the institutions of the Church in places where they do not exist. But while it says this, it claims the extraordinary inherent powers spoken of already, and is inconsistent with itself on this point also.

If our reasoning is sound, the question of the extent of the evangelist's authority in any particular field is to be settled by appeal, not to any inherent powers of his office, but to the act of Presbytery delegating such authority. And his exercise of the power of jurisdiction is shown to be lawful, not by the nature of his office, but by the legal right of Presbytery to delegate its power to him, and by the fact that it has done so. The language of our Form of Government—already quoted—seems very clearly to imply this. "To him may be intrusted power to organise," etc. We again note that it is not said he has the power, but it "may be intrusted to him," and that the clause is not mandatory, but permissive. It recognises the right of Presbytery to take such action, but does not say it must be done. It seems to us, there-

fore, that this claim of extraordinary power inhering at any time in this office, falls to the ground, and with it falls the assumption that he is not an ordinary minister of the word.

The conclusion seems to be clear that the evangelist is an ordinary minister, called to the special work in which he is engaged, not by any particular congregation, but by Presbytery or a higher court, and sent to preach the gospel without limiting his charge to a particular congregation. And the measure of power committed to his trust, will vary with the varying circumstances of different cases. An illustration will show this variation. An evangelist is sent into the destitute region on the frontier of one of our Presbyteries. At one place he finds no church gathered; at another it is gathered, but not organised; at another it is organised in part, there is perhaps one ruling elder; and at still another the organisation is complete. At one of these points the constitutional rights of the congregation limit the power of the evangelist. They have called to office those who bear rule among them, and though they consent to receive the evangelist as he is sent to them by the Presbytery, this does not suspend nor supersede the authority of their own rulers. The evangelist cannot possibly have any more power in that congregation than a pastor would have, and the Presbytery has no right nor power to give him more.

At another point where no church exists, he has the power to receive members, to organise, and to ordain; because no such limitations are found as in the former case. In each case the act of the Presbytery is to be construed as conveying full working power, but always without prejudice to the rights and authority of others, the guiding principles being: 1. That the Presbytery has a right to delegate its powers; and 2. That it has not the right to suspend from the functions of their office the elders whom the people have called to be their rulers, nor to overbear their authority by the appointment of another to bear rule in their place. The rights of the people forbid any such overbearing. The power committed to the evangelist cannot impair those rights nor set aside the authority of sessions or office-bearers in any congregation.

The same principles apply in the case of an evangelist among

the heathen. He has all the power necessary to constitute the church and complete its equipment. It has been delegated to him by his Presbytery. But let a native church be organised and officers called and ordained, and his delegated power will be limited by the rights of the people and the authority of their rulers. Or let another evangelist be sent into that field, and the principle of the parity of presbyters makes them of equal authority, unless to one or the other has been expressly made a delegation of superior power.

Can this delegation be made? Has the Presbytery the right to make it? Has the evangelist the right to receive it? This opens to our inquiry these two questions: 1st. Has Presbytery power to give to one presbyter authority over another, so that one may exercise control over the other? 2d. Has Presbytery the right to give to one evangelist authority superior to that of another in such things as organising, ordaining, etc.? That is, may Presbytery give to one evangelist the power to organise, etc., and withhold this power from another evangelist in the same field? It is admitted that larger powers may be demanded for one field than for another. But this admission does not touch the question of superior authority. Let us consider the first of the questions written above: Has Presbytery power to give to one presbyter control over another? If it can do this, then it has power to contravene one of the settled principles of Presbyterian Church Government. For such a claim the warrant ought to be very clear. Nay, it may be said that no warrant can be supposed to exist that would establish such a claim. It is needless to say that none such can be found in our Constitution. We hazard nothing in saying that the whole Church would unite with us in denying to the Presbytery the right to confer any such power.

Has the Presbytery the right to give to one evangelist authority to organise churches, ordain officers, and do other such things, and at the same time withhold that authority from another evangelist in the same field? An illustration will make plainer the meaning of that question. There is an evangelist in a heathen city. To him has been intrusted all the power needed for his work—power to receive members, to organise churches, to ordain

to office or to administer discipline. Another evangelist is needed in the same mission. It may be that one can be found among the native members who is qualified to take part in the work of the first, but not to do all that he is commissioned to do. He may be prepared to preach the word, administer the sacraments, and receive members, but lacks those qualities which would fit him to administer discipline, or to judge of the expediency of organising, etc. Now has the Presbytery the right to refuse to him any of the powers which were committed to the man who was first in the field? The answer to this question may be found in the principle that to each one is to be given just so much power as the needs of the work shall justify. If the larger measure of authority may be withheld with present advantage to the work, there is no principle of Presbyterian Church Government that forbids it.

This is evident from precedents scattered along the histories of all our Presbyteries. Questions of the temporary supply of certain pulpits are expected to arise in the interim from one meeting of Presbytery to another, and these questions are referred to the chairman of the Presbyterial committee of Home Missions, or to the agent of Sustentation, and he is authorised to conclude the matter. And after the reference, no other member of the Presbytery has any voice in the decision. The arrangement is made and stands till Presbytery meets again. Does this interfere with any principle of our Church Government? Yet authority is given to one and not to others. We are not overlooking the difference between this case and that of the evangelist who should hold powers not committed to his brethren. As was stated in another case, this is special and that is general; this has a date set for it to terminate, that runs on till cause arises for its closure. But in each the principle of action is the right of Presbytery to delegate its power to one and not to another. Indeed, if there be any right to delegate power, that implies a corresponding right to select those to whom it shall be delegated.

A still more striking illustration of this right to delegate power to one and not to another is found in the office of superintendent as it formerly existed in the Scottish Church. If, then, Presbytery may at home commit certain trusts, and with them the powers

they imply, to the hands of one and not of another, why may not a similar course prevail in our mission fields? Why may not one evangelist have powers and responsibilities which another is not called nor qualified to bear? This interpretation represents all evangelists, and, indeed, all presbyters, as equal in rank and inherent power and as differing in the extent of delegated authority alone. And it leaves the Church free to give to its evangelists or to withhold the larger evangelistic powers as may seem to be wisest and best.

The report represents the evangelist as a missionary—only and always a missionary. It says “the *only* feature that distinguishes the evangelist is, that he labors to *plant the gospel and the institutions of the Church in places where they do not exist*. We object to the proposition because it makes evangelistic work and missionary work identical. It seems to assume that Art. VI., Sec. 2, Chap. 4, of the Form of Government, gives our whole doctrine on the subject, and that Article adds nothing to it. Now is this the position of our Church? The two Articles are as follows: Art. 1. “This office—viz., that of minister of the word—is first in the Church for dignity and usefulness. The person who fills it has in Scripture different titles expressive of his various duties. . . . As he bears the glad tidings of salvation to the ignorant and perishing, he is termed evangelist.” Art. 6: “When a minister is appointed to the work of the evangelist, he is commissioned to preach the word and administer the sacraments in foreign countries, frontier settlements, or the destitute parts of the Church; and to him may be intrusted power,” etc.

There can be no doubt of the interpretation of this last Article. It fully sustains the report. And it may at least plausibly be said that Art. I. does not with any clearness set forth another doctrine, and that its language is intended to apply only to the names by which the minister of the word is known, and not at all to the offices he fills. We will not discuss this interpretation; we think it contains a fallacy; but if it is true, then in our opinion here is another reason for an amendment to our “Form of Government.” And whether true or not, the fact that it is held by

some to be sound calls for the amendment to be made. For we are persuaded that this is not the doctrine of the Scriptures nor of our Church. That it is not the teaching of the Bible, we infer from the preaching of the evangelist Stephen in Jerusalem, within the limits of an organised and working church, and from the recorded labors of Barnabas and Timothy and Titus among the established churches. And we believe that it is held by most men among us that Nettleton, Baker, Stiles and others, were as certainly, and, perhaps, as profitably engaged in evangelistic work, when preaching among organised churches, as if they had been in frontier or foreign fields. We are therefore persuaded that this paper gives a mistaken view of the position really held by our Church; and this, notwithstanding the vote by which the Assembly adopted it and made it their own.

We have not space to discuss the employment of evangelists among those churches which have already the stated ministry of the word. We know it is regarded with distrust by many of our most cautious thinkers. But we venture the suggestion, that this is because of abuses which have been allowed to come in, and which in fairness belong to it no more than they belong to the pastor's work of preaching to his people.

We are satisfied that these abuses would disappear before a wise Presbyterian oversight, and that then important advantages would follow this scriptural use of the evangelistic office. We can only indicate—not discuss—two or three of these: 1. Ministers are not alike in their gifts, and many a pastor has felt in his work the need of some preaching that would supplement his own and awaken consciences which he could instruct but could not arouse. 2. Some reserve force is needed, to be used at critical times in places when just then a week or two of wise and earnest effective work is worth as much as the labor of a year under ordinary conditions. 3. God in his sovereignty calls some men to what is generally known as revival work, and fits them for it. Why should we not place these men in such positions that their peculiar gifts may be of the largest service to the Lord and to his Church?

The principles which have been here set forth seem to us to carry with them a solution of all those questions which touch the

relation of the evangelist to the Church at home and abroad, and his relation to his fellow-workmen in the same field. His relation to the Presbytery at home is defined by these facts. He is a member of it, is an ordinary minister of the word, is its appointee, and holds whatever power he has as the delegate of the Presbytery to a specified work. He is responsible to it, and subject to its control as are all other ministers of the word. His work may lie beyond the bounds of the Church, and his support and the direction of his work may come through the Assembly's Committee. That Committee has been made the agent of the Presbyteries for this purpose. But in all other respects his relation to his Presbytery is the same with that of other ministers. His relation to the Assembly is in like manner the same, except in those things in which the Assembly's Committees have been authorised to act. In these things there is a closer contact with the Committee, and a closer relation to the Assembly. But it is only in the matters of salary, and of oversight of work. And in these things the exceptional relation exists only in cases in which the evangelist is put by his Presbytery under the care of the Committee.

His relation to his fellow-evangelists is settled by the principle of the parity of presbyters, which places all on the same level of official position and dignity, and forbids that one shall have authority over another.

His relation to the Church in his field is determined by the extent of the power delegated to him by Presbytery, and by limitations which the constitutional rights of others impose. This relation may be such as to present the appearance of change from year to year. At the beginning of his work, he may hold in his hand for that field all the power of the Church. At the close of his ministry, churches are at work, a Presbytery has been organised, and by the call and ordination of presbyters, and the formation of courts, his power has been limited again and again, till now the field is filled with churches and presbyters and courts; the extraordinary authority intrusted to him by the Presbytery at home is absorbed by the Presbytery in the field, and there is left to him only the power to preach the word and administer the sacraments.

D. E. JORDAN.

ARTICLE VII.

THE PRESBYTERIAN DIACONATE AGAIN.

I.

1. It is with extreme reluctance that the writer again asks the ear of his brethren to an essay on the diaconate. Since the issue of last October's number of this REVIEW, he has written out, with a fulness that is far beyond his custom, a review of every complete paragraph of "*The Diaconate Again*," as he had previously done with the "Report" to the last Assembly of its "Committee on the Diaconate." As the article and the Report were written by one and the same distinguished ecclesiologist, and the documents themselves are but two aspects of the same thing, the publication of either of those essays would be an answer to both of the papers. But neither our conscience nor our judgment will permit us to seek the publication of these replies. It would be to the REVIEW a waste of space; to the reader, a waste of time; and to our "good brother," cruelty. We therefore prefer the less of two evils (wasting our own time and our own space, and crucifying ourselves), and recast and publish only a few passages in rejoinder. Of course this procedure compels us to bury much that is *essential*, and more that is *material*, to a complete answer.

We have also *pondered* the article in the last number of this REVIEW, of which we may say that its positions and arguments had been substantially anticipated from their previous appearance in the Report. Modifications have been made in the prepared specimens of the reply we were tempted to write, in order to allude to their form; and a few new paragraphs have been added, to meet unanticipated matter.

2. So much for our own benefit: now a few words for the benefit of our "good brother." And *first*, we recall his attention to the fact that *he* was the man that cast the argument into that syllogistic form which sophisticated his admirers and co-Committee men. To be sure, his syllogism was abridged to the last degree, and was both enthymematic and prosyllogistic.

This, however, is a legitimate abridgement of logical processes; legitimate, indeed, but dangerous, both to the author and to the reader. *Secondly*. We take his appeal from the court of Logic to the higher court of Metaphysics, (a) as a regular procedure of which no prosecutor has a right to complain; (b) as a confession, that in the court of original jurisdiction, the verdict has gone against him; and (c) that he judges the cause of his failure to be the necessary limitations of the logical science; *i. e.*, that Logic properly deals only with *symbols* of notions, and not with their *matter* and *essence*. Exactly so; and that is the *point* of "The Presbyterian Diaconate" to which he replies, both in the Report and the articles. That article was intended to show that his *consequence was false*, without deciding on the truth or falsity of the consequent.

This is the end of Logic, and we went no further. But (d) we do feel *logical* indignation at the appellant when he introduces his appeal with a sneer at the Court. Of course, "Logic would be content with arbitrary symbols," and it would be salutary for the logician to imitate her—*secundum quid*.

Thirdly. We notify our "good brother" that in examining his metaphysics, we intend to use the established *language* of Metaphysics as far as necessary, just as we used the language of Logic, when his exploits on that battle-field were tested. We decline to discuss any question in any other language than that of the science to whose sphere it belongs. We shall therefore speak of the *matter of a genus* and the *essence of a species*, matter being that which *is given* and *is prior* to an operation, essence being that which *is given* by the operation, and is, in the order of thought, *posterior* thereunto.

Logic rattles her dry bones, for the excellent reason that she *is* a skeleton, and has nothing else to rattle; and the *drier* they are, the more completely the moisture of rhetoric is *wiped off*, the better will they rattle.

Metaphysics, however, is a cold and murderous blade; and the colder and keener it is, the better will it be suited to divide between one concept and another.

3. We wish also to call the *special* attention of the reader to

the *fact* that our "good brother," even in the latest amendments of his argument, has not dared to assert that his premises give any other conclusion, or can *by possibility* justify any other inference, than that which was allowed, in our criticism, to flow legitimately from them, to wit, that one *group* excludes every other *group*, or that one *unit* excludes every other *unit*; that is to say, again, as we said before, that "the roll of presbyters does not contain the name of a single deacon, or that Rev. Mr. P. does not include Deacon D." We added the words, "*Who ever* affirmed that there was not as clear a distinction between them as that between a ten-foot pole and a yard-stick?" And yet our learned opponent has imputed to us the very position which we have shown to be *his*, and which we have repudiated as totally irrelevant to the question in debate. He says, triumphantly: "What now becomes of the reviewer's illustration, that 'a ten-foot pole' *includes* a yard-stick"? Now we appeal to the reader to say whether wrong has not been done us. We do *now* affirm that a ten-foot pole contains one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten *feet*—all these *marks*; but we have never said that a yard-stick includes a foot *rule*, or that a ten-foot *pole* includes a yard-stick; and what is more, we have never attempted to *prove* that the one *excludes* the other; and we beg the reader's pardon for showing before, and now showing again, that this is exactly the supererogatory work that our "good brother" has done in the great travail of his logical and metaphysical soul.

4. The attention of the reader is called also to the aim of our essays, to wit, that our fathers had some good sense, and (a) expressed a sensible and *pertinent* thought, when they affirmed that "the higher office includes the lower," and (b) that this thought is perfectly scriptural. They could not have meant to deny the truism that one group or unit excludes any and every other group or unit; but meant to affirm that the higher office *as such* includes the lower office *as to its nature*. Our illustration was the stock illustration of books on logic, but it seems that we must explain it further, lest perchance some reader may miss the point as completely as our opponent has done. When it is said that man includes animal, it is meant that *man* has an animal nature united

with his personal rational nature, and that he truly performs all animal functions, but it is not meant that he performs them as a mere animal or as a brute. On the contrary, he performs them all as a rational animal, though he performs them in his animal nature. Take any animal actions for example—say eating and walking—man does not eat and walk as a brute, but as a man. The person of the agent lifts all the acts of his animality out of the conditions under which the irrational animal acts, and raises them into the sphere of rational actions. In like manner the presbyter deacons, not as a mere deacon, but as a presbyter. His higher nature, in which his personality resides, in the one and sole agent of all the deeds done in his diaconal nature, and lifts them up into the sphere of episcopal actions.

II.

The articles and the Report precipitate themselves suddenly and with dangerous momentum into the cold metaphysical operation of dividing a genus into its species, and, for a while, get along very well indeed. If, however, the author had started with less heat, and had kept himself cool, he would probably not have lost his head, but perceived that the result of his metaphysics was precisely coincident with the result of his logic. Here is the whole conclusion—all the fruit of his great hunt on the fields where genera and species “most do congregate.”

Hear his own words. “In order to set this matter in a clear light, we will employ the illustration repeatedly adverted to by the reviewer. The species, man and brute, are included under the genus, animal. Consequently the essential attribute of the genus, viz., animality, is included in each of the species. But who would say that, because animal is included in man, therefore the species brute is included in the species man?” Verily, *who?* Most certainly not the present writer, especially as that is the very thing which our former article showed to be the only legitimate outcome of our antagonist’s logic, and, as such, totally irrelevant to the question in dispute. We hold and believe that every unit and every group, whether higher or lower, or in the same plane, *excludes* every other unit and every other group, as such.

What we contend for is that the higher species (man) *as such* includes the lower species (brute) *as to its nature*; or, to put it in another way, as man includes animality and performs the functions of animality, so the higher church officer includes *diaconality* and performs all its functions. We never said or thought, and know no *a priori* laws of thought by which we could *begin* to think, that a dollar *coin* or a ten foot *pole* includes a dime *coin* or a yard *stick*; and we are firmly persuaded that it is perfectly *immaterial* to this exclusion whether the *matter* of the coins or the sticks be the same, or one be gold and the other silver. Every office and every officer excludes every other office and every other officer *as such*. "It is a mere waste of time, in controversy, for one of the contestants elaborately to prove what the other concedes." A dollar can buy whatever a dime can buy, and something of greater value besides. Each higher deacon can perform all the services of the lower, and some more important services besides. All this is just simply saying that the higher species contains in it all the *marks* of the lower, besides its own specific nature, which gives it *name* and fixes its relative rank.

The cause of our opponent's mistake, as far as metaphysics is concerned, is the confusion of the *name* with the *thing*. If he had only *named* his species, simple deacon and higher deacon, or simple animal and higher animal, it would have put his candle on a candlestick, and manifested in a clear light that there is a good deal in the art of putting things; and that it is better *metaphysics* to say that a man is an animal than to say that a man is a brute!

III.

The author of the articles and the Report, with singular rashness, goes on, immediately after "carrying coals to Newcastle," in order to set his conclusion in "a clear (!) light," to say: "What makes man" (higher animal) "and brute" (lower animal) "species relatively to each other? Their specific marks. One of those characterising man, as contradistinguished from the brute, is the faculty of speech—he is a speaking animal. One of those characterising the brute, is dumbness—he is a dumb animal. Now to say that the brute is included in man, is to say that

is, as dumb, so included. And then by virtue of this conclusion, we have man a dumb, speaking animal." This is a specimen of our opponent's skill in the *reductio ad absurdum*. We well remember, though it was a third of a century ago, our first recitation on specific Difference and Property, and the art of dividing a genus into its species. We have hunted up the dusty book, and here is the text, italics included. "That is the most strictly called a *property* which belongs to the *whole* of a *species*, and to that *species alone*, as polarity to a magnet. And such a *property* it is often hard to distinguish from the *differentia*; but whatever you consider as the most *essential to the nature* of a species you must call the *differentia*, as rationality to man, and whatever you consider as rather an *accompaniment or result* of that difference, you must call the *property*, as the use of speech."

The last number of "The American Journal of Philology" contains an article by W. D. Whitney, maintaining the same ground, viz., that the want of articulate speech in brutes is not due to any *organic* deficiency, but to the absence of a rational power. We rely, however, on the judgment of the reader. It is plain that in every individual there must be the whole matter of its genus and the whole essence of its species. If speech, as a faculty or function, is essential to his *species*, then man cannot lose it without falling out of his species. But may not a man be dumb and "be a man for all that?" On the other hand, the very power of some lower animals to imitate human speech, shows that dumbness is only a *property* of brutes, and not a *mark* of their species. On this point, however, we have Scripture to help us out. Balaam's ass used human speech, (2 Pet. ii. 16,) and still only an ass, though it was "the dumb ass speaking." The miraculous element did not change the *species* of the brute. To suppose so would be to carry the whole narrative quite out of the domain of the scriptural miracle into that of heathen metamorphosis. Now, if one wishes to make logical divisions, he may choose his principle, but *may not* change it afterwards.

We thus divide an *omne* by species, or by opposite states, etc.; but whatever principle of division is assumed must be carried *all*

the way through, or we get *cross* divisions, which logic abhors quite as much as nature abhors a vacuum. Suppose one should divide *animal* into men, bipeds, and negroes; or books into quartos, English and historical,—this would be simple fumbling. To be sure, a class formed on one principle may happen to coincide so nearly with that formed on another that the novice may be deceived himself and deceive others thereby, but it is none the less fumbling. When we divide animals into men and brutes, we use the principle of *differentia*; but when we divide animals into speaking animals and dumb animals, we use the principle of *properties*. The divisions thus reached cannot be compared *in logic*, and are not even plausibly coincident. The property of speech may be taken from a man—as from Zacharias—and that man still belong to his species; and the same property be added to a brute—as to Balaam's ass—and that brute still remain in his species. But what has our antagonist gained by his blunder? His own words are: “By virtue of this conclusion we have man a dumb, speaking animal. The same fallacy is perpetrated when we say that one species of church officers is included in another species.” There it is again! Now we never said it, and we do not believe it; we have said and do believe that the *nature* of one species is included in the higher species of the same genus. But his paralogism will not yield to him even that “lame and impotent conclusion,” for its premises contain cross divisions. It may be further remarked that, if that excluded property is *nothing*, like dumbness, we see no difference between its inclusion and its exclusion. We hold that man, as man, includes the lower animal *as to its nature*. Suppose that our opponent was making an argument to prove that the South was *justifiable* in engaging in the late war, and that we should reply by solemnly showing that *evil* ought not to be done that good may come, it is very probable that even he would feel tempted to say something severe *about the day on which we were born*. We remember that this mode of reply is called, in treatises on logic, *the ignorantio elenchi*.

IV.

The articles and the Report reiterate that our position is absurd

because it requires us to take the deacon as a species of church officer without any specific essence. He maintains that the essence—"peculiar attribute"—of the preacher is preaching; of the ruling elder, ruling; and of the deacon, distributing. We maintain that the essence of the deacon is deaconing; of the elder, a double unit, ruling and deaconing; of the preacher, a triple *unit*, preaching and ruling and deaconing; and that the elder and the preacher do their deaconing in their diaconal nature. Now attention is called to the fact that the matter of the genus is bare *deaconing as opposed to ruling*; and this matter as the *πρώτη ἕλη* of a common term, is without "*form*." Butler's Hudibras "professed

He had *First Matter* seen, undressed,
And found it *naked* and alone,
Before one rag of *Form* was on."

Now we have on our side every metaphysician that ever lived, when we affirm that the *lowest* species of every genus is just this *unformed* matter *informed*. Form is the *essence* of an essence, or its "peculiar attribute." Take the naked matter of any genus and add to it primary form, *separate subsistence*, is the metaphysical recipe for making the "*infima species*." Our opponent, notwithstanding the horrible storm of genera and species which he rained down on our naked head, has failed to make a fracture. He himself speaks more than once or twice of cases in which the matter of a genus and the essence of a species "*coincide*." There is nothing, our critic affirms exultingly, in this *infima species* that was not previously in the genus. Nothing, we reply, *except species itself*. *Subsistence in re* of the generic matter *is* always the essence of the lowest species and defines it. When our opponent conceives of presbyters as a genus, and divides them into preaching elders and ruling elders, he does the same thing precisely, and does it very properly. Why then should he find fault with us for doing the same thing?

V.

The Report and the articles make much of *distributing* and *collecting* as pertaining to the *essence* of the diaconal office. In

the test passages, these words must be taken as referring to *acts* and not the *authority* by which they are performed.

Now we formally decline to discuss so small and barren a question. The words do not occur in "The Presbyterian Diaconate," except twice, in close connexion, where the bare act had to be spoken of. Believing that *qui facit per alium facit per se*, as far as official responsibility is concerned, is common sense and common law and common religion, the writer cares little *who* performs the *acts* of distributing and collecting. The deacon may send to the beneficiary his share of the relief by a child or a servant or a grocer, provided it be the diligent and affectionate expression of his official and personal "care of the poor." Of course, he must discharge his duties, which are far higher than mere distributing, not in a formal and perfunctory manner, but in great love to the poor, and realise in himself and his work Christ's love and the Church's love "to the poor saints." Of course, too, this requires that he should *visit* the poor and pray with them and console and advise them.

Now, it is eminently proper for the mere deacon, as for the higher deacon, to perform the *acts* which his office requires to be done, provided he can do so without the sacrifice of aught that is *essential* to his office. What the writer holds is, that the essence of the deacon, as a church officer, is "the care of the poor saints;" he cares not at all *who* "takes up the collection," or who carries the collection-money to the treasurer or to the poor saint.

VI.

The author of the articles and the Report is perpetually perpetrating the metaphysical and logical crime of filching from the writer his *secundum quid*, and then parading a *reductio ad absurdum*! Of course, this unlawful procedure "leaves us poor indeed." To give two examples out of many. We had said, as he quotes: "Let it be remembered at the outset that the name can never lose the odor of the thing which it represents, and, therefore, that our search for the ecclesiastical significance of these terms must start with the idea of service as opposed to rule;" and again: "The search for the ecclesiastical meaning of the word

starts with an *a priori* conviction of the impropriety and violence of distinguishing the office of presbyter from that of a deacon by the scope or objects of their official powers." On these passages he remarks: "We cannot understand this passage. What *a priori* convictions have to do with defining church officers, we are unable to see. But how with any convictions, we can define them without considering their object matter passes our comprehension." And no wonder! It passes our *apprehension*. The only objection to the statement is that this deponent did not attempt to perform such a feat. He merely proposed to *start* on his ecclesiastical voyage with a little *subject-matter* on board, very little indeed, only the *smell* of the word, and then *define* it by the object-matter as soon as that precious substance was discovered. The writer is not aware that any metaphysician ever undertook to create even a concept *ex nihilo*. He always starts with *something* as a pure subject, some virgin matter, and "puts the tunic on," when it is convenient or possible to perform that useful work. How an unprejudiced mind, as keen and analytic as our opponent's, could mistake his contestant's *subject-matter* for his *object-matter*, the author of the Report and the articles "may tell, but we cannot."

But the next sentence of the article "out-Herods Herod." Here it is: "But, moreover, the ruler, according to the reviewer, is a deacon, since all church officers are deacons. He is not Christ's servant when he rules, he is his servant only when he cares for the bodies of the poor. This, we say, it tasks our understanding to apprehend." And *we say* that it tasks our charity very severely. We were speaking of *church* officers, of preaching to, ruling, and serving *the church*. We were not speaking of the relation of these persons or acts *to Christ*. We started out with the bare concept of service *as opposed to rule*, nay, only the lowest concept of that concept, "service rendered to the body immediately." To this subject-matter we gave the primary form of a "church officer," and this constituted "the deacon," or *the servant of the church*. So far as the nature of this deacon is included in the higher classes of *church* officers, just so far are they also *servants of the church*. There is no sense in the discussion if one

shifts the *secundum quid*. Are we talking about preaching to or ruling *Christ*? If not, then we are not talking about *servi*ng Christ. It is taking a foul grip in logic to say, "the service of rule," and, "the ruler serves," when in this contest it is confessed that *service and serving are opposed to rule and ruling*. There is indeed a beautiful metonymy in the language, and *the ruler* should reverently look upon his *ruling*, and the preacher upon his authoritative declaration of Christ's will, as a strict *service* done to *Christ*, for he says: "Inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these, *my* brethren, ye did it unto *me*." But nevertheless our opponent has committed the same sin, metaphysically and logically considered, as if he had changed the servants of the church into the servants of the devil; and it is all the worse for the ascertainment of the truth on this question, because the devil of logic is like the great Antichrist, *simia Dei*.

VII.

The articles and the Report are very severe on the writer's position, that the church must be regarded under *two aspects*: that of an ecclesiastical body, and that of a secular body. On this part of our previous essay our adversary roams around, in the highest state of distraction, between conflicting hypotheses and supposititious conclusions from hypothetical premises. He commits the enormous blunders of mistaking two *aspects* of one and the same thing as *species* of a *genus*, of mistaking the *matter of an aspect* for the matter of a genus, or the *substance of the body of which it is an aspect*, and of mistaking the *nature* of an aspect for the *essence* of a species. No wonder that he finds it "a hard endeavor to reach an intelligent construction" of such a theory! But that theory is none of ours, no more than the theory that a ten-foot pole includes a yard-stick. The necessity of regarding the church in these two different aspects is as old and as sensible and as pertinent as the necessity of regarding the distinct orders of the church as constituting species, higher and lower, of church officers. To be sure, an aspect may be made a species of some other more extensive aspect to which it stands related as its genus, but then it ceases to be one of several aspects

of the same body, and disappears from the theory and the argument. The church here is any body of men associated together voluntarily for the worship of God according to the Christian religion. Now, such a congregation is not an *ecclesiastical* body or a *civil* body, but may become either or both. This *capacity* or passive power is the *logical matter*. The body is, or is conceived to be, the *same in numero* under all its aspects. Give to this body the *energy* or active power to perform ecclesiastical actions, and it becomes an ecclesiastical body: give it the energy to perform civil actions, and it becomes a secular body. This *energy* is *logical nature*. By ecclesiastical incorporation, it becomes the former; by civil incorporation, it becomes the latter. The functions, etc., of the one are defined in its form of church government; the functions, etc., of the other are defined in its civil charter.

We feel persuaded that our readers will generally reach, not only without any severe labor, but also with positive comfort to their unsophisticated judgment, "an intelligent construction" of this theory, and a ready acquiescence in all its "good and necessary consequences." We therefore pursue it no further. But we do just here formally enter our "complaint" against our able and honored antagonist. We had a *right*, when making so full and formal and careful a statement as "*different in matter, nature, orders, officers, functions, and ends,*" a statement that is conspicuous for the *absence* of three words *substance, form, and essence*, which generally figure in such affirmations—we had a *right* to suppose that *he*, of all men, would take their exclusion as expressly *intended*, and spare us the pain of *supposing* that we had affirmed a *difference in substance and form and essence*.

VIII.

The author of the articles and the Report, by the same facility of substituting one concept for another, exhibits many other imaginary inconsistencies in our previous essay. He actually puts into our mouth a syllogism, which he says (!) "he meets *passim,*" to *prove* that "the higher order of presbyter must include the lower order of deacon." Now, we did attempt to *prove*

that very thing *by Scripture*, but we have never felt the slightest temptation to try to *prove* it by a syllogism, or by the manufacture of concepts in the laboratory of metaphysics, *or to evolve it out of our dogmatic consciousness*. We did attempt to prove that *he* had not proved any relevant cases of exclusion; and his criticisms and refuges have given us perfect assurance of our success. We *assumed* that our fathers meant something capable of an intelligent construction by their *dictum* concerning inclusion, and then merely translated it into the language of logic. But this imputed syllogism, which is adduced to show that we have violated our own principle, is a conspicuous example of exchanging furtively one concept for another. We had said that the *syllogism*, "in any given case, does not and dares not take notice of the principle of classification, or the natures that are unified." Very true; but does this imply in the least that *natures* may not be classified or unified, and *as classes or units*, appear in formal logic? Verily, *no*. But, furthermore, the syllogism itself is faulty in form, though professing to be exact. The minor premise ought to have read: *Presbyter is a higher order which has the nature of the lower order of deacon*. The taking of *such liberties with formal accuracy* is the very thing that is continually betraying the constructive imagination of our noble brother, and robbing him of all likeness to Saturn, who "devours his own children," and digests them in great comfort.

The same documents change the concept of *preaching* the truth into that of *truth* itself, the concept of *administering* the sacraments into that of a *sacrament*, the concept of *ecclesiastical* nature into that of *nature*. Indeed, we could go on *ad nauseam* if it tended to edification. But surely the reader must be weary. At any rate the writer is *very* weary of untying knots which do not deserve even to be cut. We have written what we have written, *first*, to show that our honored brother had not fairly gotten out of his premises the conclusion which he wanted; and, *secondly*, to show that when he undertook to improve the matter and amend the argument, he was rewarded with no better success. It is our whole aim, in these logical and metaphysical strictures, to rob the Reform movement of the powerful influence of *his*

name and advocacy. We have done the disagreeable work only for the sake of the Church. And now we will say to him, in all candor, that we believe that the very acuteness of his powers of analysis has betrayed him, in the defence of a bad cause, to deal as unjustifiably with the laws of the interpretation of Scripture, as he has with the laws of logic and the laws of thought. This charge we now proceed to make good, giving notice, however, that we will drop the language of logic and metaphysics, so far as possible, and use the language of exegesis—a better tongue to speak, and a sweeter voice to hear.

J. A. LEFEVRE.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE DIACONATE OF SCRIPTURE AGAIN.

I.

In a former article it was shown that the New Testament uses the word *deacon*, *first*, in two secular senses, to wit, (*a*) that of *servant*, in a wide or general signification, and (*b*) in a narrower or special sense, that of *table-servant* or waiter; also, *secondly*, in a religious and ecclesiastical signification, parallel with the secular sense, to wit, (*a*) that of a general ecclesiastical servant, and (*b*) that of a special ecclesiastical servant to the poor saints.

Just here we wish to warn our reader against that abuse of language which transfers this established terminology of exegesis to the sphere of logic, as if the *general* sense of a word was equivalent to logical *genus*, and the *special* sense equivalent to logical *species*. The very opposite is much nearer the truth. In exegesis, the general or wide sense always *includes* the narrower sense; the narrower always excludes a *part* of the general sense. In the English New Testament, not in the original Greek, there is a fine illustration of this use of *servant*. “But which of you, having a *servant* plowing or feeding cattle, will say unto him, by and by, when he is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat?”

and will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and *serve* me, till I have eaten and drunken, and afterward thou shalt eat and drink?" (Luke xvii. 7, 8.) Here we have one who is servant of all work, very properly transferred to the work of a *waiter*. Of course he performed only one service at a time. As examples of the wide ecclesiastical sense of the word, besides other references, we quoted at large: Acts, i. 17, 25; xx. 24; xxi. 19; Rom. xi. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 6; iv. i; v. 18; vi. 3, 4; xi. 23; Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 23, 25; Eph. iv. 12; 1 Tim. i. 12; Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7; Col. i. 7; 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 5; Col. iv. 17. It is confessed by all, and by none more freely than our opponent, that in these passages apostles, evangelists, pastors, preachers of every kind, are called *deacons*, in an official sense; their office a *diaconate*; and their work a *deaconing*. How, then, it may well be asked, can any man deny that the pastorate includes the diaconate? Our opponent answers, that these terms are applied to them in their *wide* or *general* ecclesiastical sense. We reply: *Beyond all doubt*; and that is precisely what we contend for; *but remember*, that it is an *established rule* of interpretation, that the wide sense *includes* the narrow. Our critic excludes the narrow sense from the wide one, and then propounds to us a number of exegetical puzzles to solve on his theory; all of which we give up, simply saying that we hold to *two senses*, a wide and a narrow one; and also that wide deaconing includes narrow deaconing. It is this mistaken interpretation of his that involves him in a battle in which, as he confesses, "the presumption seems to be against" him. He says, also: "The array of Scripture passages which has been marshalled against us is portentous; and one would be apt to think that the least regard for inspired authority should, in view of this mass of evidence, induce in us a speedy abjuration of our errors. But it sometimes happens that one does not know what his assailant sees clearly: that he has been beaten, and ought incontinently to surrender." Now, we do believe and grieve that he is, in this matter, on the wrong side, and we pray and labor to make him see it clearly. If, indeed, this happy result should happen, then, of course, he ought to

surrender, not incontinently, but with dignity and self-respect, as one of the most faithful and able *deacons* of our beloved Church. We therefore call his attention to another established rule of discourse and exegesis, the neglect of which has involved him in no little perplexity. It is this: that when a subject has a dual nature and two names, one may affirm of it, under one name, what is true, logically, only of the other. Thus the Scriptures affirm of the Son of Man what is true only of the Son of God, and of the Son of God, what is true only of the Son of Man. The name loses, as it were, the consciousness of its origin, and vicariously represents the complete subject. This use of language will not do for science, which is always a dead thing; but for discourse, which is a living thing, it is often unavoidable and always beautiful and natural. Our brother gives us many examples; for instance, "The ruler *serves* the church," but all of them out of place. The superficial inconsistency of predicate with subject pointing to the fact that the *name* is taken from only a *part* of the thing named. We stop, not to justify or illustrate this rule, as no denial of its validity is anticipated. We simply apply it as we did the other rule, to the passages in hand. The subject of this discussion is called, say, both preacher and deacon. Why has he these two names? Because the sacred writers, from their stand-point, view him as having two natures. Well, then, preaching may be affirmed of the deacon, and deaconing may be affirmed of the preacher; and this is exactly what is done in that "portentous array of Scripture passages."

On the other hand, there is not a solitary passage in the New Testament where preaching or ruling is predicated of the *deacon* in the narrow ecclesiastical sense of the word, as the lowest class of church officers; thus showing that the sacred writers did *not view him* as having a dual nature. The rule of interpretation here applied we have never heard called in question. It relieves the passages of all obscurity, the mind of all perplexity, and our Presbyterian fathers of all heterodoxy. We would define the deacon just as our catechisms define *every* "*quid*," say, a sacrament, by enumerating its *scriptural* characteristics in logical or-

der, but not in the terminology of logic. We say, then, in the common language of the Presbyterian Church, that the deacon is that officer of the church to whom is committed the official care (*a*) of the poor saints, and (*b*) of other poor persons who are not saints, according to the church's ability. We defy any one to show from *Scripture* that they even were the trustees of the church's property. If any one wishes a more minute description of the diaconal office, and a touching illustration of the spirit and diligence of the true deacon, let him read those two eloquent chapters (2 Cor. viii., ix.) of holy writ, which tell us of the Apostle Paul's "care of the poor saints." What he did there *is deaconing in the narrow sense of the word*; and what he did there he did *in virtue of his status and functions as a deacon*. And if these statements need further confirmation, Paul says, referring to the same facts, the collections in the Macedonian and Achaian churches (Rom. xv. 26), "But now I go to Jerusalem *to deacon unto the saints*, for it hath pleased them of Macedonia to make a certain contribution for *the poor saints* which are at Jerusalem." The apostle here expressly states that it was his purpose *to deacon* to the poor saints. In what did *this deaconing* consist? Not in the simple carrying of the contribution to Jerusalem, for that act is not *essential* to deaconing, says our critic, and so say we. Not in actually collecting or distributing the money, for he did not perform those acts, he continues, and we agree. In what sense then did he "*deacon*" to the poor saints at Jerusalem? His own words are: "We have seen that there are two senses of the word deacon;" "Paul did not deacon in the narrow sense;" "Paul ministered to the poor saints by carrying the money to their elders in Jerusalem, but there is no proof that he deaconed to them by putting it into their hands." To this we reply, *first*, that his substitution of "ministered" for "deaconed" is unfair, unless he means to use it for "deaconed" in the *general* sense in which, according to his own definition, it is "the symbol of a general notion which collects under it all kinds of service, but specifies no particular sort of service." But he does not so use it here, for he specifies the particular service itself. He does not mean that Paul "performed all kinds of service, but no particular kind

of service, by carrying the money to the elders." What he means as the context shows, is, that Paul did not act in these matters as "deacon proper"—the lowest class of church officers; *and he is right*. Paul acted in this and in all official work as *apostle proper*. But the fact that "he deaconed" to the poor saints in any particular, shows that, as *apostle proper*, he was a *general deacon*, like evangelists and those who are "pastors and teachers." Now the notion of a general deacon is indeed that of deacon or servant of all work. But whenever that *general deacon* performs an act, it must be a special service. It may be that of the narrowed sense, or that of some other sense. Our opponent classifies all the special senses of the term as *preaching, ruling, and distributing*. Now we ask, Did Paul *preach* to the poor saints at Jerusalem? Of this there is not a particle of proof, but much to show that he did not preach at all in that city. Did he *rule* the poor saints in Jerusalem? There is no proof of it. Did he *distribute* to them? "There is no proof of it." But these three senses exhaust the term. What, then, on our opponent's theory, did Paul do when he "deaconed" to the *poor* saints in Jerusalem? On our theory he "cared for them" and took charge of their interests as such. He thus deaconed to them tenderly and affectionately in many ways, both in Gentile lands and at Jerusalem. These were the only apostolic functions which he discharged in the holy city. This is the narrow meaning of the word: much wider, however, than distributing or collecting, or both together.

Each complete particular church had its *deacons proper* and the whole Church had its general deacons—its rulers proper—in whom resided official *capacity* and *energy* for the performance of every diaconal act. We now ask our readers to regard, in this additional light, the conclusion of the whole matter on this point, as it was stated in a former essay. "The first appointment of deacons as *officers* of the Church (Acts vi. 1-6) cannot be put later than A. D. 33, and the name must have been bestowed at the same time. The date of Paul's earliest epistles, those to the Thessalonians, was about A. D. 54; that of his latest epistle, Second Timothy, about A. D. 66, *thirty-three years*, at least, after the institution of the diaconal office. Is it pos-

sible, if Paul had this new theory of the office of deacon, that for these twelve years, at so great a distance from the origin of deacons, when their office and work were so well and universally known, that he could or would have regularly and officially spoken of himself, his fellow apostles, evangelists, pastors, preachers of every kind, as *deacons*; their status or office as a *diaconate*, and their work as a *deaconing*? It is plainly impossible. No one of the brethren who have invented the new doctrine, would for a moment, be guilty of speaking either of himself or his fellow-ministers in such misleading phrases.

II.

The eminent brother whom we are opposing frequently represents diaconal functions as "incompatible" with and "improper" to the presbyterate. Assuming that it has been shown in the former essay and confirmed in the former part of this auxiliary paper, that, according to the Scriptures, the higher office does involve the nature of the lower, we might also assume that there cannot be any real inconsistency between the *facts* of Scripture, but that those *facts* stand together in the greatest harmony. But we are not left to this last refuge—"good and necessary inference." If there is no incompatibility between the scriptural *qualifications* for the two offices, then the inference is proved to be good and necessary. This we now proceed to do, italicising those which are peculiar to either list, and leaving out of the list of the bishop's, the two that are his peculiar characteristics, to wit, aptness to teach and ability to rule. (See 2 Tim. iii. 2-12, and Titus ii. 5-9.)

"A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, *vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality*, not given to wine, *no striker*, not greedy of filthy lucre, but *patient, not a brawler, not covetous*, one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection *with all gravity*, not a novice, *having a good report of them that are without, not self-willed, not soon angry, a lover of good men, just, holy, temperate*, holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught."

"The deacons must be *grave, not double tongued*, not given to

much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre, holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience; let these also *first be proved*, being found blameless; let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their houses well." If we compare these formal and complete lists we find only *three* items peculiar to that of the deacon proper, to wit, "grave," "not double tongued," and "first proven." Of these the first, (grave,) differs only in the manner of its appearance, *i. e.*, out of special connexion, from its presence in the list of the bishop's, *i. e.* in a special connexion under the form "with all gravity." The Greek words are like the English, cognates. Also the qualification, "not a novice," in the first list is manifestly of equal signification with "first proven" or *tested*, in the second. In this argument it is manifestly just to remove the italics and disregard the formal difference. There remains then, as peculiar to the deacon's list only one quality, "not double tongued," *διδωλος*, which means, as its composition suggests, *the conscious* saying of one thing and meaning another—want of consistency between the thought of the heart and the words of the mouth—which is the essence of a *lie*. It is equivalent to "no liar" or rather "no equivocator." True, there is no word or phrase in the first list with which we may parallel this word, but no man will deny that it is involved in more than one of the sixteen terms that are peculiar to the bishop's list—and the last italics vanish. Now here again we have a very pertinent case of *inclusion*. If the presbyter has a *general* diaconship, and all the peculiar characteristics of the diaconship proper—the whole capacity and all the peculiar qualities—what can or should hinder him from *generally* performing the special duties of the deacon? Evidently nothing. Where now is the bishop's want of compatibility or propriety or qualification in reference to diaconal acts of any and every kind?

III.

But do not the twelve apostles at the first election of deacons in the church, (Acts vi. 2,) plainly say "that *we* should serve tables is not reason," or right, or *pleasing* to God and us? Such, indeed, is the *misinterpretation* which our opponent gives of the

passage, and then claims for himself agreement with the apostles, and charges us with making them do that very unreasonable thing. But this claim and this charge are founded in the violation of an *established rule* of interpretation, and only give point to a sarcasm. It confounds the *grammatical* subject with the subject of *discourse*, which is *not* the unmodified "we," but "we" *under the condition which makes it unreasonable or wrong* "to serve tables." We ask our brother to shut up his *grammatical primer* and take up his "higher" grammar and parse the sentence *logically*. We give a translation which reproduces the construction of the original sentence, though making rather rough English. "That we leaving the word of God should serve tables is not reason," is the exact construction of the Greek—"not reason" occupying the emphatic position, which can only be reproduced by saying: "It is not reason that we, leaving the word of God, should serve tables." *Who* are they that cannot reasonably be asked to serve tables? Is it the apostles *as such*? By no means; they are "*the apostles having left the word of God.*" Now, what it is unreasonable and wrong for the apostles to do as thus modified, or limited, or, as it would be most natural to say, *under these circumstances*, it might be very reasonable for them to do *generally*. This is common sense and common discourse. It is generally right and reasonable for a redeemed man to keep his right hand or right eye; and yet, under certain circumstances, it is his duty to himself and to God to cut it off or pluck it out. It is generally proper for a man to attend to his animal wants, but it is *unreasonable* to do so at the cost of his soul. Everywhere, in Scripture and out of it, we meet with applications of the *dictum* that the higher may not be sacrificed to the lower. So we find it here. The true and *good* sense of the passage was properly expressed when, in the former essay, it was said that "the apostles declared to the church that it was not right for them to deacon tables *at the cost* of neglecting the word of God." We did not suppose that the exigencies of argument could betray our brother into the painful mistake of taking the grammatical subject for the logical. He might as well deny that Paul (Acts ix. 18) was baptized *standing up*, or that the Sad-

duces declared (Matt. xxii. 25) that each one of the unfortunate seven brothers died *married* and *childless*. Indeed, we have compiled a most portentous array of Scripture passages illustrating the sense of this construction. But we will be merciful, only referring to one more, (Rom. xv. 25,) where Paul says: "I go to Jerusalem," not *to* deacon, but "deaconing to the saints." The modification which the participial clause makes of the subject is always *all-pervading*, making it a particular aspect of the unmodified subject. In a few cases, as the first one quoted, it is perhaps chiefly graphic; but, in most cases, it constitutes the emphasis and point of the whole statement, as in the other two. The *point* of the statement of the Sadducees is, not that the first and the other six in succession *died*, but that he and they *died married and childless*. The *point* of the other passage is that Paul's journey to Jerusalem *was his deaconing* to the saints there, or rather that he made the journey simultaneously deaconing.

There is not a shadow of proof that the bare act of taking up a collection was ever performed by *any* deacon, or even that there ever was a collection "*taken up*" in the modern sense of the word. There is proof that the making of the collection was most probably by each contributor's bringing his own contribution and personally depositing it at the feet of the apostles, or of the presiding bishop. And again, there is no proof that *any* deacon ever performed the bare act of distribution; and there is a probability that the most of the poor came personally for their part of the relief to those who were the custodians of the fund, and that the more infirm beneficiaries were gathered together in "homes," and the supplies sent to them by the ordinary means of conveyance. And furthermore, there is *no proof* that the deacon proper was ever a treasurer or custodian of the funds, whilst there is direct proof that the general deacon did fill that office; for, what else can be meant by the solemn, formal, public act of laying the money at the apostles' feet?

Now look back at "the classic passage" and the previous history. Here is a church of many thousands of members, committing the amiable mistake of having a community of goods,

thus putting all in a condition of dependence on the common fund and creating extraordinary circumstances. "*The Twelve*" could have continued to attend to the daily deaconing, without leaving or slighting the more important functions of their ministry, but for this unauthorised increase of their labors; but now they cannot. What then? First, neglect of the widows of the Hellenists, who certainly were the least known, and probably the majority, of the large community. Then, wide-spread dissatisfaction and complaint throughout all the Hellenistic portion of the community, threatening the peace and unity of the mother Church. The apostles had done all they could, without sacrificing their highest and most sacred obligations, to meet the emergency, *and had failed*. They called an assembly of the whole multitude of the disciples. They defend themselves against the injurious complaints, and propose a remedy. That this is a fair statement of the spirit of the passage, is proven by the speech of the apostles. If *they* had not "deaconed tables" before, and the complaint had not been chiefly aimed at *them*, why did they say, "It is not reason for *us* to deacon tables at *such a cost*?" Why did they not rather "turn the tables," and say: "It is not reason for *you* to expect us to do, or complain of us for not doing, what is incompatible with our office and qualifications, and what we have never done before"?

If it was not a peculiar emergency, requiring the sacrifice of one thing to another, why did they give emphasis to the required sacrifice, and why did they call this deaconing of tables, in the words of Dr. J. A. Alexander, "their need or necessity, or necessary business, implying a present and particular emergency"? It is generally considered that the right key of a complicated lock is the one that fits into all its wards and throws back its bolt, with out the least forcing. The prevailing interpretation which we defend, without lugging in supposed facts that are not even hinted at in the narrative, and rejecting no word that is contained in it, explains it naturally, grammatically, logically, and psychologically too.

J. A. LEFEVRE.

ARTICLE IX.

WHY WAS JESUS BAPTIZED ?

This is a question of much interest, and has been studied by the writer long and carefully. Modifying some former views, but reasserting others, he now proposes to demonstrate the truth by the teachings of God's word. As only four views are known, the discussion will be confined to these.

It is held that Jesus was baptized—

- I. As an example to us in the sacrament of baptism.
- II. As an act of obedience to the divine will instituting the sacrament.
- III. As a conformity to the law for redeeming the first-born Son in Israelitish families.
- IV. As preparatory to being anointed for the active duties of that Priesthood to which God had appointed him.

The latter is presented as a proposition here to be established. But the four views above mentioned will be examined in their order, as stated. Therefore we ask—

I. Was Jesus baptized as an example to us? Immersionists declare that he was, and that such is the teaching of God's word. But as there is no text of the Bible containing this teaching, it is reached by *inference*. The error is exposed by examining—

1. The *time* of the baptism of Jesus, as related to that of others baptized by John the Baptist.

Every reader of the Bible must admit that multitudes were baptized before Jesus came to John. Luke (iii. 21) places his baptism after, or "when all the people were baptized." Matthew (iii.) and Mark (i.) both record the baptism of "Jerusalem and all Judæa and all the region round about Jordan," before the coming of Jesus to his baptism. Can this be called *example*? He who sets an example is the first actor in the case. Then those for whom he sets an example follow it. But here, Jesus followed the people. So if there was an example at all, it was given by the people to Jesus. Thus the inference fails in the first point.

Note next—

2. The *circumstances* of his baptism. Jesus was not baptized

until he "began to be about thirty years of age." Luke iii. 23. Was this example? If so, his followers are to wait until that age also. But all admit that believers should not defer baptism until they are "thirty years of age." Yet if we are to follow the example of Jesus in baptism, we must conform in age, as in other points. Why not? The Scriptures are as clear on one point as the other in this special matter. Here we may note there is just as much authority for following the example of Jesus in being tempted forty days, in fasting forty days, in working miracles, in being crucified between two thieves, and in many other things in which no one thinks of following him. The Bible demands and warrants all this as much, and as clearly, as that we follow his example in baptism. But there is no demand nor warrant of such kind. And where is the right to select one act, and only a part of that, leaving other acts unfollowed when the Bible calls to one as much as to all—to all as much as to one? In vain do we search for hint or teaching that Christ's people are to follow his example in baptism. The *inference* is not from the Bible. If not scriptural: it is human; therefore not a law for faith and manners.

3. Consider the nature of John's baptism: it was but a formal, ceremonial rite. Here note—

a. When an adult is baptized, all agree that he is received into the membership of Christ's visible church upon profession of his faith in Christ. Then if John administered Christian baptism, the church should have been very large in his day; but it was very small. "Jerusalem and all Judæa, and the region round about Jordan," received John's baptism, but rejected Jesus Christ; he had but few believing followers.

b. All agree that Christian baptism is to be but once administered. Yet (Acts xix., 1-7) Paul re-baptized twelve men who had been baptized by John. Further—

c. Christian baptism is (by divine command) administered in the name of the three persons of the Godhead. But John did not baptize in the name of the Holy Ghost. These twelve converts of his had never heard of the Holy Ghost. Acts xix. 2. Evidently they had not received Christian baptism, though baptized by John.

d. A dispute about John's baptism was a dispute about purification rites. Jno. iii. 25. It was of the nature of the purifyings of the Old Testament in preparing the people for a special manifestation of God. So Moses "sanctified" the people for God's visit at Mt. Sinai.

e. There is no record of Christian baptism until after the resurrection of Jesus. Matt. xxviii. So then, as it was not instituted until that time, John could not administer and Jesus could not receive it. These and other kindred considerations refute the first theory. It is strange to the word of God; therefore an error.

We ask—

II. Was Jesus baptized as an act of obedience to the divine will, instituting the sacrament?

This theory is too indefinite to be discussed. It belongs to one or to all of the other three: What its advocates mean by it, we are unable to discover. It is treated either in what has been said, or in what follows. If it is intended to put Jesus on the same footing with others baptized by John, note:

1. John's baptism is invariably described as the "baptism of (or into) repentance." Could Jesus so receive it?

2. Those whom John baptized, "were baptized of him in Jordan confessing their sins." On receiving it, or as a duty accompanying its reception, they were commanded to "bring forth fruits meet for repentance." Could Jesus so receive it?

3. It was to "prepare the way of the Lord;" and the great demand was, "Repent ye." Could Christ so receive it? Would God command his *sinless one* to receive this baptism? Could Jesus repent? Could he "bring forth fruits meet for repentance?" Such questions cannot be tolerated for a moment! We may regard the baptism of Jesus as a part of his obedience, truly—but to what? That is the question. We deny that it was an obedience to the divine will instituting the sacrament, as is clearly seen from the foregoing remarks.

We now—

III. Take up the question: Was he baptized in conformity to the law for redeeming the first-born in Israel? This theory has

novelty, and some beauty to commend it. But the new and beautiful are not always the true.

This theory we reject on the following grounds:

The law for redeeming the first-born is found in Ex. xiii. 2, 11-13, which see. But in Numbers iii. 11-51 we find:

1. God afterwards took the Levites as substitutes for all the first-born. In numbering the people, the Levites had not been numbered. Therefore this could be done. See Numb. i. 47-50, ii. 33.

2. When the Levites were numbered by divine command, it was for the purpose of substituting them for the first-born.

3. From a month old and upwards there were twenty-two thousand Levites, but there were twenty-two thousand two hundred and seventy-three of the first-born. The cattle of the Levites were also taken instead of the cattle of the people generally. God said: "Take the Levites instead of the first-born of the children of Israel, and the cattle of the Levites instead of their cattle, and the Levites shall be mine." Now here is express proof that the law of Ex. xiii. was changed. God no more required the first-born to be redeemed by that law. But there were *two hundred and seventy-three more of the first-born* than of Levites. Numbers iii. 46-51 tells what was to be done about this. They were redeemed at five shekels each. And God said to Moses: "Thou shalt give the money wherewith the odd number of them is to be redeemed, unto Aaron and his sons." Moses did so. Numbers iii. 51. Thus the twenty-two thousand Levites were taken in the stead of an equal number of the first-born. (So God provided a special class to serve in religious offices.) Then the twenty-two thousand first-born, so substituted by Levites, *were freed* from the law of Ex. xiii. Thus further, the excess (two hundred and seventy-three) of the first-born, being *actually redeemed* at five shekels each, *all the first-born of Israel were made free*. From this event, the new law (Numb. i. to iii.) went into full operation and force, all things being equalised. And now:

4. The Levites alone are to do service and fill offices in "the tabernacle of the congregation," in subjection to Aaron and his sons. Numb. iii. 9, 8-19. To each family special service was

allotted, and they acted in two classes. The higher duties of the priesthood were taken at about thirty years of age, and held until fifty years of age. The lower duties were assumed at twenty-five years of age, and held to fifty years of age. This is yet more plainly stated in Numb. viii. 5-26. No language could state anything more clearly.

5. Aaron and his sons held the priesthood *proper*. Other Levites were assigned to serving work.

6. No Israelite who was not a Levite was to come nigh the tabernacle of the congregation upon pain of death. Numb. xviii. 22.

7. By the law, as first given (Ex. xiii.), the first-born of man and of beast were not required to be held for, nor redeemed from tabernacle service, as the advocates of this theory suppose; but were all to be *redeemed or killed*. The redeeming price (five shekels) afterwards required, when the Levites were substituted for the first-born, was not to save from *tabernacle service*, but from being *sacrificed—killed!* There is no evidence that, by law, the first-born were ever required for tabernacle service. They were claimed by God as a *memorial* that he slew the first-born of Egypt, when he saved Israel from bondage. Therefore the first-born of Israel were specially God's, and were to be redeemed to *save them from being sacrificed to God*. This precise instruction, the children of Israel were directed to give to their sons. Ex. xiii. 15: "When Pharaoh would hardly let us go * * the Lord slew all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both the first-born of man, and the first-born of beasts; therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all that openeth the matrix, being males; but all the first-born of my children, I redeem." Thus the God who forbade murder, guarded against it by the law of redeeming. This redeeming was to be, at first, not with money, but with sacrifices. The first-born, as such, were never demanded for nor put to tabernacle service. But as the first-born of beasts were redeemed to save from death, so with the first-born of man. This is exactly according to the law as written in the word of God. Look and see!

Let it be remembered, that the law of sacrifice (Ex. xiii.) was changed so as to make the Levites (who had never been numbered with Israel, Numb. i. 47) the *redemption* of the first-born, instead

of *sacrificing* them. Numb. iii. 5-13. The first mention of *redeeming the first-born at five shekels*, is in Numb. iii. 46-47, when the excess (273) of first-born over Levites was to be equalised, so as to put the new law in force. The money (1365 shekels) Moses was to collect and give to Aaron. Thus the law of Ex. xiii. was modified forever.

8. Years after this, the people having journeyed away from Sinai towards Canaan, God arranged for the support of the Levites and his service generally. Numb. xviii. To Aaron and family, his sons and their families, and all Levites, he gave the first-fruits of everything, whether produce of land, men, or beasts. He now says, not, "they are mine," as formerly; but tells the priest, "they are thine." Here we find a new law for redeeming the first-born—a law *which applies to men and unclean beasts alike*. "Those that are to be redeemed, from a month old, shalt thou redeem" at five shekels per head. *The first-born of man and of unclean beasts were to be redeemed, and at the same price each*. Numb. xviii. 15-16. Now, a question:

Were these *unclean beasts* to enter upon the service of the tabernacle, at thirty years, or any other age, if not redeemed? Certainly not. Then this redeeming was not to save from such service, as the advocates of this theory contend it was. The same law, with the same reasons, applied to men as to these unclean beasts. Therefore this redeeming was *not to save the men* from tabernacle service either. It was all for the support of the Levites, who were not allowed to have any inheritance in the land. The redemption-money, with all the first-fruits, went for this. And to show that the position taken here as to the purpose of redeeming is correct, note:

9. That even if *a man were not redeemed, he could not come nigh the tabernacle, if not a Levite!* The law forbade him upon pain of death! And *this law* was not changed nor repealed for any Israelite, as a first-born.

Let us now see how all this applies to the idea that Jesus was baptized as an unredeemed first-born, and was thus dedicated to the tabernacle service; or baptized as one who must enter such service, because he was not redeemed. This is the idea of those who hold this third theory. Note:

a. The law for tabernacle service forbade Jesus to approach the tabernacle, upon the same grounds as in the case of others, viz. : *He was not a Levite*. Only a Levite could be consecrated. No first-born could be, if not a Levite. The law claimed the Levite only—not the first-born.

b. The Levites, not the first-born, were to have the "washing," for consecration to the tabernacle service. There was no law for "washing" the first-born, at any age, for this service, whether redeemed or not. Numb. iii., viii. So as merely a "first-born," Jesus was forbidden.

c. We find no scriptural warrant for the assertion of the "first-born theory" that the parents of Jesus were too poor to redeem him, and therefore he had to be "washed" as "devoted" to God.

Whether or not Mary paid the five shekels required by law, (Numb. xviii.,) we are not told in express words. She presented her first-born "to the Lord" (Luke ii. 22) as the law required. We conclude that the officiating priest *performed his duty*. He was positively commanded (Numb. xviii. 15) "the first-born of man thou shalt surely redeem." No liberty was allowed him. "Thou shalt *surely* do it," was his law of action. Now then who shall say that Jesus was not redeemed? There is every proof, except in *express words*, that he was. For note :

(1.) His parents had him *circumcised* at the proper time, according to law. Luke ii. 21.

(2.) They came, when the days of the mother's purification were accomplished, according to the law of Moses, to Jerusalem to "present him to the Lord." Luke iii. 22. And was not this in order that the priest might *redeem* him in obedience to the law? Numb. xviii. 15.

(3.) His parents offered sacrifices for the mother's legal purification. Luke iii. 24.

(4.) Finally, Luke ii. 39, says that *they did perform* "all things according to the law of the Lord;" and then returned home. This is conclusive. If it is not satisfactory proof that, as a first-born, Jesus was redeemed, words can prove nothing. Now it follows, that, as he was not an unredeemed first-born, his baptism could have no significance in this direction, even had he not been excluded from tabernacle services by law.

d. But it is intimated that the law requiring a lamb for burnt-offering after the birth of a son, was connected with the law for redeeming the first-born, in this—that the bringing of two turtle doves, or two young pigeons (the legal substitute for a lamb in case of poverty) being a sign that Mary was too poor to bring a lamb, was also proof that she was too poor to redeem her son. The law is in Lev. xii. *It does not refer to a first-born;* but if a child was born—son or daughter—the lamb or its substitute was to be offered. If poverty forbade the lamb, then two turtle doves, or two young pigeons must be brought—one for a burnt-offering, the other for a sin-offering. But why? Not for the child, but *as an offering for the mother's purification!* This is, strictly, the law language. “And the priest shall make an atonement”—not for the child—but, “for her, and she shall be clean.” This then, was Mary's offering, and its purpose. It had no relation to redeeming the first-born. The redeeming under the new law was for the support of God's priesthood and service. Mary, as shown, had her son redeemed at the “five shekels,” and the priest applied this money as commanded. But no priest anywhere or at any time could touch Jesus as an unredeemed first-born, to consecrate him to anything. As a first-born in Israel, he, like others, had his substitute in the Levites. For the law arranging this as to the first-born, was never changed. For such reasons the theory that he was baptized as an unredeemed first-born, is rejected.

IV. We now turn to the proposition that Jesus was baptized as a preparation for being anointed to active duties of his priestly office. He certainly was never a disciple of John Baptist, as the first theory discussed would make him, in regarding him as baptized as others were who came to John. He was not baptized as a matter of expediency, for expediency is not obedience to law. But we note :

1. Jesus was obeying law in his baptism. John did not consider himself warranted nor worthy to baptize him with the same baptism administered to others. “John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee; and comest thou to me?” And not until the command, “Suffer it to be so now,” was given, with the reason,

“for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,” did John yield. Who were the “us” here? John and Jesus—none others. Now it is accepted by all, that this phrase, “thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,” means, *thus it is right and proper, or needful, to conform to what is required by law*. Jesus said, Matt. v. 17, “Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.”

In being baptized he deemed it necessary to conform to some law touching this act; some law demanding his baptism. “It becometh us;” that is, “it is needful for us to do this.” It was no act of mere *decorum*, but something *necessary* under the circumstances—legally necessary. In Heb. vii. 26, the same word is used, “Such an High Priest became us.” The baptism was a legal necessity. Then what was the law making it so? Certain remarkable circumstances point to the law touching priestly consecration. We search in vain for any other, answering to the case. In order that this may be seen, note:

2. The law of that priesthood in which the types and symbols of the priesthood of Jesus were found. Then compare the circumstances found in the baptism of Jesus, and what preceded and followed.

a. In Ex. xxviii, Aaron and his sons of the tribe of Levi are chosen to be God’s priesthood; and the succession passes from father to son throughout their generations. See Ex. xxix., 1 Chron. vi. 48–49, etc.

b. The priest, entering upon his official duties, was consecrated with holy anointing oil. But *preparatory* to this anointing, he must be clothed in splendid garments, and “washed with water” at the door of the tabernacle in the presence of all the people. These latter ceremonies were not the consecration, but preparatory to it. The anointing, which was the consecration to office, followed. See Ex. xxix., xl., etc. Thus the priest was “hallowed” or “sanctified” to minister in his office.

c. The Levites entered and held office (as already shown) from twenty-five to fifty years of age. But the priesthood *proper* was held by Aaron and sons exclusively, from thirty to fifty years of age. Such was the Levitical law. Now note:

3. The points in which Jesus answers to this.

a. That he was a priest, need not be argued. The word of God leaves no room for doubt. As "the man Christ Jesus," he is our High Priest.

b. In this, human nature and at just the legal priestly age, he came to be baptized. Luke iii. There is significance in Luke's expression: "*Jesus himself*" (iii. 23). The priest was set apart to active duty at about thirty years of age. "And *Jesus himself* began to be about thirty years of age," when he came to John for baptism.

c. Immediately after the baptism,* he was *anointed*. The Scriptures declare that, as soon as he was baptized, the Holy Ghost descended upon him, and God accepted him. He was "anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power." Acts iv. 27, x. 38. The anointing oil of the Old Testament was the "shadow;" here was the "substance." And it is evident that until this occurrence Jesus performed no priestly work. We have no hint of his before acting in official character at all, anywhere.

d. He was appropriately *clothed*, also. Isa. xlix. 10, "For he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation; he hath adorned me with the robes of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with jewels."

It is noteworthy that this chapter begins with the words: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he hath anointed me," etc."

It was *prophetic* of Matt. iii. 15, which records the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus after his baptism. We know also that Jesus applied Isaiah's prophecy to his work on earth, and declared it therein fulfilled. See Luke iv.

So this same prophet, afterwards looking upon Jesus coming to his work, exclaimed: "Who is this that is glorious in his apparel!" Thus the splendid furnishing of Aaron was but symbolical of the better furnishing of the better Priest. Thus in every point Jesus answered to his types.

e. The *appointment* of Jesus to the priesthood, was as definite as was Aaron's, and as truly in subjection to the divine will. In Heb. v. 4-5, we read: "No man taketh this honor unto himself,

but he (taketh it) that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a High Priest; but he (that is, God, thus glorified him) that said unto him: Thou art my son; to-day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place: Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." Now here we see the inspired teaching that Jesus did not assume the priesthood of his own motion; that he did not glorify himself, but that God glorified him by appointing him; and, finally, that God chose this divine Priest from *another order* of priesthood. Again we read, Heb. iii. 2: "Who was faithful to him that appointed him (to the priesthood), as Moses also was faithful in all his house;" in the duties to which he (Moses) was appointed. With such teachings as these, the appointment is undeniable. Ps. cx., Heb. vii. 16, 17, 21, 28. Jesus was as really appointed of God, as were Moses and Aaron.

f. The *time* of this appointment is also positively fixed by the word of God. In Heb. vii. 28, we read: "The law maketh men (referring to the Levites) priests, which have infirmity, but the word of the oath which was since the law maketh the son (a priest) who is consecrated forevermore." Here we are told that "the word of the oath" which made Jesus a priest, was "*since the law*" which made the Levites priests; and that this new Priest is never to be succeeded by others, being "consecrated forevermore."

Now what are the facts of history? The Levitical law was given at Mt. Sinai nearly 1500 years before Jesus came in the flesh. The "word of the oath" is declared by the Psalmist (Ps. ii. and cx.) B. C. 1030 or 1015. Let us say 1030 years before Christ was born. It is thus seen that his *formal appointment* to the priestly office occurred (humanly speaking) about 470 years *after the law appointment* for the Levitical order—the difference between 1500 and 1030 being 470. It was God's act done after the giving of the law. So the Scriptures show. Therefore it is proven. But by this, we do not understand that God had any new thought or plan. What he does is always of his eternal counsels. But *until he makes the revelation*, we can say and know nothing; we cannot run ahead of his revelation, nor go back of it. Therefore we cannot go beyond his declaration to find the appoint-

ment of Jesus to the priesthood. In God's eternal counsels, he was *to be* Priest. But for us, he *is* Priest only after God's formal revelation of the appointment. Ps. ii. and cx.

Therefore it is right to say, God appointed Him to be Priest; and here the *date* is fixed. The expression is scriptural and prophetic. Thus, about 500 years before Christ, Zechariah (vi. 13) made prophecy: "*He shall be Priest upon his throne.*"

g. So too the anointing of Jesus is a matter of prophecy and revelation.

Among the things to be done on earth after the lapse of a certain time was this—"to anoint the most holy." Dan. ix. 24-26. The atoning death of Jesus is also declared in this connection. Now the facts of history correspond to this. For in "the fulness of time" Jesus was anointed, and afterwards put to death. He was both priest and sacrifice, which no other priest could be. Thus, as Aaron (the type of Christ) was appointed before he was anointed, and anointed before he ministered in his priestly office, so was it with our great High Priest, Jesus Christ. Note:

He did no active priestly work until his incarnation; nor then, until he attained to priestly age; nor then, until he was baptized; nor then, until after God had anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power! In all these things he responded fully to the demands of law upon priests, and, as it "became him," fulfilled all righteousness! Not one point of importance is missing. We notice further, that God's declaration, quoted in Heb. v. 5-6, "Thou art my son, to-day have I begotten thee," stands in immediate relation to the words, "Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." The two sayings belong one to another.

Again, God's declaration (Matt. iii. 17): "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased," stands in immediate relation to God's act of anointing Jesus after his baptism. The first of these sayings is God's *recognition of his chosen Priest*. The second is God's *recognition of his anointed Priest*. He first appointed him; then accepted him; then covenanted to abide by all that his Priest would do in the work to which he had just anointed him.

Thus we see that the practical working of Christ's appointment

did not begin until after he had taken his position on earth as a man of priestly age. What he did during the preceding part of this earthly life, we do not entirely know. Mark vi. 3. But until the priestly age of thirty years, he evidently did no priestly work. And in all this is great significance. It is also remarkable that Matthew is the only writer who was particular to record the words, "Thus it cometh us to fulfil all righteousness." He wrote for the Jews specially, (though himself a native Galilean,) and seems to have been conscious that these Jews would be quick to take exception to any neglected law-points. Therefore, guided by the Holy Spirit, he was careful to show that this in-coming priest acted in strict conformity to law. The significance of this record, therefore, is, that Jesus was lawfully inducted into office. The advocates of the theory of "baptism as an unredeemed first-born," say, "Jesus Christ was really and truly man, as well as really and truly God. As man, he was a Jew, 'made of a woman, made under the law,' and was therefore bound, and as much subject to law as any other man under law. He was bound to do and perform whatever the law required of him, just as any other man similarly situated. * * * * Then as his baptism was to fulfil all righteousness, or in other words to comply with the law which required it, the question to be settled is, what law required it, and was fulfilled by his baptism?" We think this question fully answered in this article. In our search we are able to find conformity to only one law requiring the application of water to Jesus; viz., *the law for priestly consecration*. And we have seen that the anointing of Jesus which followed the use of water, was not only prophesied to occur on earth, but that it did so occur at the priestly age at Jordan after his baptism. His whole conduct up to the age of thirty years, was certainly that of a priest awaiting this legal age, at which time he could receive his consecration to active duty in conformity to law.

Let us now look upon this Priest:

1. He was really and truly *man*. 1 Tim. ii. 52: "The man, Christ Jesus." Heb. viii. 3: "It is of necessity that this man have somewhat to offer." This human nature was necessary to the work, for without it Jesus could not execute the duties of his

office; could not offer the required sacrifice—*himself!* Therefore the nature of this Priest is carefully set forth in the Scriptures. The divine nature gave merit to all that the human nature did. The work of the God-man was perfect.

There was also *purpose* in his becoming man. "Wherefore in all things it became him to be made like unto his brethren" (the seed of Abraham) "that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Heb. ii. 16, 17. This teaches that, as God only, he could not execute the functions of his priestly office. If not also *man*, he could not be such a High Priest as was needful. "Since the law" he was appointed, the Scriptures say. His work, then, belonged to time and earth, in making the "reconciliation for the sins of the people." During time and upon earth, "being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Heb. v. 9. Next—

2. Notice the *order* of his priesthood. (a) It was not Levitical, but, "Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." Heb. v. 6. Melchisedec was both priest and king. Heb. vii. 1, 2. The Levitical law forbade this. 2 Chron. xxvi. shows that Uzziah, a king, was punished for intruding upon priestly duties. But God appointed the Prophet-King, Christ Jesus, a Priest-King also. The control of the law was in the hands of God, to make, to change, or to repeal it. In the case of Melchisedec and of Jesus, the immediate choosing and constituting of the priests was of God. Heb. vii. 3. The likeness was, (1) neither had predecessors nor successors in office; (2) nor is the termination of their priesthood recorded; and (3) both were priests by extraordinary appointment. So far as history speaks, Melchisedec "abideth a priest continually," "having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God." And the Priest, Jesus, "because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." Heb. vii. explains this fully. Also, (b) this Priest, Jesus, was superior to every other. The Epistle to the Hebrews is full of this doctrine. His consecration and work, his person and anointing, were all infinitely superior, as was also his tenure of office. Forever, he is the perfection of all that was foreshadowed

in the types and symbols before his incarnation ; as much greater than all preceding him as the Holy Spirit (with which he was anointed, and in the power of which he did all his works) was greater than the anointing oil used upon Aaron and his successors. The "first tabernacle," before which Aaron stood to be anointed with that oil, was but "a figure for the time then present" of the "greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands," before which Jesus stood to be anointed with the Holy Spirit. There God accepted and anointed his chosen Priest. See Heb. ix. for full explanations. Finally—

3. We note difficulties in this theory. *a.* The law forbade any but a Levite to be a priest; therefore forbade Jesus, who "sprang out of Judah." But Heb. vii. shows that when God changed the order of the priesthood, he also changed this law. See verse 12. "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change of the law also." This seventh chapter of Hebrews is a complete answer to this objection. It is an *inspired commentary* upon Christ's appointment to the priesthood. Ps. ii. and cx. In verse 15 the apostle teaches that "it is yet far more evident" that the law confining the priesthood to Levi was changed, because another priest after the similitude of Melchisedec ariseth, "who is made (priest) not after the law of a carnal commandment, (as the Levites were,) but after the power of an endless life." And (verse 18) to provide for this, "there is verily a disannulling of the commandment (or law) going before," etc.¹

b. It is objected that the idea of an earthly consecration lowers Jesus to the level of human priests. But this objection smites at God! He made Jesus of a woman; made him under the law; guided him from Bethlehem to Jordan, and there consecrated him by anointing him with the Holy Spirit. God did it all, and Jesus agreed to it.

Further, if in his estate of humiliation it was not beneath him

¹ Here it is seen that though God did never change the law so as to demand or admit the "first-born," as such, to tabernacle service; yet he did change the law which forbade any but a Levite to be priest. The priestly prerogative is here declared to be taken from Levi, and given to Jesus Christ of the tribe of Judah forever. The change is not as to be first-born, but as to the *tribe of the priest*.

to be circumcised; to be presented for redeeming before the Lord, as other Israelites were; or to conform in all things to the law of the Lord, as other men did; neither was it beneath his dignity to be lawfully consecrated as priest on earth, where he was to begin his work. And whether it be more a lowering of Jesus to say that he was baptized as a preparation for God's anointing than to say that he was baptized as an unredeemed first-born, let the reader decide. If he took the *very nature* of priests, subject to law, why call it a low thought, that in this nature he conformed to the law under which he "was made"? The objectors themselves say: "As a man he was a Jew, made of a woman, made under the law, and was, therefore, as much subject to law as any other man made under law." This is true. But if it does not lower Jesus in the light of other theories, neither does it lower him in this. The objection is destroyed by its makers.

c. But Jesus is said to have been "*baptized*," while the law called for a "*washing*" of the priest. A distinction without a difference, this is. In Heb. ix. 10, the word "washings" is given (in the English) for the use of water under the old dispensation. But these "washings" were really "baptisms," for the Greek says "*baptismois*." Thus of the ceremonial rites in Mark vii. 4, where the English says "wash," but the Greek says "baptize;" so the law was honored, for the priest was "baptized," though "washed." It is objected—

d. That John had no right to consecrate Jesus. We do not say that John did so. He "prepared the way of the Lord." As a legal priest he administered the washing preparatory to God's anointing his priest; *this latter was the real consecration*. That John had the right to administer the washing, is clear. For—

1. He was a legal priest by regular descent. Luke i. 5-25, 57-66.

2. He did not act until Jesus, his Lord, commanded him to do so, and gave a reason for his command. Christ's "suffer it to be so now," settles all doubts.

3. If it was proper for a Levitical priest to minister in the ceremony of redeeming Jesus as a first-born, or in his circumcision, or in the "all things" in which the law for him was fulfilled, it was surely proper that this greatest of Levitical priests should of-

ficiate in what he was sent to do, viz., "to prepare the way of the Lord," especially when *commanded* to act by this Lord. It was the grandest act ever performed by a Levitical priest, performed by its greastest priest. When John went as far as he might in introducing to active duty that priest of the order which was to supplant his own forever, his recognition of this duty was, "he must increase, but I must decrease."

e. Only one more difficulty will be noticed, viz.: It is said, "if Jesus was not consecrated to active duty of office except on earth, and at Jordan, the Old Testament saints had no priest in him;" But—

(1.) By faith looking forward, those saints partook of the benefits of Christ's priesthood as truly as the New Testament saints do, by faith looking back to him. See Acts xv. 18, and Heb. xi.

(2.) As Redeemer, purchasing the church of God with his own blood, Jesus did not offer his sacrifice until the close of the old dispensation. But who thinks of arguing that therefore the Old Testament saints had no Redeemer in Jesus? No more can it be argued that they had no Priest in him.

To conclude:

We can see our way to but one answer to our question, Why was Jesus baptized? It was the "washing" preparatory to his anointing, given him as required by the law for consecrating a priest to office. The many human, imperfect priests, preceding Jesus, were but types, symbols, shadows of the coming *perfection*, the better priest. They "were many priests because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death." "Those priests were made without an oath;" God took no solemn oath for them. "But this (priest, Jesus, was made priest) with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." Heb. vii. 20-21. Therefore, his baptism no one else can ever receive. In it, no one can ever "follow his example." He has "fulfilled all righteousness," and none is left to be fulfilled by others. Here, as under that other law by which a sinner is condemned, "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

HERBERT H. HAWES.

ARTICLE X.

THE REVIEWER REVIEWED.

A REPLY TO DR. J. LEIGHTON WILSON'S ARTICLE ON OUR SCHEMES
OF BENEVOLENCE.

In estimating the value of the contributions of the Secretaries to the discussion of reform, we are liable to err in one of two opposite directions.

Those whose time is so engrossed with the demands of their fields of labor as to exclude all attention to the real nature of our ecclesiastical machinery, are in danger of error in assuming that this machinery cannot be fully understood by any but a Secretary. They will therefore attach weight to the views of the Secretaries, which, under the careful analysis to which these views would otherwise be subjected, would never be accorded them. If it were remembered that the warrant for whatever the Church may lawfully do, must be found in the word of God, it would be seen that ministers, as such, must deal with these questions, which in one aspect of the case are essentially questions of doctrine, and it is to the ministry that the key of doctrine is committed. In proportion as a Secretary is a faithful executive officer, busied with the details of his office, to that extent will he be disqualified for the discussion of the doctrinal aspects of the question, by his practical demission of distinctive ministerial work. It is to be noted that a call to the ministry is no less a "call to rule" because a call "to labor in word and doctrine." One of the alarming features of the times is the tendency in our Church to a practical neglect of the function of ruling on the part of presbyters. The obligation to vote, to decide questions, necessarily implies an intelligent conviction, but this involves a careful consideration to secure a thorough understanding of the question at issue. Not only is it true, that no man is under obligation to vote on questions, to determine measures, which he does not understand; it is also true that no man has the right to vote on any question which he does not comprehend. If therefore there rests upon presbyters, (rul-

ing and teaching elders,) as members of the courts of the Lord Jesus, the duty of deciding issues, there is necessarily involved a solemn obligation to study and understand these issues. This obligation cannot be met by referring this decision to any man, or set of men, however good and wise they may be. Those who are called to rule in the Lord's house may not respond to this call by proxy. The tendency which is rapidly developing of relegating all questions concerning our aggressive work to a handful of ecclesiastical manipulators, of allowing our policy to be determined by our executive officers, is not only a tendency fraught with evil because of the commingling of executive and legislative functions, but because it involves a neglect of those duties which are essential elements of that office to which God's servants are called by the Holy Ghost. No man can sit as a member of the General Assembly for ten days, study the questions he is called on to decide, and vote intelligently, without realizing that it is seldom that more arduous labor is required of any one. But our practice is developing the popular conception that a commission to the Assembly is the opportunity for free travel to distant relatives or interesting localities, for pleasant reunion, social intercourse, for listening to good preaching and interesting debates. That the danger to which attention is called is not an abstraction is manifested by the fact that the executive officers of the Assembly exert more influence in determining her legislation than ten times their number of the members of that body. In other words, the grave evil which we have to combat is found in the fact that to a large extent our executive department controls our legislative department. It cannot be disputed that a blank cartridge from a Secretarial Columbiad is vastly more effective than a well directed shot from a subordinate, that is from a ruling or teaching elder *simpliciter*. If there be no weight in a Secretary's arguments the weight of his office will be felt. It is always therefore worth while to answer a Secretary, irrespective of the intrinsic value of his argument.

On the other hand we are in danger of discounting too heavily the views of the Secretaries because reform proposes the abolition of the Secretariat. Men are prone to argue that the incumbent

of an office will not be the best judge of the need for that office, not merely on the low ground that the office constitutes his living, but on a higher plane, by the operation of a natural principle whereby a man is inevitably inclined to overestimate the importance of the work to which his life is devoted. Whether or not we entertain the view that this is simply an executive office and that the business of a Secretary is not to dictate nor suggest the policy of the Church, but to *execute* the will of the Assembly, and whatever view may be held in regard to the propriety of a Secretary's engaging in this discussion, now that we have to deal with the fact that the Secretaries are struggling to retain the Secretariat, we will be wise if we discard all accidental considerations and estimate the views of the Secretaries according to their intrinsic value.

The writhings and contortions of the opponents of reform, the irreconcilable positions assumed by different anti-reformers, and the contradictory statements found in the article before us, constitute a notable tribute to the strength of the scriptural basis on which reform rests and from which it has not been moved by the assaults of its adversaries.

Before entering upon the discussion of the special issues raised by our reviewer, it is expedient to examine the general remarks with which the Secretary prefaces this discussion. The Secretary says: "The great controlling idea which seems to pervade this Report (the Minority Report) from beginning to end, is economy, or, more properly speaking, *money-saving*." P. 256. If the reader will turn to the Report, he will find that half a page is occupied in refuting the statement made in the Majority Report, that there is "the necessity for locating the Committees in the cities, where the costs of living are always much greater than in the country;" that one of the five reasons given for abandoning the Tuscaloosa scheme was the single statement, that under its operation we were undertaking the education of a colored ministry at a cost of \$500 per annum for each candidate; that it is incidentally stated, that the combination of the *Earnest Worker* and the *Missionary* would be in the interest of economy; that one of the five reasons given for triennial Assemblies is, that it

would save an annual expenditure of \$6,000; and that under the business aspects of the question, one page is devoted to the application of the business principle of economy, out of the nineteen pages of the Report; and that the pivotal question on which the whole scheme of Reform rests, is the doctrinal aspect of the question, to the discussion of which five pages are devoted. And yet the Secretary affirms that "the great controlling idea of the Report is money saving." Just here the Secretary remarks, that "if it is best for the General Assembly to meet only once in three years, that \$18,000 may thereby saved, why not fix the time of meeting at once in ten or twenty years; or what would seem to be more consistent with the reasoning of the Report, have no meeting at all." P. 257. The answer is, that while the Church may not be able to provide her Secretaries with palatial residences, and afford them such salary as would provide swallow tail coats and white kid gloves for evening entertainments, it would not follow that she should deny them food convenient for them, or require them to go through the world *in puris naturalibus*. But the Secretary goes on to affirm that "one is tempted to infer from reading the Report that the writer regards it as the chief duty of the Church to *spare* the money of her people, or, what is substantially the same thing, to conduct all her work on the most niggardly scale, in order to save their money, and thus save them from the necessity of giving *cheerfully* to the cause of Christ." "It aims to conduct the work of the Church on the narrowest and most sordid scale. In other words, that what is done for the Lord must be done in a grudging manner. It takes sides with the avarice and selfishness of the human heart, and it is not surprising, therefore, that it meets with much favor. But if this narrowness becomes the prevailing feeling of the Church, and is encouraged by our church courts, its influence will not be felt alone in connexion with our schemes of benevolence, but in every possible direction. Ministers' salaries, miserably insufficient as they are at present, will have to be brought down to a corresponding standard," etc. "The great need of the present moment, therefore, is not increased economy, but greater liberality." Pp. 257-8. On these rather extraordinary statements one or two remarks are to

be made. In passing, it is to be noted as a curious fact that the Secretary should affirm that the ground of the popularity of the Minority Report with the people of God consists in the fact that "it takes sides with the avarice and selfishness of the human heart." We have to confess an utter inability to discover the connexion of ideas in the statement, that we "regard it as the chief duty of the Church to spare the money of her people, and thus save them from the necessity of giving cheerfully to the cause of Christ." "Cheerful giving" necessarily conveys the idea of the spontaneous, joyous exercise of this grace. With what propriety can it be represented as a burden, from whose oppressive weight the people desire to be relieved? Furthermore, we are constrained to confess that we are unable to understand how it is that sparing the people's money will save them from the *necessity* (?) of giving cheerfully. There seems to be great confusion in the Secretary's mind when he treats of retrenchment as involving any repression of the gifts of God's people, or any curtailment of the Church's aggressive work. This was a marked feature of the Secretary's Memorial to the Louisville Assembly. He actually puts the proposals of Reform in the same category with a proposition to strike a missionary enterprise from our list. The idea conveyed is, that the advocates of Reform propose to diminish our mission work to save our people from giving to the Lord. This is simply incomprehensible. These affirmations constitute an injurious charge to emanate from an official in our Church. Fortunately, the assertion does not prove the truth of the charge. We challenge the Secretary to give us a single sentence in the Report that would afford the slightest shadow of foundation for such grave accusation. Let us have the chapter and verse. It is easy to denounce the Report. Denunciation of Reform and Reformers has constituted a large staple of the discussions on this subject. We will not bandy epithets with the Secretary, or any other anti-reformer. We appeal to the judgment of every impartial reader of the Report for vindication. Whatever may be thought of the ability of the Report, or of the practicability of the plan proposed, no man of ordinary intellect, who will give it unbiassed perusal, will fail to recognise the fact that whatever else may be said of it,

the inspiration of that Report was an earnest desire to advance the cause of Christ.¹

To those who are familiar with the life, the labors, the distinctly announced principles of Dr. Thornwell, it must seem like a desecration of the memory of the mighty dead to present him to the Church as the endorser of that system which he so vigorously opposed; it might with equal propriety be affirmed that the author of the Minority Report endorses our present mode of administration because he is, as the Secretary knows, the ardent advocate of our aggressive work, and because he submits to an imperfect system until it can be changed by legitimate means. The explanation of Dr. Thornwell's acquiescence in what he could not remedy is found in a note from the Editors of his published works Vol. 4th, page 144: "Touching the employment of deacons in the general service of the Church, the conduct of Missions by Presbyteries, and the unscripturalness and unconstitutionality of Boards, Dr. Thornwell was content with urging his views earnestly; but he made it a principle through life always to submit to his brethren

¹In another part of this article the Secretary charges that the author of the Minority Report spent the greater part of his ministerial life in teaching. It is apparent, that if a minister, from loss of voice or any providential incapacity, were debarred from preaching, the statement that he had ceased to preach would have no force whatsoever. It follows, therefore, that, in making this statement, it is necessarily implied that the writer of the Report voluntarily laid aside the work of the ministry and "spent the greater part of his ministerial life in teaching." But this statement is defective in a very important particular to give it value. It lacks the essential element of truth. If the Secretary did not know the circumstances under which the writer of the Report demitted for the time ministerial work, he was under a solemn obligation to abstain from making this statement, and incorporating it into the permanent literature of the Church. If due care had been exercised to secure accurate information, the Secretary could scarcely have gone amiss within the Synods of Virginia and North Carolina. Nay, he need only have turned in his office and he could have learned from the Co-ordinate Secretary enough to show him that a false impression would necessarily be produced by the statement which he has given to the Church. We have nothing to say as to the question of taste in dragging the private life of a minister into this discussion of great principles. "*De gustibus non disputandum est.*" The simple facts are, that the writer of the Minority

in matters of established and recognised policy." We might give pages of quotations to indicate Dr. Thornwell's endorsement of the Minority plan, but space will not permit. On page 154, he affirms: "That the provisions of our book are ample to enable the the Presbytery to attend to all the spiritual and pecuniary matters of conducting Domestic and Foreign Missions with efficiency and success." "For transmission to foreign parts, nothing more would be necessary than simply to employ either some extensive merchant in some of our large cities who for the usual percentage would attend to the whole matter, or a Committee of Deacons appointed by the Assembly for the purpose." "Our Book does not, however, confine deacons to particular congregations." See page 155, and so on *ad libitum*. And on page 153, Dr. Thornwell opposes Boards, on the ground that they exercise the identical powers claimed for the Committee of Foreign Missions by Dr. Wilson on page 255 of the REVIEW. Any one who will read this 4th Volume of Thornwell's works will rise from its perusal enter-

Report, when debarred from preaching by loss of voice, was ministering to a noble and generous people, who refused his resignation and begged for the continuance of the pastoral relation without preaching, and he did continue a year with his flock, vainly hoping it might yet be possible for him to do the full work of the ministry; that he then turned his back upon numerous offers of secular positions of profit, and spent two years in out-of-door life on the farm, converging everything to the one aim of restoration to the privilege of preaching, and that just so soon as there was a possibility of renewing that work, at no small pecuniary sacrifice he returned to it. If the Secretary could form any conception of that craving thirst for the privilege of preaching the gospel, that burned during all those years of disability; if the veil could be lifted from those hours of trial when the voice of the negro that drove his oxen and called his hogs and rang through the plantation, was vainly coveted; when there was such a yearning as induced a willingness to preach anywhere and under any circumstances, he would have realised that that dispensation was an affliction of too sacred a nature to be torn by the ruthless hand of the polemic. Old Senator Benton, in high party times, once said concerning his adversary who was stricken down by disease, "When the Almighty puts his hand on a man, I take mine off." It is, alas, too true that, although we be brothers and Christians, we may sometimes be the gainers by emulating the courtesy and magnanimity of men of the world.

taining no doubt, that if that able ecclesiastic were living, the Church would ring with his arraignment of our present system and his eloquent pleas for our return to scriptural methods.

If anything more were needed to indicate the imperative necessity for reform, it is found in the mournful surrender of time-honored Presbyterian principles, as exhibited in the article before us. It affords another illustration of the influence of practice upon creed, and clearly reveals the fact that any departure from the requirements of God's word inevitably tends to the corruption of doctrine. Notice the third proposition which the Secretary discusses: "Has the present mode of conducting the Foreign Missionary work proved a failure, and is it necessary therefore to go back to apostolic times for a model upon which to conduct it?" Page 262, prop. 3rd.

We remark, 1st: That the necessary implication is the plain admission of that for which the Minority Report contends, viz., that our present mode of administration is not in accordance with the model of apostolic times. 2nd. That the determination of the question as to whether we shall return to the scriptural model, is made, not upon the principle of loyalty to God's word, but upon the question of expediency. The necessity for such return to the scriptural pattern will only exist, if our present human contrivance be proven to be a failure. In other words, if the wisdom of man appears to be successful, adhere to it; but if it fail, then invoke the power of God.

We should be loth to attribute to the Secretary such latitudinarian views, if the statement was in other form than as constituting the thesis which he proposes for consideration in a deliberate REVIEW article. But we are left in no doubt as to the views entertained; for on page 275, the Secretary proceeds to warn us of the disastrous results that will ensue to other interests if we insist on returning to the scriptural model, and he says: "Furthermore, it would be well for those who call for the exact 'pattern shown in the Mount,' to look well to what their principles would lead." And again on page 275: "Why, then, is the plan adopted in our day to be denounced because no exact counterpart can be found in the Acts of the Apostles?" We were taught in boyhood

that "the word of God is the only infallible rule of faith or practice;" that the Bible is the statute book of the Kingdom, and that "Christ has given all laws for the guidance of his Church," as well as for the direction of the individual Christian. We have cherished our Presbyterian birthright, because we have held it as a characteristic of our Church, that she planted herself on the word of God, received it in all its fulness, without addition, without subtraction, and knowing the truth would dare maintain it with an absolute disregard of consequences. But we observe, 3rd. That the Secretary again repudiates Presbyterian doctrine by denying that there was an apostolic plan. Page 272: "Now what is that 'pattern shown in the Mount'? Who can tell us what was the apostolic plan for carrying on the great work of evangelising the world? Or whether they had anything that could be properly called a plan or pattern for carrying on that work?"

Page 274: "The powers and functions of the constitution of the Church were left to be developed by the Church under the guidance of the Holy Ghost *as their situation and circumstances would seem to demand.* ¹*No particular form of outward worship existed in the primitive Church. She had no creed. * * No distinct system of discipline established for the government of the Church. * ** And so no particular plan was adopted by which all the *energies of the Church could be concentrated on the great work of evangelising the world.*" If this be true, where is the warrant for the Presbyterian system? Why may not any body of believers adopt any plan that to them may seem best, and, asking the aid of the Holy Ghost, claim equal authority with us? (But we are debarred argument for brevity's sake.) We have here the Secretary's creed; let us hear what our Church holds on this subject. Form of Government, Chap. II., Sec. 3, reads thus: "Christ, as King, has given to his Church officers, oracles, and ordinances, and especially has he *ordained therein his system of doctrine, government, discipline, and worship; all which are either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced therefrom; and to which things he commands that nothing be added, and that from them naught be taken*

¹Italics ours.

away." It is apparent that if the Secretary's position be correct, Presbyterian foundations are swept away, and there is no more reason why a man should adopt this Presbyterian rather than any other. It would be now in order for the Secretary to discuss for us the thesis, "Why am I a Presbyterian?" Every body of Christians must pray for the Holy Spirit, and "develop the Church as their situation and circumstances would seem to demand"—they, of course, being the judges of what is expedient. The issue is sharply defined: we have the Secretary and the Secretary's doctrine of the authority for the human contrivance on the one hand; and on the other no Secretariat, but the distinctive doctrine of Presbyterianism. If Presbyterianism be in accordance with the Scriptures, the issue is as sharply made between the word of God and the dictates of human reason. It is apparent that the charge made in the Minority Report that we have gone astray from the word of God is fully sustained by the admission of the Secretary. He actually defends the departure from the scriptural mode.

The statements of the Secretary in regard to our agencies are fatal to the theory of the Majority, and confirm the position taken by the Minority Report. While strenuously advocating the continuance of his own department, and declaring that it rests on a somewhat different basis from our Domestic schemes, he asserts that the agencies of Publication, Education, and Home Missions "have in themselves no ecclesiastical functions or powers whatever, using the term in its stricter sense." "Beyond the duty of gathering and circulating information in relation to the condition and wants of the different portions of the Church, and especially of the poorer and more destitute parts of it, they are little else than *central financial agencies* for gathering up the gifts of God's people and disbursing them so as to promote the highest interest of the whole Church." We simply remark, that as those duties of financial agents for gathering and disbursing the gifts of God's people are not allotted by our Book to ministers of the word, but are expressly assigned to deacons, it follows that the Secretary has unconsciously endorsed another cardinal principle of the Minority Report, and the logic of his statements would concur with that Report in affirming that it is not reason that ministers should

enter the Secretariat, and thus "leave the word of God and serve tables."

The Secretary cites certain cases to show that the apostles performed the duties of deacons. He states that "Paul says he had come to Jerusalem to bring offerings which he had carefully gathered up in the churches, and that Barnabas and Paul had raised money at Antioch." If the reader will refer to the sacred record, he will find no warrant for the Secretary's statements. There is no evidence that Paul made a single collection. As the apostle had by the direction of the Holy Ghost set apart certain men for that specific work, the irresistible inference is that, when such collections were made, they were made by those men. As to Paul's carrying money from Antioch to Jerusalem, if that incidental act made him a deacon, it will make a deacon of the mail carrier, and of many a commissioner to the next General Assembly. We suppose that the humblest intellect can apprehend the distinction between the incidental handling of money by a minister, and the detailing of a minister from his ministerial work, and assigning him to the collection and distribution of ecclesiastical funds, the essential work of the Diaconate. We would respectfully remind the Secretary that his whole line of argument here is not so much against the Minority Report, as such, but against the doctrine and order of the Presbyterian Church.

The Secretary takes exception to our mode of stating the expensiveness of the Secretaries. He says (p. 276): "We are told in the Report that during the last fourteen years it has cost \$160,000 to operate our four different schemes of benevolence. This big sum is so presented as to shock the sensibilities of unthinking men." We remark first, that this is not the statement we made. If the reader will turn to page 24 of the Report, he will find that it cost us *\$160,000 in salaries alone*. It cost us much more "to operate our four schemes." And now as to our "presenting it so as to shock the sensibilities of the reader." Really, if we intended to state the truth, we did not know how to present it without a shock. It is not the mode of presentation, it is the fact that causes the shock.

The Secretary objects to our claim that it is a violation of

ordination vows for ministers to act as Treasurers for our causes, and says: "It is not stated, as it should have been done, that these ministers were devoting a portion of their time to this work." We were not aware that it would extenuate the fault of a Sabbath-breaker to be able to say that he only did the forbidden thing a portion of the time. When we turn to the 6th Chapter of Acts, we find that the reason given for the appointment of deacons was not because the administration of finances would occupy all of the apostles' time, but because it was incumbent on those called to the ministerial office to "give themselves continually to prayer to the ministry of the word." In 1 Tim. iv. 15 we find the injunction to ministers is, "Give thyself *wholly* to them." And in our Confession of Faith (Larger Catechism, Q. XCIX.), we are told that "the law is perfect, and bindeth every one to full conformity in the whole man, and so as to require the utmost perfection of every duty, and to forbid the least degree of every sin." "That what God forbids is at no time to be done." We may well ask whether we merit the charge of being "a disintegrationist," or whether it would not be more appropriate to those who defend the departure from the requirements of the word of God.

II. In combating the proposition to substitute one Central Diaconal Treasurer for our various ministerial Treasurers, the Secretary says: "Our first remark about the proposed Central Treasurer is that it is not new," and he proceeds to expand this argument (?) throughout a whole page. This is refreshing. The Secretary has given loose reins to his imagination in depicting the disasters to the Church from the *innovations* suggested by the Minority Report, and now his first argument against this prominent feature of the Report is that it is *not* an innovation, that it is "*not new*." He is constrained to confess "that it had been tried with good success by two branches of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland." We are forcibly reminded of a certain fable in which figured a wolf and a lamb. Now, we are to be slain because we are proposing some *new schemes*, and now, because *our schemes* are *not new*. Now, we are warned against the disasters that will ensue if we insist on conformity to the re-

quirements of Scripture, and now we are twitted for not proposing at once every change that is called for by loyalty to God's word. But what has the age of the proposition to do with its merit? or how does the question of originality concern us? The question is not whether the proposition is new or old, nor whether it originated with A or B. The real question is whether it will be in harmony with the Scriptures, and conducive to the efficiency of our benevolent schemes to cease to assign to the office of treasurer "ministers who are called by the Holy Ghost to give themselves continually to prayer and the ministry of the word," and as a substitute for these clerical treasurers to appoint "a deacon called of God to serve tables" as a central treasurer who shall receive and disburse all funds under the control of the General Assembly. It is thus seen at a glance, that the remarks of the Secretary are irrelevant. This turning aside from the real issue has a twofold signification. The policy of the Majority has been to exclude the light, to choke off discussion, and there has also been developed a deliberate plan to destroy Reform by discrediting its advocate. This mode of attack is distinctly brought out in other parts of this Article. One would suppose that the important question for the Church to decide, is not how shall we best accomplish our mission? but rather, what estimate shall we form of one who advocates a particular plan of operation? The Secretary makes himself merry over what he is pleased to term the undeniable claim to originality on the part of the author of the Report—an assumption without a particle of foundation, for the preëminent characteristic of the Report is the claim that it proposes a return *not to any plan originated by man, but to methods required by the word of God.*

An eminent supporter of the Secretary, who affirmed that Dr. Girardeau's new (?) doctrine of the diaconate had been crushed by the pyramid of the tools and scaffolding of logic heaped upon it by Dr. Lefevre in the April number of the REVIEW, and that the Minority Report had been borne down steep places and swept into the sea by this article of Dr. Wilson, also stated that the Doctor had shown that all that was good in the article was not new. Marvellous, indeed, the logic of these brethren. The ele-

ment of excellence in one part is neutralised by the element of newness, and the element of excellence in another part is not worth reckoning, because it is not new.

While admitting the undoubted success of the plan of reform in the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, the Secretary denies that "what is practicable for Scotland is practicable for us" (page 263); but he utterly fails to show what are the influences, whether climatic or other, that render a principle which is effective in Scotland inoperative in America. We had supposed that there are great principles underlying all secular business, and great principles underlying the administration of the kingdom of grace, which are applicable to all races and all climes. But the Secretary claims that a deacon could never perform the duties of central treasurer, because of the nature of the inquiries made of him by those transmitting money. He says: "The central treasurer would soon find himself surrounded by difficulties which neither he nor the proposer of the Report had ever thought of." "These inquiries are of a very varied character, as, for example, how much it will take to support a heathen child in a given school; what is the comparative expense of supporting schools in Greece, China, and South America? will a lady teacher be appointed to the Mexican, the Indian, or Italian mission, if a certain Ladies' Missionary Association will provide the means of support? what has become of a certain boy that was supported by a certain Sabbath-school, that was named for a certain Doctor of Divinity, that was in a certain Chinese school a certain number of years ago? These are only specimens," etc. (P. 264.) Well, it may be the writer's obtuseness, but he is constrained to confess an utter inability to understand why it would take a Doctor of Divinity, or "one called by the Holy Ghost to give himself continually to prayer and the ministry of the word," to frame an answer to these inquiries. We are aware that it requires an acute philosopher to discern many occult principles with which the human mind has to deal; and doubtless this accounts for the fact that we are unable to discern the profound principle in theology that is involved in telling how much it will require to support a heathen child, or what is the location of a certain little boy that was supported by

a certain Sabbath-school, that was afflicted by the imposition of a certain big name of a certain umbrageous Doctor of Divinity! It will be observed by those who have read the Report, that the Secretary's assumption that no other provision is made for our work than the appointment of a central treasurer, is incorrect, as is also his assumption that the Report proposes not only that all moneys, but also that *all inquiries*, shall be sent to the central treasurer. But as the Secretary can find no such suggestion in the Report, his objection lies not against the Report, but against the creations of his own fancy. The objection which the Secretary raises on the ground of the necessity for official connexion between the Treasurer and the Executive Committee is irrelevant, because the plan of Reform does not propose to dissolve that connexion. His further objection, on the plea of necessity for locating the treasurer in a city, does not lie, because the Report is silent as to the location of the central Treasurer and the location of the Secretary, will be treated in its appropriate place, if space will permit. The Secretary declares "that this great work, involving so much that is secular, must be conducted, to some extent at least, on secular principles" (p. 267). Well, the appeal is made to Cæsar, and to Cæsar shall he go. All that we demand here is, that so much of the church work as involves secular business shall not be made to depend upon miraculous intervention, but shall be conducted on business principles. Will the Secretary produce a single business firm or corporation that, managing a sum of money equal to that controlled by the Assembly, would, on a purely artificial classification, commit the absurdity of employing three or four treasurers? What would be thought of such a firm if it should have one treasurer for all money brought in by the sale of bacon, and another for flour, and another for molasses? It is curious to notice the Secretary's application of this wise remark. Instead of applying it to our mode of administration, he turns to the men who are executing these trusts, and affirms that "the only wise course for the Assembly is to appoint godly, judicious, and practical men to conduct it" (p. 267). Very good, indeed! But the question under discussion is not the character or qualifications of the men, but the features of the sys-

tem. The character of the men will not prevent the evils which arise from a vicious system. The next remark which is made to enforce this statement, "that we need have no fears about discomfiture or disaster" (p. 267), is peculiarly unfortunate. This is just the same cry of "Peace! peace!" "Do not agitate!" "Do not scrutinise!" that was sounded in our ears before the deplorable disaster to our Publication cause. It was kept up after that cause had reached a state of concealed collapse, and all who dared to vote for inquiry into and modification of that system were fiercely denounced by the prelatie power in the Presbyterian Church. With a painful lesson taught us in the school of experience fresh in our memories, with the fact before us that \$100,000 of Christ's money was lost to our cause by the logical result of our system, we are still enjoined to allow this machine to run, without modification; nay, without inspection. The wisdom of this injunction is certainly not emphasised by the logic of facts, nor endorsed by the analogy with our past history. As the question of debt is not so much as alluded to in the Report, the remarks of the Secretary on this subject are not germane, and can be passed by; for we believe in according to our opponents the privilege of demolishing as many men of straw as it may please them to construct. Now, if it can be assumed that the Secretary is in a position to know what difficulties would lie in the way of realising this plan of a central treasurer, and that he is very much in earnest in endeavoring to prevent it; and if it be conceded that we have given his objections a fair examination, and proven them to be inconclusive and irrelevant, it would follow that this proposition of the Minority plan is unimpeached. We challenge for it the closest scrutiny. It requires no argument to sustain it. In the language of the Minority Report, "An accepted principle in the conduct of all business requires the greatest simplicity in machinery. We violate this principle in the multiplication of treasurers, who are to hold and disburse funds held by the same body. The classification on which our division of labor is made is purely artificial. The General Assembly's funds for Publication go to one treasurer; the General Assembly's funds for Education go to another treasurer. What would

be thought of the city railway company that should have one treasurer for funds used in buying horses, another for funds used in buying forage, and another for funds used in buying cars?"

III. There are some general propositions which it might be well for our Assembly to consider.

1. That the simplest, most economical, and most efficient plan, will be that which harmonises with our constitution and meets the requirements of the word of God. The plan proposed in the scheme of reform involves the resumption of Presbyterian duties by that court; the emancipation of ministers from the service of tables; the restoration of the long neglected and paralysed diaconate to its scriptural position of importance and efficiency; the resumption of the duties of the pastorate in enforcing the requirements and incentives of God's word for the prosecution of all our work as essential functions of the Church, thereby laying upon pastors the obligation to be agents for every legitimate cause.

2. That if the power of the Secretariat be too great to render it possible to bring the Church to this simple scriptural method, the question is still open as to modifications of our plans of beneficence. Those who hold that there are legitimate spiritual functions connected with the Secretariat properly administered, may well consider whether modifications cannot be made which will enure to the benefit of the Church. We believe that a careful scrutiny will make it manifest that one Secretary could gather all the duties of our different departments that could pertain to a minister of the gospel, and that one diaconal Treasurer could perform all that would fall to his share. It would then only be necessary to give assistance in the office, in the inexpensive form of clerkly aid.

IV. The Secretary proposes for discussion the question, "Can any of our Executive Committees, and especially the Committee of Foreign Missions, carry on and work with system and efficiency without a Secretary?" In the discussion of this question our Reviewer gravely undertakes to prove that no court and no committee could perform its necessary duties without a Secretary or clerk. *Mirabile dictu!* What a tribute to the strength of the real propositions of Reform is unconsciously afforded in this continual



dodging of the real issue. What a travesty upon straightforward discussion in this effort to create the impression that "a leading feature of Reform" is the perpetration of the absurdity of constituting a body without its *essentiae* of the organisation of a committee without a clerk or secretary. There is not a word in the Report that warrants the assumption that reform proposes to change the constitution of the Committees by leaving them without an official to perform clerky duties. Nay, inasmuch as the plan of Reform proposes "to retain the Executive Committees" (page 17 of Reports), and inasmuch as the Secretary maintains that a secretary or clerk is of the essence of the Committee, it necessarily follows in virtue of the Secretary's logic, that we do propose to retain the essential elements of chairman and secretary with each Committee. We suppose that the humblest intellect can discern the difference between the generic term *secretary*, used in its general sense as applicable to all bodies requiring such officer, and the specific technical term *secretary*, used in an ecclesiastical sense as representing our Presbyterian Popes. Whatever mistakes others might choose to make, we might be pardoned for supposing that a Secretary had sufficient dealings in dollars and cents to discern between a Secretary of Foreign Missions with a salary of \$3,000, and a secretary of the Committee of Foreign Missions with no salary at all, or only such small compensation as would be required for his clerky duties.

In order to show that the office of Secretary of Foreign Missions cannot be abolished, our Secretary gives a summary of the duties which pertain to that office, arranged under four heads (p. 268): 1 and 2. Home and Foreign correspondence; 3. Editorial labors; 4. Duties in connection with the official acts of the Executive Committee. It will be seen at a glance that these duties are only made necessary on the assumption that our missionary work is to be conducted on the old plan. Suppose that Dr. Thornwell's plan of conducting Foreign Missionary work by Presbyteries were adopted, where would be the necessity for these Secretarial duties? Each Presbytery would be its own Secretary of Foreign Missions. The reports from each Presbytery would be transmitted to Synod and the Assembly, and the general re-

sults would be classified and brought before the Church, just as our other work is reported.

Suppose the Minority plan be adopted, then, as the missionary work is placed upon a scriptural basis, and made the essential duty of the Church as such, the unfolding of the obligation of the Church, of the scriptural incentive to the prosecution of the work, of the wants of the cause, would devolve on pastors according to Christ's appointment. As we would thus constitute over *one thousand ministers* as agents of Foreign Missions for our *one Secretary*, where would be the necessity for an over-burdened Secretary?

Let us examine these duties in detail. In regard to the first, it is to be noted that with an opportunity of reaching the people every month through the *Missionary*, and every week through the religious press, there does not appear any necessity for any very burdensome correspondence to "answer questions," "make suggestions," and "give information."

2. The Secretary tells us that the letters from the missionaries amount to from fifty to sixty per month. There does not appear to be anything so burdensome in this class of duties that would call for any large portion of a \$3,000 salary. The correspondence is not larger than that of many a minister who is doing the full work of the ministry.

3. As the editorial labor consists in furnishing one-half of some half-dozen pages of editorial in the *Missionary*, it is seen to be far less than many of our ministers voluntarily perform, in addition to their pastoral work. It is to be remembered, too, that the editorial work, like the other work of the Secretary, is provided for in the plan of Reform. If the *Missionary* and the *Earnest Worker* were united, its editor could be paid from the royalty given by the publishers, without a dollar's expense to the Church.

4. The Secretary enumerates the duties in connexion with the official acts of the Executive Committee, as follows:

- (1) Those incident to the appointment of new missionaries;
- (2) those incident to the establishment of a new mission station;
- (3) those incident to the appropriations for the year.

We remark, as to the first and second, they are of rare occurrence, and cannot be said to constitute any large part of the daily labor of a Secretary. As to the third, the Secretary informs us that they are made at the beginning of the year, and, of course, they do not run through the year as daily duties. He tells us, (page 271) that "the missionaries usually send explanations of the various items embraced in their schedules, and ordinarily this would be a sufficient guide for the Committee. But when it becomes necessary to cut down these schedules one-third or one-fourth, how will it be possible for the Executive Committee to apportion out the funds under their control in a just and equitable manner?" etc. We remark, that we are unable to see why it should require a Secretary to scale the appropriations, or how it can be made to appear that a Committee composed, as it is claimed, of some of the best business men in the city of Baltimore, are incompetent to perform so simple an arithmetical calculation. A general remark in regard to this claim of the Secretary is, that it certainly sustains the proposition of the Minority Report, which holds that there is no necessity for annual sessions of the General Assembly. The Secretary says, page 269: "It is impossible for the Committee except to a limited extent to know all the facts bearing upon any particular case that may be brought under their notice. No member of the Committee who does not give special attention to the subject, could give this information so necessary to wise action on the part of the Committee." If this statement of the incompetency of the Committee is correct, it would seem that we have very much the same state of things that existed in the department of Publication. That is, we have the name of a Committee, but essentially the Secretary is the Committee, and the appointment of any Committee is the merest farce. More than this, if it be impossible, in the nature of the case, that the Executive Committee can know these questions which it is called on to decide, *a fortiori* it is impossible for the Assembly to understand them. The Secretary appears to be not only the Committee, but the Secretary is the Assembly. We have had this conviction thrust upon us, but we did not expect to see the truth leak out from official headquarters. All that the Assembly need do is, to

appoint a Secretary, dissolve and go home, and leave the whole missionary enterprise of the Church to revolve within the corporate limits of the Secretary. But the conclusive proof, that the Church, even under the present mode of administration, is not dependent upon a Secretary, and that the work of Foreign Missions does not require the whole time of a separate Secretary, is afforded, not in the field of speculation, but in the school of experience. It is shown in the fact that for years Foreign Missions was administered in conjunction with Home Missions, without a separate Secretary, and that since we have had a separate Secretary for each cause, during nine months of sickness and absence from the country of one Secretary, the other performed all the duties of the two offices, with never the least intimation that the burden was excessive or that the cause suffered on this account. If the inference from these facts be correct, viz., that one Secretary could have performed during the last ten years all that was essential to the work of Home and Foreign Missions, then our boasted system is responsible for the squandering of \$30,000 of Christ's money in this single item of unnecessary salary of the additional Secretary. With how much more force does this truth apply to the department of Education, which is admitted to be a mere disbursing agency, and to the department of Home Missions, in which we pay a salary of \$3,000 for handling nominally \$40,000, but in which the sum *necessarily* handled, even according to present mode of administration, does not amount to more than \$12,000; and to the cause of Publication, in which we paid a salary to have our contributions sunk, and now keep a Secretary at a salary of \$3,000 to collect \$8,000 per annum. This is supposed to be a Secretarial conception of what it is to "conduct secular business on secular principles!" The writer has no hesitation in declaring his sincere conviction that the Secretariat constitutes a great bar to our progress, and to the success of our aggressive enterprises. It is not only subversive of the Presbyterian scriptural doctrine of the diaconate; it cuts up by the roots the doctrine of our Church that Christ hath given all his Church all officers needful for her work. It is subversive of the scriptural truth that the grace of giving and the evangelisation of the

world are essential characteristics of the Church, and that the ministers of the word, who are called by the Holy Ghost and appointed over the flock, are sufficient to declare God's will and unfold the scriptural incentives to the exercise of these exalted privileges. The real alternative is between one Secretary of Missions appointed by man, or one thousand called of God. Whether it ought to be so or not, we have the practical fact that the appointment of an office to "exercise the grace of liberality" and "fix attention upon the great commission" does tend to influence the ministry to leave that work to him to whom it has been assigned by the Assembly. If the principle were correct, we ought to have a ministerial Secretary for every Christian grace and every Christian duty.

V. We proceed to examine the Secretary's claim for the transcendent success of the Secretariat in the conversion of the world: a success so brilliant and dazzling, according to the Secretary's presentation, that it does seem a pity that this wonderful invention had not been discovered in the days of Paul. If he and the other apostles could only have known of this marvellous expedient, what wonders might they not have accomplished. If, instead of relying on primitive scriptural methods, whose efficacy the Secretary has not disproven, they could only have possessed the magic influence of the Secretariat, and had the services of a Secretary of Home and Foreign Missions, how much greater advance the gospel would have made! The Secretary institutes a comparison between the progress of the gospel in apostolic days and the progress of the gospel in Secretariat days, which he thinks results in leaving the apostles far behind in the race. In making this contrast, the summary which the Secretary gives of the advantages on the apostolic and primitive Christians, by which its success is to be discounted, is extraordinary. He gives us, p. 278:

1. "The freshness of the impression made upon the world by the life and death of the Lord Jesus Christ." As if these facts are not as fresh when first made known to heathen now, as when first made known to heathen then.

2. "The undeniable proofs of his resurrection and ascension to

heaven." As if there were any doubt on that subject now, or any defect in the evidence of this cardinal doctrine of the gospel.

3. "The extraordinary outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost." As if God's promise to give his Spirit in answer to prayer were not as good in this day as in that. And

4. "The gifts of tongues and miracles." As if they were essential to this dispensation, or any more potent for the conversion of sinners, than the ordinary means of grace.

5. "The special preparation, both of Jewish and Gentile mind, to listen to the claims of the gospel." As if the Spirit did not still prepare the heart for the reception of the truth.

6. "The nuclei for the establishment of Christian churches in most of the great cities of the Roman Empire by the Pentecostal converts." As if the fruits of the work were to be counted as the cause of the work.

But let us hear the Secretary's estimate of the value of apostolic methods, compared with the improvements of modern thought. He states that during the last twenty-five years there have been more than fifteen times as many converts from missionary enterprises throughout the world, as during the first century. He gives us also the *future* success. He says: "More than this. *If* (Italics ours) the work of conversion goes on among the benighted nations of the earth as rapidly during the next twenty years as it has been during the last twenty years, the number of converts at the end of this century will be scarcely less than 5,000,000, or fifty-times as many as those during the first century." Unfortunately for any deduction that might be made, the Secretary has not informed us what is the relative population in these two contrasted centuries, nor the relative number of Christians and ministers, and therefore nothing can be inferred from the fact that conversions are more numerous in this age than in that early period of the world. There is another fact that the Secretary might have mentioned; and as he has omitted it, we will supply it. It is beyond all question true, that there are more converts in this present century than there were in the days of our first parents, Adam and Eve.

If the success of modern missions be creditable, the inquiry

still recurs, was it by the instrumentality of the Secretariat that the Church was brought to that state of efficiency that made this success possible?

But the inconclusiveness of the Secretary's reasoning is made manifest by a consideration of the fact that the question under discussion is not the success of Christianity, nor yet the comparative results of evangelisation in the first and in the nineteenth centuries: but the question is the success or failure of our own peculiar methods of conducting our aggressive work. The Secretary undertakes to prove that the machinery of the Presbyterian Church is perfect, by showing that Christianity has received larger accessions in this age than in the early history of the Church. *The triumphs of the cross have been greater in the nineteenth century than in the first century; therefore the Secretariat plan of conducting the work of the Southern Presbyterian Church is better than the apostolic plan which was devised by the Holy Ghost.* We may concede all that the Secretary claims for the success of Christianity in this age, but there is still the missing link, and that deep chasm which the Secretary, with all his logical agility and his facility for ready transition, cannot bridge. Where is the causative tie that binds this success, these results, to the Secretariat? These conquests for the Redeemer, accomplished by the sum of Christian effort in all denominations, by various modes of administration, are all credited to the potent influence of the Secretariat. Could we believe it, we dare not speak a word against these mighty potentates. But alas for our unsophisticated old-fashioned notions, we pass by the gorgeously arrayed officials in the bomb-proofs, and in the sphere of instrumentality we honor those who, following in the footsteps of the divine Master, have turned their backs upon the emoluments of the world and the allurements of ecclesiastical preferment, and with toil and privation have carried the gospel to the benighted regions of the earth. When we turn our attention to the real question, the success of our present machinery, do we find any ground for boasting?

With the confessed failure of our people to approximate the scriptural standard of giving, the languishing condition of all

our enterprises, the frequent perils and embarrassments and disasters of the past, the want of increased beneficence in proportion to increased numbers and means, with the ominous signs of an apostate ministry and a spurious membership, is it a time to reprove inquiry and constrict every effort that is made to promote the efficiency of the Church and restore her to her ancient scriptural moorings? The failure of the Secretariat has been recorded by the Secretary's own hand. Turn to the files of the *Missionary* and of the circulars issued from the office, and compare the Secretary's statement of the Church's failure, under the Secretariat, with this labored claim for eminent success. Nay, the Secretary's pen has recorded this failure in the article before us. It is only necessary to quote the Secretary against the Secretary. In discussing another phase of the question, the Secretary informs us that \$250,000 per annum would be an humble standard for our Church, and not more than one-half or one-third of which other evangelical Churches are giving. Well, has the Secretariat brought our churches up to this humble standard? When we turn to the Reports of the Secretaries, we find that we do not aggregate one-half of what the Secretary considers an humble standard! The boasted success of the Secretariat consists in bringing the churches up to less than one-half of an humble standard of giving, and to one-fourth or one-sixth of what other evangelical churches give!! We think we may pause here, and allow this statement from exalted official authority to exert its own legitimate influence.

In regard to the fierce assaults that are made upon all who dare to inquire into our machinery, or suggest any modifications, we beg to remark, that, as this work is conducted in the name of the Church, her humblest members have the right of free inquiry and of a knowledge of all the details of our mode of operation. The Church in this day will not long tolerate a close corporation within her limits, and her confidence can only be secured by a response to a claim similar to that which Mr. Adams is now making of the railroad corporations, viz., of absolute transparency of operation. Just so long as the Church conducts any enterprises, so long must her presbyters inspect and watch their opera-

tion. The Secretary's opposition to this discussion is disposed of by a simple consideration. If we agree with the Secretary in holding that our machinery is a human expedient, which we have a right to fashion according as our circumstances may demand, then the discussion of our machinery is always in order. If we agree with the Secretary that our present plan is not in accordance with the apostolic mode, and disagree with him, and hold that nothing is lawful which is not warranted by the word, then of course we must use all legitimate means to secure conformity to the word. There is no occasion for anything but a calm discussion of principles, in a fraternal spirit. It is absurd to ask that the discussion cease.

In the language of the Minority Report we claim that "the plan of reform proposes the recovery of our Church from her wide departure from the requirements of the word of God. We present to-day the remarkable spectacle of a Church possessing a written Constitution which most distinctly formulates the teaching of the Scriptures as to the doctrine of the Presbyterate, and the doctrines of the Diaconate, and yet of a Church which, through its highest court, ignores the practice of the apostles, contravenes the requirements of the Scripture and the provisions of our Constitution; mingles the characteristic functions of two distinct orders in the Church, becomes the temptress of her own ministers, and offers to those who profess to be called by the Holy Ghost to labor in word and doctrine, a premium to demit the essential and characteristic functions of the ministry, to leave the word of God to serve tables.

"In the estimation of some, this is a mere abstraction. There are those who sneer at the statement of a principle as a controlling factor in practical matters. But let it be remembered that none can calculate the influence of any deviation from the requirements of the word, in dwarfing the spiritual life of the members of Christ's body. Who can say that we have not been prevented from going up and possessing the land, because God has a controversy with us? Error in its minutest form is a terrible curse. It is the truth, and the truth alone, that can make us free. We shall never fully realise our great commission, and accomplish the work

to which God has called us, until we are relieved from what the great Thornwell denominated the incumbrance of being 'hewers of wood and drawers of water,' and are restored to the simplicity of the primitive Church, trusting not to franchises and endowments and investments in stocks and bonds and worldly goods, but relying on the mighty influence of the word of God, and on the power of the Holy Spirit. We can never successfully combat the power of this world with its own weapons. All the stocks and bonds, the gold and silver of the universe, were of no avail to us if we have not the approving smile of Christ and the presence and power of the Holy Ghost. With these we will have all things needful; but these we cannot claim if we depart from Christ's methods, and substitute the *wisdom of man for the power of God.*"

S. T. MARTIN.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Great Baptizer. A Bible History of Baptism. By SAMUEL J. BAIRD D. D. "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Matt. iii. 17. Philadelphia: James H. Baird, 1882. Pp. 489, 12mo.

Dr. Baird says: "Heretofore the discussion of the subject (of Baptism) has been little more than a disputation alike uninteresting, inconclusive, and unprofitable, concerning the word *baptizo*. The present treatise is an attempt to lift the subject out of the low rut in which it has thus traversed." "The recent researches of Drs. Conant and Dale have exhausted the philological argument as concerning *baptizo*. The former, representing the American (*Baptist*) Bible Union, and the latter, from the opposite stand-point, have come to conclusions which, to all the practical purposes of the discussion, are identical and final. Essentially, they agree (1) that *baptizo* never means to dip, that is, to put into the water and take out again; but, primarily, to put into or under the water—to bring into a state of mersion or intusposition; (2) that it also means to bring into a new state or condition by the exercise of a pervasive control, as one who is intoxicated is said to be *baptized with wine*. The former of these meanings is all that remains to the Baptist argument from the word. The latter is all that is desired by those who repudiate immersion. The philological discussion being thus brought to a practical termination, the occasion seems opportune for inviting attention to the real issues involved in the question respecting the form of the ordinance; and to the reasons and abundant testimonies of the Scriptures as to its origin and office, its mode and meaning, its history and associations."

This elaborate and very valuable volume is divided into two books. Book I. gives us, in six parts, THE OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY of Baptism. Part I. discusses, in six sections, *Baptism at Sinai*; Part II., in six sections, *The Visible Church*; Part III. in twelve sections, *Administered Baptisms=Sprinklings*; Part IV., in nine sections, *Ritual Self-washings*; Part V., in eleven

sections, *Later Traces of the Sprinkled Baptisms*; Part VI., in one section, *State of the Old Testament Argument*.

Book II. gives us, in ten parts, the *New Testament History*. Part VII. is *introductory*; Part VIII. discusses, in five sections, *the Purifyings of the Jews*; Part IX., in six sections, *John's Baptism*; Part X., in three sections, *Christ's Baptisms and Anointing*; Part XI., in fourteen sections, *Christ the Great Baptizer*; Part XII., in six sections, *The Baptist Argument*; Part XIII., in three sections, *Baptismal Regeneration*; Part XIV., in five sections, *The New Testament Church*; Part XV., in nine sections, *Christian Baptism*; Part XVI., in three sections, *The Family and the Children*. And then comes the *Conclusion*.

Among the points which our author is satisfied that he has established from his examination of the Old Testament History are these:

1. Baptism at the time of Christ's coming was a rite familiar among the Jews and not a new institute.
2. It was an ordinance imposed at Sinai as part of the Levitical system.
3. There is no trace of immersion in the Levitical law.
4. There is no allusion in the Old Testament to immersion as a symbolic rite, but many references to pouring and sprinkling.
5. The Baptisms therefore to which Paul refers as "imposed" on Israel could not have been immersions, and the word *baptizo*, in his vocabulary did not mean to immerse.

In the introduction to his examination of the New Testament History, Dr. Baird begins with noticing the precise state of the question at this stage of his enquiries, and he finds two rites presenting themselves and claiming each to be what Christ commanded to be administered to all nations. The one is the ritual sprinkling of water perfectly familiar to the Old Testament Church, and coming to the Church of the New Testament, hoary and venerable, embalmed and hallowed, and fragrant with the profoundest and most precious experiences of God's people for fifteen centuries. The other rite is immersion as a symbol of the burial of the Lord. No antiquity is claimed for it beyond the resurrection of the Saviour. It has no precedent in the Levitical law, or any where else in the Old Testament. Its evidence stands wholly in defini-

tions contrary to the unanimous testimony of lexicographers. And in the relations and details of this rite, incongruity and contradiction are both conspicuously displayed. If baptism, like all sacraments, is a typical seal of the new covenant, then the administrator represents the Lord Jesus; but if baptism is by immersion to represent the burial of Jesus, then the administrator represents Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus! Again, living water is the scriptural symbol of the Holy Spirit; but according to the immersion theory, the dipping of the person in this element represents the consigning of the body of Jesus to the grave, which is the den of corruption and death! Moreover, the resemblance of immersion to burial is a transparent misconception. In the sense required by immersion Jesus never was "buried." The sepulchre of Joseph was not a grave dug down into the earth, but a spacious above-ground chamber.

These brief statements are all that our space allows us to make respecting this very interesting and timely volume.

J. B. A.

The Truth at Last. History Corrected. Reminiscences of Old John Brown, with full details of the Pottawattamie Massacre, etc., etc. By G. W. BROWN, M. D. When thou findest a lie that is oppressing thee, extinguish it. Lies exist only to be extinguished. Rockford, Illinois: Published by the author, to whom address orders. 1880. Pp. 88., 8vo. Mailed to any address for 25 cents.

The author of this work was an early and earnest friend of "Free Kansas," and a most devoted laborer and sufferer in her cause. It was he who printed the first Free State newspaper in the Territory, "*The Herald of Freedom.*" He went to Kansas in the autumn of 1854, taking a party of nearly three hundred with him from Pennsylvania, his wife, parents, sister, and brother, and nearest friends, *all* being with him, and imbued thoroughly with anti-slavery sentiments, and all going there to help make Kansas a free State. At the close of the war, in 1865, considering his mission accomplished, he bade adieu to Kansas and moved back to Illinois. Qualified thus to give a fair account of Kansas matters from the Republican point of view, he attended, in Sep-

tember, 1879, a gathering of the "Old Settlers of Kansas," near Lawrence city, and while there repeatedly hears John Brown lauded as the savior of Kansas from slavery, to whom a monument had just been erected at Ossawatimie, and a statue of whom it was proposed to send to Washington, to be set up in the national capitol. Knowing how unworthily all this honor was heaped upon this old man, and solicited by Gov. Charles Robinson, one of his fellow-sufferers and fellow-actors in the Kansas drama, to sit down and furnish the real facts, which might "enable the historian to know where to put John Brown" in the history of his State, he writes this volume and sends it forth, pricking thus the bubbles blown up to such huge dimensions by Redpath and others in favor of "Old John Brown," and contributing what he may to dispel the halo which our Northern brethren have delighted so long to hang over his name and memory. •

Sensational writers (says Dr. Brown) endorsing one another, such as Redpath, Philips, Realf, and Hinton (all Englishmen), threw a false glare over the Harper's Ferry hero, magnifying many times his meritorious deeds, but concealing his vices and crimes. The future historian (he says) has a Herculean task before him, if he would prevent admiring generations from converting a creature of the mere fancy into a god, to be worshipped. Young men, inexperienced in practical life, imbued with the wildest enthusiasm, flooded this country with letters wholly devoid of truth, and have given a false coloring to history, which it must take many years to remove. As a result, thousands of the American people honor John Brown as a martyr of freedom. The armies that invaded the South sang war songs about Old John Brown's soul marching on as their leader. The *American Cyclopaedia* (our author says) made its article on John Brown by simply abridging Redpath's book, who was (he says) utterly untrustworthy, drawing all the time on his imagination for his facts. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* (he thinks) borrows from the other, and French and German publications from it, and so Falsehood travels many a league while Truth is putting on his boots. French sympathisers struck off a gold medal, "*To the memory of John Brown, judicially assassinated at Charlestown, the 2d December,*

1859, and to that of his sons and of his companions who died victims of their devotion to the cause of the liberty of the Blacks." And Ralph Waldo Emerson is credited with blasphemously saying: "The time will come when the gallows of Old John Brown will be glorious like the cross of Christ."

We are introduced to John Brown at the beginning of this history as he made his appearance, in August, 1855, at an "Ultra Abolitionist" convention somewhere in Central New York. The famous Gerrit Smith presided. "A gentleman standing six feet in his boots, thin face, dark complexion, with flowing beard and gray hair, rose and said that he had four sons in Kansas, and three others who wished to join them there, but they had no funds to pay their way; besides, he was opposed to sending any person there without arms; that he was a firm believer in the doctrine, that 'without the shedding of blood there was no remission,' " and he then proposed that the Convention, if in earnest, arm and send his three boys to Kansas with arms for the other four, and that he would go with them, and would promise a good report of their doings.

The next day Gerrit Smith, in open session, presented John Brown seven voltaic repeaters, seven broad-swords, seven muskets with bayonets, and a purse of gold, and told him to go to Kansas with his boys and fight for human freedom.

On the 24th of the following May, there occurred a horrible massacre of five men on Pottawattamie Creek. The murdered men were taken from their homes in the dark night (one from the bed of his sick wife, unable to help herself), and they were severally put to death and mutilated. The book before us leaves no room to doubt that this was the work of old John Brown and a few others whom he led. In the language of Col. Blood, a leading Free State man of Kansas, who met John Brown and his party near the Pottawattamie settlement a few hours before the massacre, and who observed the "wild frenzied looks of Brown and his party:" "When I heard of the massacre, I could not resist the conviction that it was done with those Scotch claymores."

The Eastern press (says Dr. Brown) were not content to make him a model hero in almost every direction, but they gave him

credit for fighting bravery, where battles were never fought; made him a leader, where he did not command; represented him a veteran warrior, while he was only a stripling of fourteen and eight hundred miles distant from the battle; made him defend a town against a heavy invading force, where every one fled to the bush; said he was the savior of a city, where the enemy did not fire a gun; represented him as a grower of blooded stock, which to put it mildly, he *pressed* from their owners; as a heavy landed proprietor in Kansas, where he never owned a rood; as having his home in Kansas, when it was in northeastern New York; and his wife as being insulted and abused, when she was a thousand miles away from the place of the pretended outrage. Even the portraits exhibited by the admirers of old John Brown are *frauds*—the pictures of a man much younger, “probably John Brown the wool buyer, certainly not John Brown the guerrilla chieftain.”

They credited him (our author says) with making Kansas a Free State, whereas he only threw obstacles in the way of that result. And last of all, “*John Brown’s Cabin*,” thousands of pictures of which were sold at the Centennial in Philadelphia at high prices, and which figures in the first biennial report of the State Board of Agriculture of Kansas as the veritable cabin, was a *fraud* upon the credulous enthusiasts who loved to heap glory on their hero. The Hon. James Hanway, of Lane, Franklin County, Kansas, publicly declared, in 1879, that a photographer having taken a picture of an old log cabin on his place, asked him, what shall we call it? He said, Let us call it “*John Brown’s Cabin*,” and under this name the artist got his work received by the public. The author says: “Governor Anthony aided and abetted in extending and perpetrating this fraud by sending a copy of the engraving to a subscription club in Paris, telling them that it was still standing as it did when it domiciled the old hero during his residence in Kansas.” “But (adds Judge Hanway) John Brown never owned a cabin nor any land in Kansas.” (See pp. 50, 56, 57.)

Dr. Brown closes his History with a letter he received from the Hon. Eli Thayer, of Massachusetts, who had more to do with making Kansas a free State than perhaps any other individual.

Mr. Thayer says it would have been "fortunate for the afflicted territory of Kansas if Brown had never come at all." "He had nothing in common with the Free State settlers and came not as they, to make a free State, but to incite a Northern rebellion against the government of the Union." It seems that John Brown, under pretence of furnishing protection to some Free settlements in Kansas from the "Border Ruffians," induced Mr. Thayer to let him have certain arms, which he actually made use of in his attack upon the United States Arsenal at Harper's Ferry, and those arms were captured, which, of course, puts the Hon. Eli Thayer under a strong necessity to expose and denounce the old hero. Mr. Thayer is very definite in proving that John Brown had the *leader's part* in the Potawattamie massacre, and he also declares that before his attack on the arsenal, he spent weeks in Virginia, pretending to be a mineralogist, breaking off corners of rock with his hammer, but under the pretext of searching for copper getting opportunities to try and "enlist the slaves in his rebellion." Mr. Thayer concludes his letter thus: "But whether sane or insane, he acted well the part of the *heavy villain* in the Kansas drama. Now, 'his soul goes marching on!' Well, let it march—until it shall become infinitely remote." J. B. A.

A History of Presbyterianism in New England: its Introduction, Growth, Decay, Revival, and Present Mission. By ALEXANDER BLAIKIE, D. D., for thirty-three years pastor of the (U.) First Presbyterian Church, Boston, author of "The Philosophy of Sectarianism," etc., etc. Boston: Published for the author by Alexander Moore, No. 3, School Street. 1881. Pp. 512, 12mo.; price \$2, sent by mail.

Dr. Blaikie in his Dedication to Presbyterians in New England, says quaintly, but truly: "Both Prelacy and Congregationalism borrow our axle to keep their wheels in motion. They could not usefully exist without at least some consultative, if not judicial, representation."

In the Council at Edinburgh, in 1877, no less than forty-nine divisions were found taking shelter under the general name of *Presbyterians*—so much for the freedom of thinking which

Calvinism cultivates and encourages. Our author "cannot harmonise (he says) with the largest portion of the Presbyterian family in the United States." "They have become not a little Congregationalised." He is a minister of the United Presbyterian Church. Yet his history is intended to set forth all that has happened to the various branches of the family in New England. His work is written to make known "something of the doctrine, faithfulness, endurance, and success, or otherwise, of Presbyterians in former generations here—under the overshadowing influence of a different Church policy—sustained by the civil power." "The first authoritative and official civil action against Presbyterianism in New England, was taken in 1643, or 1644," (says Dr. Blaikie, quoting from Hutchinson's History of Massachusetts,) "for several persons who came from England in 1643 made a muster to set up Presbyterian government under the authority of the Assembly at Westminster, but a New England Assembly, the general court, soon put them to the rout." "Freedom to worship God" was for Congregationalists only, and not for Presbyterians, under the "theocratic form of the union between Church and State" which the Pilgrim fathers set up.

"The first numerous arrival of Presbyterians in New England after A. D. 1640, were bondsmen. They were transported from their native land, and sold in America, for fidelity to their oaths of allegiance to King Charles the Second. They had sworn to their own hurt, and they would not change." They were sold, not to perpetual bondage, but for six, seven, or eight years. When their years of servitude expired, these Scotch and Irish people, being dissenters from the established religious order of New England, to whom no ecclesiastical organisation was permitted, returned to their native land, went to other provinces, or were absorbed by the churches of New England.

English-speaking people being thus hindered from introducing Presbyterianism into the New England Colonies, it had a second advent in the persons of French Huguenots. "The facts that they were refugees, and that they conducted their religious worship in an unknown tongue, protected them from scourging and cropping; yet it took twelve years (after they had purchased

and paid for their lot) of humble supplication to allow them to erect a Presbyterian church on the soil of Massachusetts," p. 35. In 1716 they got leave to put up a brick building 30 by 35 feet. The Huguenots dying out, this house was sold, in 1748, to a Congregational Society "to be for the sole use of a Protestant church forever." But it had a strange fate. In violation of the deed, it was sold to the Roman Catholics, and became the first domicile of Papal superstition in Massachusetts.

The Scotch-Irish immigration into New England began in 1718. Their reception was not very friendly. In 1719 a company of them commenced the erection of a Presbyterian meeting house. "The inhabitants gathered tumultuously by night, hewed down and demolished the structure. Persons of consideration and respectability aided in the riotous work of violence" (p. 53). This statement is taken from the *History of Worcester* by Wm. Lincoln, Esq.

Dr. Blaikie's history brings down the records of Presbyterianism in New England to 1881. It is a very minute and elaborately detailed statement, bearing the marks of honest truth upon its face. The record is not honorable to the fathers of New England, whom the author displays as full of intolerance. Seeking for "freedom to worship God" themselves, they denied it fiercely and cruelly to others. Nor is the record honorable to modern Congregationalism. It is shown to be not maintaining its pristine purity in doctrine and worship. So far has it swept round the circle from the theology and the morality of the Puritans, that the very foundation of domestic life, the marriage relation, is tottering. About every twelfth marriage produces a divorce (p. 483). And the native religion of New England is waxing feeble for self-protection and perpetuity on its own soil. It will not now take a prophet's ken to see that in not above fifty years, the New England metropolis will become the most intensely Irish-Catholic city on the continent. In 1843 Boston proper was reported to have three churches of that denomination. In less than forty years these have increased to above one score, exclusive of the largest cathedral and the most capacious arch-episcopal residence in the land (p. 458).

Dr. Blaikie says, however, that it "will be eternally wrong to allow Popery and Infidelity to obliterate the Christian civilisation of 'the New England Primer.' New England must yet be redeemed by coming to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, and Presbyterians must make the experiment of assisting in the work, whether they succeed or not. Generations of errorists may flourish on that soil, but the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." J. B. A.

A Scriptural Argument. Infant Baptism in a Nut Shell:
By E. B. CRISMAN, D. D. Third edition. Revised and enlarged. Price forty cents. St. Louis, Mo. 1880. Pp. 104, 16mo.

Dr. Crisman is Secretary of the Board of Missions of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, St. Louis. He has given us an excellent discussion of Infant Baptism for popular use. We might criticise his language about the Lord's Supper and baptism *typifying* the two great facts of redemption, viz., Christ's sufferings and the new birth. If this be so, it is a little curious that the former fact is not set forth in the former ordinance, and the later fact in the second ordinance, but that the facts and the ordinances are put in reverse order. This, however, does not neutralise the great value of his general argument. As a specimen of the way in which he handles the views and practice of our Antipædo-Baptist friends, take the following: "When a shepherd gathers his flocks into the fold to protect them from ravenous wolves, he does not gather in the grown sheep and leave the lambs without. Why should the great Spiritual Shepherd pursue a different course in gathering his spiritual sheep into the spiritual fold? When the herdsman turns out his cattle in spring and summer to graze on the hill sides and valleys, he is careful that the young shall first be marked and branded with the same marks as the parent cattle bear. But our Baptist brethren would have us be less careful of our children in spiritual things than we are of our lambs, pigs, and calves in natural things" (pp. 30, 31).

"It is said that as children are incapable of exercising faith,

therefore they must not be baptized. Let us apply this argument to a few passages of Scripture, and see how much it proves more than enough. *First*, 'If any will not work neither shall he eat.' Children cannot work, therefore they must not eat. *Second*, 'Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.' Children cannot repent, therefore they must all perish. *Third*, 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' Children cannot believe, therefore they must be damned. And so on. As in the previous case, the argument proves far too much." J. B. A.

The Newer Criticism and the Analogy of the Faith: A Reply to Lectures by W. Robertson Smith, M. A., on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church. By ROBERT WATTS, D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the General Assembly's College, Belfast, Ireland. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1881. 12mo., pp. 320.

This timely volume is a formal and able reply to the work criticised in a previous article in this number of our REVIEW. Dr. Watts has confined himself to the third of the propositions advanced by Mr. Smith—that which asserts the late composition, and introduction into the Pentateuch, of the Levitical ritual. This position is discussed with learning and ingenuity, in eleven chapters. In these Dr. Watts shows that the principles of the newer criticism are unsound and unreasonable; that the conclusions, drawn from them are repugnant to all the established facts of the history; and that the theological consequences which flow from Mr. Smith's criticism are opposite to the Westminster doctrines. The latter is, perhaps, for Presbyterians, the most important part of the reply. The best advice we can give to those who have been disturbed by the reading of Mr. Smith's criticism, is, to reserve their opinion until they have given to Dr. Watts a thorough study. The incisiveness of his style may be judged from the following sentences. On Mr. Smith's remark, that "if we are shut up to choose between the traditional theory of the Pentateuch, and the sceptical opinion that the Bible is a forgery, the sceptics must gain their case," he replies: "The fact is, his theory leaves no room for choice. . . . One cannot choose between

such a theory and scepticism, for the simple reason that there is no difference between the two things. . . . The ever-recurring principle, in obedience to which the Old Testament record is to be not only revised, but recast, is, that the non-observance of a law proves its non-existence! Reversing the apostolic maxim, that 'where there is no law there is no transgression,' our critic proceeds throughout upon the assumption that where there is transgression there is no law." R. L. D.

Bible Terminology relative to the Future Life. An Enquiry into the meaning of the principal Scriptural terms touching the Nature and Destiny of Man. By J. H. PETTINGELL, A. M.: a Congregational minister, formerly District Secretary of the American Board of Foreign Missions, late Chaplain at Belgium, Author of "Homiletical Index," "Theological Trilemma," "Will Satan Live Forever?" "Platonism versus Christianity," &c., &c. Philadelphia: The Bible Banner Association, J. D. Brown, Agent, 506 Minor Street. 1881. Pp. 276. 12mo.

The author tells us this is a fragment—a portion of a volume to be entitled "*The Life Everlasting: What is it? Whence is it? Whose is it?*" The first chapter was given to the public under the title, *Platonism versus Christianity*. What is now before us is chapter second. Other chapters are to follow, and then the whole be published together in one volume.

The doctrine of the book is that since the fall, death terminates the natural life of every man, and that the life hereafter is *not natural*, but *supernatural*, and that it is only through the death and resurrection of Christ that there is any resurrection or life whatever for man hereafter. It teaches the resurrection of all the dead, and the general judgment both of the righteous and the wicked, and the absolute finality of the judgment; but that in the *second death* the wicked are absolutely and literally destroyed and cease to exist, while upon the righteous life everlasting is conferred through Christ the Saviour, and that that is the unspeakable gift spoken of by the Apostle. Touching believers who have departed, the doctrine is that they are, all of them, in a deep unconscious sleep. The author appears to be a Christian

man, and is very confident that he has discovered the truth where so many other good men from the beginning have been misled. He boasts continually of deriving his doctrine directly from the Word of God, literally and fairly interpreted. But we have only room to say that he seems to us to misinterpret what the inspired Apostles say both as to the state of the departed believer now and as to the everlasting punishment of the formerly impenitent; and in a very remarkable manner to pass over without notice (so far as we discovered) the awful declarations of the Lord himself, who certainly exceeded every one of his servants in the fulness and the terribleness of his descriptions of the endless future misery of ungodly men.

J. B. A.

The Priest, the Woman, and the Confessional. By FATHER CHINIQUI. Montreal: F. E. Grafton. Pp. 184. 8vo.

The author of this book is the Rev. C. Chiniqui, whose exodus from Rome in French Canada excited so much interest thirty years ago. Since that time he has become the faithful pastor of a great company of reformed French Papists, who emigrated from Canada and found a refuge in the State of Illinois.

This is a fearful revelation, by an eye-witness, of the tendencies of Romanism, and especially of her prime instrument of spiritual despotism, auricular confession, and of the actual morals of Popish priests and their victims. It has been well said of the book that it is one which every father of a family ought to read, in order to open his eyes to the nature of the foe from which he has to protect his household, but which he ought then to burn. By this it is not meant to intimate that the author has exhibited any pruriency in his method of bearing his testimony. On the contrary, every word of his portraiture is guarded by sanctity, and animated only by a shuddering horror of the iniquities he has to expose. But these iniquities are such as only the duties of our guardianship over souls should make us willing to know.

We have found this book what we did not expect—an able and scholarly argument against the pretended authority for auricular confession, as well as an indictment of its foulness. Father Chiniqui proves that it was not only not sanctioned, but expressly

denounced, by the Fathers of the Greek and Latin Churches, and that it was a mere invention of priestcraft in the age when priestcraft was blackest in its crimes. X.

A History of Rowan County, North Carolina, containing Sketches of Prominent Families and Distinguished Men, with an Appendix. By Rev. JETHRO RUMPLE. Published by J. J. Bruner, Salisbury, N. C. 1881. Pp. 508, 24mo.

This little book contains just what might be expected to grow out of researches by one possessed of antiquarian genius and tastes into the early records preserved in the Court House at Salisbury. Old North Carolina is a great State. Her people are intelligent, enterprising, industrious, brave, and true-hearted; and they played a great part both in the Revolutionary war and in the late war between the States. North Carolina Presbyterians are the very best sort—true blue—and the respected author of this History one of their most valued and useful ministers. He has made a readable and entertaining book, which we commend to all who are interested in the past, present, and future of the Carolinas. J. B. A.

The Parables of Jesus. By the Rev. ALFRED NEVIN, D. D., LL.D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1334 Chestnut Street. Pp. 503. 12mo.

We seldom meet with a new book more beautifully gotten up than this, though in the simplest and most unpretending style of simplicity and neatness. Our old friends, Wescott & Thomson, of Philadelphia, who brought out the *Collected Writings of Dr. Thornwell*, and with whom we had so long and so pleasant relations in the course of their publication, are the stereotypers and electrotypers of this volume; and the copyright is the property of the Trustees of the Presbyterian Board of Publication of the Northern Church.

The thirty-one parables of our Lord are here explained sensibly and judiciously, and the book will be interesting and attractive to many. It deals not in criticism, but in lecturing. It is not a volume of expositions, but short sermons on the parables.

The author was "much more anxious to prove useful than to be esteemed original," and has therefore "gathered from every available source whatever would subserve" his purpose. He has sought to be "free from the parade of scholarship or the vanity of speculation," and to "meet the capacity and satisfy the needs of ordinary minds."

J. B. A.

Mottoes for the New Year, as given in Texts of Sermons Preached in the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. By HENRY A. BOARDMAN, D. D. Philadelphia: E. Claxton & Company, No. 930, Market Street. 1882. Pp. 274, 8vo.

These sermons were preached on New Year's day (or, rather, on the first Sunday) of each year during some fifteen years of Dr. Boardman's long pastorate. Some of these mottoes are as follows: "God is my Helper;" "This is my Friend;" "For to me to live is Christ;" "Waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ;" "To every man his work;" "A little while." The sermons are extremely well written, and the style carefully polished and pleasing, but having more finish than force. Yet they are earnest and eloquent exhibitions of important truth, which must have edified his people when heard by them, and will edify any candid reader now. One thing we note with especial satisfaction: several of them were delivered during the dark days of the war, and the preacher made distinct and decided reference to the contest that was raging; but all that he says is without any tincture of unchristian or even partisan spirit. Not a word uttered by the preacher could have given offence to a Southern man present, and not a word would have been unbecoming in a Southern preacher's lips. What was uttered by Dr. Boardman was what any good man in any section of this broad land might well have said, considering the melancholy condition of his country in the midst of the terrors of war.

J. B. A.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The "Speaker's Commentary," as it is popularly styled, is the best work extant for intelligent readers who may happen to be imperfect linguists, and yet wish to be put abreast of the latest results of critical investigation.¹ It is sound according to the ideas of soundness which are in vogue in the orthodox wing of the Church of England. The learned Bishop of Peterborough (the eminent Hebraist) is doing a good work in laying these scholarlike expositions² of particular books of the Old Testament before the ordinary student of the vernacular Scriptures. Mr. Streane's contribution to the literature of Jeremiah³ is well spoken of; and Dr. Plumptre's distinguished name is associated with an ingenious and valuable interpretation of Ecclesiastes.⁴ We do not accept without *caveat* the view that the work is by a later hand than that of the Preacher himself. The Commentary⁴ of Mr. Hammond is of a different sort, and is meant to be helpful in the way of homiletical suggestions. Dr. Brunton's plea for Evolution⁵ as in harmony with revelation contains an excellent summary of several of the physical sciences. Its apologetic value can be estimated when it is known that the author treats the narrative of the creation of Eve as an accommodation to human ideas.

¹The Bible Commentary. New Testament. Edited by F. C. Cook, M. A., Canon of Exeter, Vol. III., Romans to Philemon. Pp. 844. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. Price \$5.

²The Cambridge Bible for Schools. General Editor, J. J. S. Perowne, D. D. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, together with the Lamentations, with marginal notes and introduction. By the Rev. A. W. Streane, M. A. 8vo., pp. 404.

³Ecclesiastes: or, the Preacher. With notes and introduction by Professor E. H. Plumptre, D. D. 8vo., pp. 271. Printed at the University Press, Cambridge, 1881. Macmillan & Co., New York, 1881.

⁴Pulpit Commentary on First Kings. By the Rev. Jos. Hammond, LL. B., B. A. 4to., pp. 564, cloth, \$3.50. A. D. F. Randolpp & Co., New York.

⁵The Bible and Science. By T. Lauder Brunton, M. D., D. Sc., F. R. S., etc. Pp. 440, illustrated. London, 1881, Macmillan & Co.

Why not apply the same process to the narrative of the incarnation, of the crucifixion, and the last judgment? Professor Milligan of Aberdeen comes before us with an interesting, and, in the main, commendable argument respecting the Resurrection, which is, however, marred by an erratic and even heterodox view of the Atonement.¹ Professor Ladd's important treatise on "Church Policy"² should not be characterised hastily. "The Orthodox Theology of To-day"³ seeks to imbue the thought and feeling of the American Church with something of the "Johannean" spirit of Schleiermacher, (!) Neander, Rothe, and Dorner. There is an element of good in this effort, but the modes are extreme ones, and the tendency is pushed too far. "The Conflicts of the Age"⁴ administers one of the most trenchant and effective blows that Agnosticism has yet received.

The value of a good index in the case of a worthy book is at all times great; but the value of a good index to such a work as Lange's Commentary⁵ is great in the highest degree. The chief objections to "Lange's" are, that it is so utterly heterogeneous, and that, notwithstanding there are many good things in it, there is often as much difficulty about the task of finding one of them as there is in the quest for a needle in a bundle of hay. The more Dr. Phelps's "Theory of Preaching"⁶ is examined, the more it is admired and applauded. Dr. Charles Robinson⁷ has succeeded in

¹The Resurrection of our Lord. By William Milligan, D. D. The Croall Lecture for 1879-80. London, 1881. *Ibid.*

²The Principles of Church Policy. By Professor George T. Ladd, D. D. Crown octavo, pp. 458, cloth, \$2.50. Ch. Scribner's Sons.

³The Orthodox Theology of To-day. By Newman Smyth. Pp. 190, 12mo. New York. 1881. *Ibid.*

⁴The Conflicts of the Age. Containing (1) An Advertisement for a new Religion, by an Evolutionist; (2) The Confession of an Agnostic, by an Agnostic; (3) What Morality have we left? by a New-Light Moral-ist; (4) Review of the Fight, by a Yankee Farmer. N. Y. *Ibid.*

⁵Hebrew and English Index to the Fourteen Volumes of Lange's Commentary on the Old Testament. By the Rev. B. Pick. 8vo., pp. 650, paper, 50c. *Ibid.*

⁶The Theory of Preaching; Lectures on Homiletics. By Austin Phelps, D. D. N. Y., 1881. 8vo., pp. 610. *Ibid.*

⁷Studies in the New Testament, By the Rev. C. S. Robinson, D. D., 12mo. *Ibid.*

making two of the best hymn books. His exegetical venture has also been received with marks of favor. The famous author of "A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life"¹ was a man of remarkable genius, remarkable force of character, remarkable piety, and remarkable eccentricity. The present biography is pronounced one of first-rate excellence, and is a convenient horn-book in Mysticism. Johnson's and Gibbon's praise, and Macaulay's diatribes, will not be forgotten. Principal Fairbairn² of Bradford has done well in giving us "Studies" in the life of our Lord, rather than something after the manner of Farrar or Geikie. Dr. Bruce's little volume on the End of Revelation³ does not ring clear on the subject of Miracles and Prophecy, and the relation they sustain to the divine message. His catholicity of feeling is unquestioned; but in avoiding narrowness of view and sentiment, he becomes latitudinarian, both in reference to creed and polity. This book advocates the very hazardous and prohibited experiment of a reconstruction of the Church on a new and wide basis. Pastor Bersier is confessedly one of the first pulpit orators and most attractive writers of Protestant France, and his new volume of Sermons⁴ is said to compare favorably not only with others of his own, but with those of other and even more celebrated men. The two best contemporary treatises on Hermeneutics are those of Immer and the one now offered us by Professor Cellerier.⁵ Both are translated into good English. The French work surpasses the German in the charm of its diction and manner of presentation.

¹ William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic: A Sketch of his Life, Character, and Opinions. By J. H. Overton, M. A., Vicar of Legbourne, etc. London, Longmans, Green & Co. 1881.

² Studies in the Life of Christ. By the Rev. A. M. Fairbairn, D. D., Principal of Airedale College, Bradford. 12mo., cloth, \$1.75. D. Appleton & Co., N. Y.

³ The Chief End of Revelation. By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D. 12mo., pp. 278. New York, A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

⁴ St. Paul's Vision, and other Sermons. By the Rev. Eugene Bersier. Translated by Marie Stewart. 12mo., cloth, price \$1.50. *Ibid.*

⁵ Biblical Hermeneutics. Chiefly a translation of the "Manuel d'Hermeneutique," by Prof. J. E. Cellerier, of Geneva. By Charles Elliott, D. D., and the Rev. W. J. Harsha. Cloth, 12mo., price \$1.50. *Ibid.*

We have already spoken of Godet¹ as one of the princes of Israel. "Sin and Salvation"² are the marrow of all vital theology, and of all genuine Christian experience. The only infallible diagnosis of the one, and the only effectual method of the other, are to be found in "The Gospel of Christ."³ We rejoice to know that the marvellous dreamer (who may be styled the Shakespeare of religious allegory) is as popular as ever. Regarded merely as a noble specimen of the older monosyllabic English, the "Pilgrim's Progress" is alone enough to weigh down whole libraries of other volumes. Its value as a practical guide, especially to the humble class of believers, is simply incalculable. This is the showy Elstow edition.⁴ We hail with joy the lives of two such men as Bishop Janes⁶ and Bishop McIlvaine.⁵ The writer of these cursory jottings well remembers the glow of pleasure with which he once listened to the Episcopal prelate, whose career is appropriately delineated in one of these memoirs.⁵ This godly man was thoroughly evangelical, and was educated at Princeton Seminary. No one in his denomination overtopped him in abilities or influence.

We are not struck by the felicity of the title of last year's Bampton Lecturer,⁷ but the subject of his discourses is, one of the

¹ Lectures in Defence of the Christian Faith. By Professor F. Godet. Translated by W. H. Lyttleton, M. A. 12mo., cloth, price \$1.25. *Ibid.*

² Sin and Salvation. By Henry A. Nelson. Cloth, 12mo., price \$1. *Ibid.*

³ The Gospel of Christ. By Anthony W. Thorold, D. D. 16mo., pp. 219, cloth, \$1.25. *Ibid.*

⁴ The Pilgrim's Progress. By John Bunyan. The Elstow Edition, with Memoir and Biographical Notes. Illustrations by W. Gunston and others, engraved by R. Patterson. 8vo., pp. lvi. and 384, \$3.50. London, John Walker & Co.; New York. *Ibid.*

⁵ Memorials of the Right Reverend Charles Pettit McIlvaine, D. D., D. C. L., late Bishop of Ohio, in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. Edited by the Rev. William Carus, M. A., Canon of Winchester Cathedral, formerly Senior Fellow of Trinity College, and incumbent of Great St. Mary's, Cambridge. New York, Thomas Whitaker, No. 2, Bible House, 1881.

⁶ The Life of Edmund S. Janes, D. D., LL. D., late senior Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Henry B. Ridgway, D. D. 12mo. pp. 428, cloth, \$1.50; half morocco, \$2.25. (Phillips & Hunt.)

⁷ The One Religion: Truth, Holiness, and Peace desired by the Na-

profoundest interest and moment. The idea of this particular series might have had an air of greater originality, had it not been preceded (if not suggested) by Trench's Hulsean Lectures on "Christ the Desire of all Nations." The Episcopal Bishop of Albany, as the son of the late Bishop Doane,¹ of New Jersey, ought to be very High-Church, but is undoubtedly a man of talents, and a man of society as well as a man of books. He is a good speaker, and his personality is in Albany regarded as an impressive one. Out of his own diocese Dr. Doane is hardly so considerable a man as from his aspect and port one would be inclined to suspect that he fancies he is. The Reverend Phillips Brooks² is an effective pulpit orator as well as a brilliant and attractive rhetorician and suggestive sermoniser. He is Broad-Church after the fashion, though hardly to the extent, of F. W. Robertson. He opposes "election," scouts all judicial views of the atonement, advocates "The Accumulation of Faith," and exclaims against everything savoring of what he calls "Retrospective Christianity." From its very nature Christianity must in point of fact be at once "Retrospective and Prospective." The geographical and archaeological exploits of Selah Merrill in the lands of Moab, Gilead, and Bashan, were worthy of the chronicle they here find³ side by side with those of Robinson and Thompson in the region lying betwixt the river and the sea. The two other contributions to the enormous literature of Palestine, which we can do no more than mention, are of less significance, but each

tions and revealed by Jesus Christ. The Bampton Lectures for 1881. Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford in the year 1881. By the Rev. John Wordsworth, M. A. 8vo., pp. 392, \$3.50. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.

¹ Mosaics: or, The Harmony of Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the Sundays of the Christian Year. By the Rt. Rev. William Crosswell Doane, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of Albany. *Ibid.*

² The Candle of the Lord, and other Sermons. By the Rev. Phillips Brooks. 12mo., pp. 370. New York, 1881. *Ibid.*

³ East of the Jordan. By Selah Merrill, Archæologist of the American Palestine Exploration Society; with illustrations and a map. With an Introduction by Prof. R. D. Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1881. 8vo., pp. xvi., 550, \$4.

of them has its special claims on the attention of travelled and untravelled readers.^{1 2} The honored name of Dr. Lowrie³ stamps with importance anything he may have to say on the subject of the foreign work. We take it that Bishop Williams is of the Protestant Episcopal Church. At all events, works like this one,⁴ exhibiting the testimony of men to the Saviour, are to be welcomed, when they do not teach heresy. The Harpers are to be congratulated on the superb manner in which they have brought out the noble work of Mr. Norton on Mediæval Church Architecture,⁵ considered not only in its artistic, but in its historical, political, and religious connexions. Cassell's Popular Library is made up of good books for the people. The one on The Huguenots⁶ should be interesting to others besides the descendants of French Protestants. "Metaphysics"⁷ is a *mare magnum*, and in one sense almost a *mare clausum*, ever since the days of Ariostotle. The work of Mr. Bowne is a profound and novel, and at the same time a masterly and satisfactory treatment of this intricate subject. President Laws, of the University of Missouri, has also lately come forward with a sound, as well as a bold and trenchant, discussion of the same topic.⁸ His argument displays wide reading, and evinces aggressiveness and ability. Dr. Laws's coadjutors in the

¹ Palestine Explored. By the Rev. James Neill, M. A. 16mo., pp. 319, cloth, \$1.25. A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

² The Ride through Palestine. By the Rev. John Dulles, D. D. 12mo., pp. 528. Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board of Publication.

³ Missionary Papers. By John C. Lowrie. New York, Robert Carter & Brothers, 1881.

⁴ The World's Witness to Jesus Christ. Vol. I. Bidell Lectures. By the Rt. Rev. John Williams, Bishop of Connecticut. Cloth. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

⁵ Historical Studies of Church Building in the Middle Ages: Venice, Siena, Florence. By Charles Eliot Norton. 8vo., pp. 331. Harpers, New York.

⁶ The Huguenots. By Gustave Masson. Vol. X. of "Cassell's Popular Library." 16mo., pp. 192, paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c. Cassell, Petter Galpin & Co., New York.

⁷ Metaphysics. By Borden P. Bowne. 8vo., cloth, \$2.50. Harper & Bros., New York.

⁸ Public Lectures delivered in the Chapel of the University of Missouri, by members of the Faculty, 1878-9. Course II., Vol. I.

Faculty are also his associates in these Lectures, some of which are more than usually instructive. The plan of securing and printing such discourses is one which other institutions might find advantage in following. The Essays of Mr. Carson, of South Carolina, are represented as being thoughtful and worthy of preservation,¹ though not in the beaten track of the usual speculative literature of the day. Professor Watson, of Canada, honors the centennial year of the "Critic of Pure Reason" by a masterpiece of philosophical criticism of his own, in which both Kant and his empirical censors are taken to task, but especially such writers as Mr. Spencer and the late G. H. Lewes. The book was confessedly suggested by the similar one of Dr. Edward Caird, of Scotland.² Carpenter's fascinating theory as to the functions of the anterior portion of the cerebral hemispheres, has been greatly modified by later pathological and clinical researches, particularly by such successors of Flourens as Dr. Brown Sequard and Professor Ferrier. It is now pretty well demonstrated that the anterior lobes have far less to do than was previously supposed with the operation of the higher mental faculties, and that the sensorium itself must be referred to a more central region within the cranial circumference than earlier anatomists and physiologists allowed for. These later views are carefully considered and estimated in the standard work of Dr. Dalton,³ of which six editions were put forth before this one. If "Economics" is yet a fixed science, it is a branch of theoretical knowledge which cannot, as it would seem at present, be reduced to harmonious practice.⁴ We happen to know that one of the books of one of these Man-

¹ Essays: Theology and Philosophy. By W. B. Carson. Atlanta, Georgia: James P. Harrison & Co. Pp. 94. 1881.

² Kant and his English Critics: A Comparison of Critical and Empirical Philosophy. By John Watson, A. M., LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. New York: Macmillan & Co. Pp. xii., 402.

³ A Treatise on Human Physiology. Designed for the use of Students and Practitioners of Medicine. Seventh edition, thoroughly revised and re-written. By J. C. Dalton, M. D. With about 360 illustrations on wood. Svo., 900 pp. Henry C. Lea's Son & Co., Philadelphia.

⁴ The Elements of Economics. By Henry Dunning McCleod, M. A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-law

chester Professors¹ is the one chiefly relied upon by some of our most expert agricultural analysts. Mr. Roscoe is also the author of the admirable "Primer" of Chemistry, in the "Scientific Primer Series." An accomplished Frenchman has recently undertaken to account, not only in a general way, but in some detail, for the impression Demosthenes has made upon "the fierce democracy" of Athens and upon the world. The work is said to be an eminently successful one.² Mr. Freeman is one of the best informed of specialists,³ one of the boldest critics, and one of the most incisive writers of the age; and his violence of feeling and language on certain topics is all that militates against his claim to be one of the great historians of our time. The opportune⁴ is all the same with the welcome; and this may be said of the Chevalier de Hesse-Wartegg's octavo volume on the land of the Beys, of richly embroidered cigar-cases, and of olive wood snuff-boxes, black with short inscriptions in Hebrew. The gossip of famous courts makes up much of the interest of such writings as those of de Sevigne and St. Simon.⁵ Lady Jackson's brace of crown octavos⁵ derive additional attraction from the bearing which they have on the French Revolution. George Augustus Sala is selected by the Royal Commissioners for the digest of the law to prepare the digest of the law of bills of exchange, bank notes, etc.; Lecturer on Political Economy in the University of Cambridge. In two volumes. Vol. I., 12mo., cloth, \$1.75. D. Appleton & Co., New York.

¹A Treatise on Chemistry. By H. E. Roscoe, F. R. S., and C. Schorlemmer, F. R. S., Professors of Chemistry in the Victoria University, Owens College, Manchester. Volume 3. The Chemistry of the Hydrocarbons and their derivatives; or, Organic Chemistry. Part I., 8vo., cloth, \$5. *Ibid.*

²Political Eloquence in Greece—Demosthenes. With extracts from his Orations, and a Critical Discussion of the "Trial on the Crown." By L. Brédix. 1881. S. C. Griggs & Co., Chicago.

³The Historical Geography of Europe. By Edward A. Freeman, D. C. L., LL.D. New edition, revised by the author. Vol. I., Text, 654 pp. Vol. II., 65 colored maps. 2 Vols., 8vo., cloth, \$12.00. *Ibid.*

⁴Tunis: The Land and the People. By the Chevalier de Hesse-Wartegg. Illustrated. 8vo., 300 pp., \$3.60. Scribner & Welford, New York.

⁵The French Court and Society in the Reign of Louis XVI., and during the First Empire. By Catherine Charlotte, Lady Jackson. 2 Vols., large crown 8vo., with several portraits. \$9. *Ibid.*

a prince amongst the rabble of humdrum tourists and of slap-dash raconteurs, and deserves well of the South for his just and fascinating pictures of Richmond (a mere *silhouette*), Charleston, Atlanta, and especially New Orleans. The Paris of *L'Exposition Universelle* was, indeed, a marvellous contrast to that of the siege and the *Commune*.¹ The writer of these flying notes was there in the autumn of 1873, and again twice in the spring and summer of 1878: The original series of Illustrated Biographies of the Great Artists proved so popular, that a new series is now begun; and is opened fittingly with the names of Murillo and Meissonier.² Murillo's *chef d'œuvre* is at Madrid. He is equally happy in depicting ethereal blue-mantled virgins treading upon fleecy clouds and golden crescents, and in representing the dirty meals and bare-foot games of unkempt varlets on the common highway. Meissonier combines the minute and exquisite detail of such plain Dutch painters as Teniers, with the brilliancy and military *elan* of such soldierly artists as Vernet, and that superb Parisian finish of which Meissonier himself affords the unapproachable example. What literary and historic theme could be finer than "The England of Shakespeare?" Mr. John Richard Green and Mr. Richard Grant White have both handled it well, and another writer is announced as emulating their good example.³ A group^{4 5 6} of small, or smallish, volumes of what may be called legal *ana* are rendered all the more racy from the fact that two of them at least are of Irish parentage and complexion, and

¹ Paris Herself Again, 1878-79. By George Augustus Sala. New edition. With 350 illustrations. 12mo., 539 pp., cloth, \$2.25. *Ibid.*

² New Series of Illustrated Biographies of the Great Artists; each with from 8 to 15 illustrations. Vol. I.—Meissonier. Vol. II.—Murillo. Price per volume, \$1. *Ibid.*

³ The England of Shakespeare. By E. Goadby. 16mo., cloth, 50 cts.; paper, 25 cts. Cassel, Petter, Galpin & Co.

⁴ The Wit and Wisdom of the Bench and Bar. By the Hon. F. C. Moncrieff. Vol. XII. of Cassell's Popular Library. 16mo., 192 pp.; paper, 25 cts.: cloth, 50 cts. *Ibid.*

⁵ Barrington's Sketches of his own Times. By Sir Jonah Barrington. 12mo., cloth, \$1.50. P. J. Kenedy, New York.

⁶ Shiel's Sketches of the Irish Bar. By Richard Lalor Shiel. 12mo., cloth, \$1.50. *Ibid.*

are rotund and buoyant with the genial and yet caustic Irish energy and spirit. Mr. Cox is one of the most gifted and versatile of American politicians, and has already shown through the newspapers what interesting accounts he can give of portions of the region lying between Egypt and Labrador.¹ Mr. Morley is undoubtedly one of the most thorough *Belles Lettres* scholars in England, and has succeeded better, apparently, in his *résumé* of English literature under Victoria,² than in some of his previous efforts. The great blot on most of his writing is flagrant scepticism. We accept with gratitude Mr. Long's trim volume of ancient wisdom clad in Oriental garb.³ The fifth volume of Prince Metternich's Memoirs⁴ brings matters to a sort of crisis. The five years covered by it were years of prosperity and confidence at home, but of almost unvarying failure in policy abroad. This want of success in his foreign diplomacy did not in the least ruffle the *amour propre* of the astute and imperturbable statesman, but was readily attributed by him to the mad frenzy, as he regarded it, of the nascent spirit of democratic license. It would be about as easy to enclose the sea in a tub as to circumscribe the unwritten Constitution of England within the bounds of an American duodecimo. Yet Mr. Rannie may have done well to have undertaken this "outline."⁵ It is simply astonishing to buy a play of Shakespeare, neatly printed, for five cents.⁶ Professor Vance's books have discovered to us more in elocution than we

¹ Pole to Pyramids. By the Hon. S. S. Cox. 8vo., cloth. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

² Of English Literature in the Reign of Victoria. By Henry Morley, Cloth. *Ibid.*

³ Eastern Proverbs and Emblems Illustrating Old Truths. By the Rev. J. Long. 8vo., 280 pp. Cloth, \$1. I. K. Funk & Co., New York.

⁴ The Memoirs of Prince Metternich. Vol. V., 1830-1835. Edited by his son, Prince Richard Metternich. 8vo., 488 pp. Cloth, \$2.50. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.

⁵ Historical Outline of the English Constitution. By David Watson Rannie. 12mo., 192 pp. Cloth, \$1. *Ibid.*

⁶ Shakespeare's Othello, Merchant of Venice, Macbeth, As You Like It, Comedy of Errors, Hamlet, etc. 17 Vols., 16mo., 64 to 96 pp. each. Paper, 5 cts. each. William L. Allison & Son, New York.

had ever dreamed of previously.^{1 2} He is "Hyperion to a satyr," in comparison with not a few sciolists who pretend to take the place of the old Greek "rhetoricians" whom Tully journeyed into foreign lands to visit. After a careful study of Dr. Vance's lecture on "Emphasis," we do not shrink from the avowal that, in our opinion, it is the one thing we ever saw that is worth reading on that subject. Dr. Vance is a scholar and an accomplished gentleman, as well as a simple master of the art and theory of public speech. He is, moreover, a wonderfully impressive teacher, and as untiring and patient as he is apt and skilful.

¹The Philosophy of Emphasis: One of a Course of Lectures delivered at the University of North Carolina, 1881. By James J. Vance, LL.D. Baltimore: Printed by John B. Piet, No. 174, West Baltimore Street. Tall 12mo., pp. 55.

²Philosophic Elocution: Voice Culture. A Treatise on the Structure, Development, and Thorough Cultivation of the Voice for Oratory, Reading, etc., with appropriate Exercises, Praxis, and Selections. By James J. Vance, LL.D., Barrister at Law (England), Member of Canadian and American Bar. Tall 12mo., pp. xi. and 207.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

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

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

☞ All business communications should be addressed to the Proprietor, JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued until a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or after the first number of a volume is published.

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

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

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

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

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

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

Vol. XXXIII.

JULY, MDCCCLXXXII.

No. 3.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. THE CHRIST OF JOHN. By the Rev. Prof. L. G. BARBOUR, D. D., Richmond, Ky.,	439
II. PRESBYTERIAN ORDINATION NOT A CHARM, BUT AN ACT OF GOVERNMENT. By the late Rev. Dr. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,	463
III. MAN'S SYMPATHY WITH MAN, AND THE MEANS OF GRACE. By the Rev. FRANCIS P. MULLALLY, D. D., Walhalla, S. C.,	519
IV. DR. THORNWELL AND OUR CHURCH POLICY. By the Rev. J. A. QUARLES, D. D., Lexington, Mo.,	531
V. A BRIEF REPLY TO DR. WILSON ON OUR HOME MISSIONS. By the Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Pendleton, S. C.,	545
VI. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1882. By the Rev. W. E. BOGGS, D. D., Atlanta, Ga.,	553
VII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	591

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1882.

With the address of each subscriber, we now print the date of the last number for which he has paid. For example, those who have paid in full for the current volume—Vol. XXXIII.—will find after their names, "Oct. '82," which means that they have paid for the October number of 1882, and of course for all preceding it. If any one has paid for all past volumes, and one dollar on XXXIII., he will find "Jan." or "Jny, '82 and 25c.;" which means that he has paid for the January number of 1882, and 25 cents on the April number. And so in other cases.

Those who have not paid for the current volume will confer a favor by forwarding the amount due to JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C.

In compliance with the wishes of many friends, it is announced that hereafter, as a *general rule*, the names of writers for this REVIEW will be attached to their articles, and the initials of each to the critical notices.

The REVIEW will continue to be, as it has always been, an open journal, favoring free discussion within limits. More than ever it is desired to make it a representative of our whole Church, as its name imports, and a faithful exponent of the Calvinistic Theology and the Presbyterian Polity.

Communications for its pages may be addressed to JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C., or to ROBERT L. DABNEY, Hampden Sidney, Virginia, or to JOHN B. ADGER, Pendleton, South Carolina.

A more generous support by Southern Presbyterians would enable the proprietor to make the work more worthy of its name.

[Entered at the Post-Office at Columbia, S. C., as second-class postal matter.]

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXXXII.

ARTICLE I.

THE CHRIST OF JOHN.

1. The germ of the doctrine of the Christ was cast into the soil of Eden. Straightway it sprang up into a vigorous plant, which has outlived and far surpassed all the glories of Paradise. Its growth through the centuries has not been constant or uniform. Long periods have elapsed without any perceptible progress; but these have been followed by epochs of great and sometimes even startling development. In the fulness of the times God was manifest in the flesh, and dwelt among us for a third of a century. For about another third of a century the Canon of Scripture was not extended beyond the limits of the Old Testament. Malachi had uttered the precious promise, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple." This was the latest promise in the Hebrew tongue. Through the long succeeding night, in which there was no vision and no revelation, it lingered in the air like a sweet presence, cheering the hearts and sustaining the hopes of all who in that troublous time waited for the consolation of Israel. But now the messenger had prepared the way. Christ, born in Bethlehem of Juda, had finished the work given him to do; had been crucified under Pontius Pilate; had been dead and buried; had risen again on the third day, had ascended on high, led cap-

tivity captive, and given the inestimable gifts of the Holy Spirit unto men. Human haste would have lost no time in putting on record an account of these marvels. Indeed, Luke expressly informs us that many had taken the work in hand before he wrote his monograph. But the Spirit of inspiration, working "without haste and without rest," waited, as well as we can judge, to the decade between 60 and 70 A. D. The Church doctrine then effloresced into the three synoptical Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

But the Beloved Disciple had not spoken yet, though oftentimes urged to speak. His life was prolonged beyond the allotted span of threescore years and ten—beyond the labor and sorrow of fourscore. Fourscore and ten came, and still the old man sat upon the heights overlooking the sea of eternity, his grey hair floating in the breeze, and his dim eyes gazing wistfully out upon the solemn main. Peter and James, who had been with him on the Mount of Transfiguration and in the garden of Gethsemane; Philip and Andrew, and the rest of the Apostles, including the fiery-hearted Paul,—all, all were gone. Their lessening barques showed like phantom ships on the far waters. Only Christ was with him—Christ abiding with him, as with us, evermore.

On one Lord's day, tradition says, he was sitting in the assembly of the faithful, when the Spirit came mightily upon him, and he cried out in an ecstasy, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." And in addition to, if we should not say above, the other three, flowered forth the last, tenderest, truest evangel. So it pleased the Spirit of truth, which infallibly inspired them all.

2. It could not be otherwise than that John's Gospel should give a portraiture of Christ resembling the previous ones in many respects. Yet it was to be expected that the Beloved Disciple, if he wrote at all, would add something to what had been said before. It was not unreasonable to hope that he would conduct his readers at least a little farther into the innermost heart of the Master.

Perhaps it may be found true that as years roll on, and we leave youth's restless activity behind us, we are more drawn to

John, and that somehow John brings us nearer to Christ. Some temperaments are fascinated in early life by his quiet pages, and it is a fascination that never loses its hold. But with others the peculiar charm is not felt until a later period. To both these classes of contemplatists the following meditations are offered.

3. Charlotte Brontë quotes from an unnamed source the thought that the career of the first Napoleon was like a rainbow, whose centre was in the heavens, while its ends rested on the earth. The military school at Brienne—the Empire—St. Helena.

The lives of most of earth's distinguished men more or less resemble this, at least when the rainbow is complete, and sweeps in its fulness from horizon to horizon. The first part of life may be hidden in impenetrable obscurity, as in the case of Elijah; or a Julius Cæsar may be cut off in the zenith of his greatness. But if life is lengthened out, the days of weakness come at last. The old man returns like a wearied child to the bosom of earth, our common mother. The wreck, however, is not always reserved for the time of old age. Misfortune, disease, crime, the wickedness of others, may antedate the ills of time, and bring distress and ruin upon us in middle life.

Mark's Gospel omits all mention of Christ's childhood and earlier manhood. He comes forth unheralded at the age of thirty from Nazareth in Galilee to be baptized of John, and then at once enters upon his ministry. All are amazed at his mighty works. His fame spreads abroad throughout all the region round about Galilee. He heals the sick, he feeds the hungry, he casts out devils, he raises the dead. But soon a dark cloud arises; it enshrouds the whole sky, and from its foul bosom the lightning leaps forth to smite and to destroy. A brief supplementary chapter adds that he arose from the dead, commissioned his apostles, and ascended into heaven.

Matthew and Luke take a different starting point, and give the particulars of the birth of Jesus. Luke's narrative is an inimitably sweet pastoral. The Old Testament worth and simplicity of Zacharias and Elisabeth in the hill country of Judea; the gentleness and purity of Mary in a fierce and filthy age and place; the shepherds with their flocks; the light from heaven;

the song of the angels. Matthew surrounds the manger-cradle with the glamour of the Orient. Wise men from the east, guided by a meteor through their long journey, offer gold, frankincense, and myrrh to the Babe born King of the Jews. Yet with both Matthew and Luke, this flash of brightness is followed by the obscurity that even yet rests upon the infancy and childhood of our Redeemer. This gives way in due time to the glory of his public ministry, and this in turn to the dark and fearful tragedy of Calvary.

4. After referring a geometrical magnitude to a given point, given lines, or surfaces, mathematicians often change the original planes of reference, and deduce quite different and most interesting equations. By a similar transformation of coördinates, John goes far back of the birth of Christ—back of Paradise—back to the beginning, to the boundary line separating the two eternities, in the former of which God existed alone, and in the latter of which he was to coexist with his universe. From this proceeds logically enough a new conception of the career of the Christ.

At a certain season of the year, as twilight sinks into night, a star of the first magnitude glitters in the northwestern sky. As night advances the star sweeps downward, struggles with earth-born mists and vapors, dips beneath the horizon, and at midnight is totally lost to view. By and by it rises again, gleams out fitfully through smoke and cloud, mounts higher, glows brighter, until night goes, and the shadows flee away. Then, having regained the elevation of the evening preceding, it lends its rightful splendor to the sky. This is John's conception of the Christ, and it is an altogether unique conception. Save Jesus of Nazareth there is none other born of woman to whom it is applicable. No wild dream of Grecian or Hindoo mythology had anticipated this thought of John; and in the centuries since it was set forth, the Church has but feebly realised the grandeur of that which the Holy Ghost revealed by the mouth of the Beloved Disciple.

“We cannot reach the mystery.

The length, the breadth, the height.”

Never, throughout the ages of the ages. For the Infinite must ever be beyond us and above. Exalted One, who from the inac-

cessible heights didst sink below the horizon of our thoughts for our redemption, pity our weakness, and lift us up into the heaven of thy peace!

5. Confirmatory of this view is the remarkable fact that in some of its aspects John never rises above the conception of Christ with which he starts out. In the beginning was the WORD. On reflection we agree with Ryle and dissent from Olshausen, in rejecting the idea that John here followed any vain traditions of the Rabbins, or the teachings of Philo¹ concerning the Logos. It belittles John, and also the Holy Ghost speaking by John, to suppose that in so grand a matter, and writing for the Church of all ages, he adjusted his phraseology to the vagaries of a few wretched theosophists scattered through Asia Minor.

John was a Hebrew of the Hebrews. He does not exhibit the Grecian culture of Paul. He views all things from the standpoint of the old dispensation. He looks abroad upon the world-wide sea of the new *régime*, but casts loving glances up the river of the old. In this last book of Holy Writ, John echoes and interprets the opening words of the first. Very captivating to him was the primeval grandeur of the simple early faith and speech. In the beginning God created. In the beginning was the Word. God created by a word. "God said, 'Be light; and light was.'" The Hebrew does not analyse; does not expatiate on volition and conation; but seizes the external fact of the uttered word as the

¹Ritter gives an account of Philo Judæus in his History of Ancient Philosophers, Vol. 4, c. 6. From this it appears that Philo was an exceedingly visionary speculator, hesitating "half-way between the Grecian and the Oriental cast of thought." "Out of matter," says Ritter, in stating Philo's views, "God has, it is true, made all things, but he did so without touching it, for it could not be that the omniscient and the happy should come into contact with shapeless and confused matter." Query: Was the Son of God not omniscient and happy? In making the Cosmos, did he do a work that would have been degrading to the Father? According to Philo, the word of God was an energy, or the collective energies of God. It is also the supra-sensible world, τὸν νοητὸν κόσμον. God is the cause (αἰτιον) of the Cosmos; the word is the instrument (ὄργανον). The angels also are words of God. It is incredible that an inspired apostle should have countenanced any such wild errorist, if, indeed, he had any acquaintance with Philo's vagaries.

expression of all that precedes it, and the proximate cause of all that follows. And now, what had been obscurely intimated by the prophets is brought out into the full light of day by an Apostle—even the mystery of the Trinity, and the office work of the Persons of the Godhead. The Father is the fountain of Deity; the Son is the creative Word. It was he specially who, in the beginning, created the heavens and the earth. Before this beginning, of old, even from everlasting, the universe lay as a Thought in the divine Mind, and now the Word spake that Thought into Being. The Son is the proximate cause. As the natural philosopher takes a beam of white sunlight, and resolves it into separate colors, so John takes the first light of revelation, in Genesis, and shows us the Trinity in the unity of the Elohim. If it were to our present purpose, we might add, that as the philosopher recombines the refracted colors into the original beam of white, so John, on occasion, reblends the mysterious Three into the primal mystery of the One. "I and my Father are one. * * * He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

To resume: The Psalmist says: "By the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hosts thereof by the breath of his mouth." The word comes forth from the man; the Son is of the Father; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God. *Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο.* All (things) came into being by means of him (*διὰ instrumentalis*); and without him not one (thing) came into being which has come into being. How succinct, yet how definite! The thought, the word, the work; the Father, the Son, the universe. But in due time there came into existence beings in the likeness of God; angels and men; creatures that could know the Creator; and to them the Son is again the Word. The Word spoken of God, and the God-speaking Word. No one hath ever seen God; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed him. (The margin of the Revised text has it, the only begotten *God*, who is in the bosom of the Father—*θεός* for *υἱός*.)

So that the Word speaks the universe into being; and to the thinking part of the universe he tells of the grace and the truth that are in the Father. Evermore the Word uttering the Thought; and higher conception than this, there is none.

6. Which leads to the remark that no inventor of stories, no dramatist of how high soever order, could have dared to begin in this way. Even if he could have done so, he would have felt that so august a character could not be sustained; but in any, ablest human hands, it would sink to some lame and beggarly conclusion.

John was sure of his theme, sure of its truth and its greatness. He could not begin too high in describing the

“Strong Son of God, immortal Love.”

It was his duty, not to originate, but to portray. - He was not a creator, but a seer; and lovingly did the aged eyes linger upon the divine original, and the aged hands delineate. He does not hesitate to begin higher than highest heaven, and to bring his glorious subject down into the deepest humiliation of earth. He leads us to the verge of an abyss, from which we recoil in horror—an abyss into which none but the Son of God has ever descended, or can descend.

7. It was not only unnecessary, but really foreign to the purpose of John, to describe the lowly manger in the caravanseraï, the offering of turtle doves instead of the lambs of the rich, and the inconvenient and toilsome flight into Egypt. Enough and most apposite to say that the Word became flesh. He by whom all things became now himself becomes. The chasm between the Infinite and the finite is spanned. The Eternal assumes the temporal, the Creator the creature, into a personal, and real, though ineffable, union, which shall endure forever. Glorious mystery of mysteries, which we shall worship evermore!

But now, again, as some majestic strain of music by a great master sweeps from joy into pathos, Christ appears as the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. To become man was an infinite condescension; to become the lamb of sacrifice, to bleed and die as the sin-offering—this was indeed an infinite humiliation.

8. A profound principle is couched in the advice of Horace to the writers of epics: Never introduce a deity unless the occasion justifies a divine interposition.

*Nec deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus
Inciderit.*

The incarnation of the Deity is the most stupendous fact in the history of the world; nor is there reason to believe we should err if we added, in the history of the universe. Stupendous in itself; stupendous in its results. Yet John is fully committed to the doctrine, and indeed makes it the fulcrum of his whole account of the Christ. If this gives way, all is lost.

This doctrine staggers unbelief, yet it has been accepted, in some form or other, by vast numbers, both in and out of Christendom. The countless ills of the present life, the darkness and terror of the boundless future, and man's sense of his own guilt and weakness, have led the human heart to cry to heaven for a deliverer. There is an unspeakable longing for some one to help our infirmities, and since earth fails to furnish this helper, our eyes look wildly to the sky. It is interesting, from a philosophical point of view, as well as otherwise, to note that many myriads have believed that the deity has come, and will again come, to our help in a visible form. It is not well to deride this principle, so deeply imbedded in our nature. The broad instincts of humanity are apt to be right at bottom. But we must distinguish between an instinctive appeal to a supernatural power, and the painfully absurd methods which that power has been imagined to employ. In the Hindu theology, the gods have, at innumerable times, come down to man. But the most noted theophanies have been the Avatars of Vishnu. Let us pity the degradation of so gifted a branch of the Aryan family, when we read in one of their Puranas that Vishnu appeared on earth as a fish, as a tortoise, as a swine. In a sense, this is beneath contempt; yet let us beware how we despise the shrieks of drowning men.

There is a progression discernible in the Avatars. In the fourth, the god comes as a being compounded of a lion and a man; in the fifth, as a dwarf; in the sixth, as the son of Iarmadayni, and thenceforward as a man or a demi-god. His tenth and last incarnation is yet to come; so that there is an approach to the truth.

John retains all the truth and rejects all the error of the Gentile myths. Man is sinful, helpless, dying; and there is wisdom, power, and compassion on high. But there are no grotesque

representations in the Gospel. Surely, this must have been due to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. To pass from the Puranas to the Evangelists is to pass from extravagance to sobriety, from folly to reason.

The Scriptures inform us that the second person of the adorable Trinity appeared to the fathers on several occasions; but it is not of these that we are treating. Our business is with the one only incarnation of God in humanity, wherein Christ was born of the Virgin Mary; wherein he assumed our nature into a personal and eternal union with the divine. So far as we are advised, this particular view is to be met with nowhere outside of the Scriptures; and in them it is most fully brought out in the writings of John.

9. After these preliminary thoughts, the question recurs, whether John gives any sufficient reasons for the assumption of human nature by the Godhead. What might reasonably, and did actually, induce the Word to become flesh, and to taste the bitterness of death for sinful men?

We answer, in the first place, his regard for the glory of the Father. This is the chief life-work of him whose life-time is eternity, to reveal the Father. In this work there was a perfect agreement in the two wills, the divine and the human, of Jehovah-Jesus. On the human side, we find in Jesus of Nazareth the one human being who loved the Father with all his heart, soul, mind, and strength, and desired, above all things else, the Father's glory. When nature shrank back from the terrific ordeal of Gethsemane and Calvary, and he asked himself, "What shall I say? Father, deliver me from this hour?" After a moment's weakness and tremor he was strong again, and said, "Father, glorify thy name!" Again, on the verge of his appalling sufferings he triumphed over fear, and, lifting up his eyes to heaven, communed, the eternal Son with the eternal Father, saying, "The hour is come! Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee."

John thus teaches us that the only begotten Son, and the noblest spirit that ever dwelt in a human bosom, desired the glory of God with a longing deeper than the love of life, and stronger

than the fear of death. That we should know God, and knowing him, love him, and loving him, rest in him, and resting in him, rejoice with an untold joy,—ah! God himself judges this the best thing that even he can aim at outside of the ineffable communion of the Trinity. This is his principal work through the ages, so far as his universe is concerned, and, with the same limitation, this is his chief joy. For our poor love, and trust, and rejoicing in him as our strength and our song, and taking him as our all, and feeling that our lot is an indescribably blessed one, is very sweet to the heart of the great Father.

Every holy being in all God's vast dominion seeks the glory of the Eternal One—seeks to know, and to lead others to know, his holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. To secure this end, no sacrifice is too great, provided it be but necessary to its attainment, and provided also, that the greatness of the honor bear a just proportion to the greatness of the sacrifice.

A crisis had arisen in the divine government. A district of his realm was in revolt; his authority was defied, his law trampled under foot, and his majesty dishonored in the dust. Eternal justice must be upheld, and eternal right maintained, at all hazards. At the same time, there was an opportunity of disclosing to the intelligent universe an unfathomable ocean of love, pity, tenderness, in the Godhead. The existence of this unsounded sea had not been suspected even by the archangels. It had lain there from eternity, unknown, save to the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Shall it continue to lie thus unknown forevermore? This, to speak after the manner of men, was the question to be decided by the all-wise Trinity. And who that has ever, with eyes divinely enlightened, looked abroad upon that mighty ocean, but will asseverate that the decision recorded by John was holy, and just, and wise, and good!—and, so far as our scanty knowledge of God's illimitable past enables us to judge, the holiest, and the justest, the wisest, and the best purpose of his that ever has been revealed to angels or to men. So that we are utterly at a loss to conceive how anything transcending it can, in any coming cycle, emerge from the depths of the Godhead.

10. In the first place, then, the Christ of John, apprehending

all these truths far more profoundly than is possible to us, did not deem the sacrifice of Calvary too great if thereby he might so illustriously glorify the Father. The second reason will be presented in the form of an apologue.

A royal family is residing in a castellated palace. Everywhere the marks of opulence abound, and corridor, stairway, and hall are elaborately furnished and exquisitely adorned. But there is within those massive walls one chamber whose very existence is known only to the monarch and his son. The door is hidden, and the key is in the possession of the king himself. That chamber is the richest in all the building. It is glorious in clustered columns and fretted ceiling, in paintings, statuary, and mosaics, and it surpasses belief in its treasured gold and gems. Hitherto the expenses of state have made no drain upon this mine of wealth; but now the cry of the famishing in one quarter of his kingdom smites upon the great heart of the king; for his heart is truly royal; but it is written on parchment, and subscribed with the king's sign-manual, and sealed with his own signet, that this treasure cannot be expended except on condition that the son pass through a course of heroic toil, and end his career with a death of horror. Then saith the son, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me—to do thy will, and thy law is within my heart. Wide open fly the doors; the treasures pour forth, and the king's heralds make proclamation to all who are anhungred and athirst, to all who are faint and dying, that they need hunger and thirst, sorrow and die no more.

The Christ of John always regards mankind as in a deplorable condition, famishing with soul-hunger, consuming with soul-thirst, and he announces himself to be the bread of life and the living water. He beholds them dying as if bitten by venomous serpents; if they will only look to him, they shall live. They labor and are heavy laden; he and none but he can give them rest. He does not offer to lay down his life in order to procure any trivial advantages for our race. He does not appear in the interests of commerce, or as a great teacher of material science. He never lays brush upon canvas, or chisel upon marble, or plectrum upon lyre. No, nothing less than the dread realities of sin and

holiness, hell and heaven, judgment and eternity, could have brought him from the bosom of the Father. His mind was untouched by the sentimentalism of an imaginary deity who will not punish sin with everlasting banishment from heaven and eternal death in hell. He came to rescue from irremediable woe, utter ruin, endless despair,—irremediable, utter, and endless, except for his intervention. It is appalling to hear his gentle voice echo and reëcho those fearful words, "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." In accordance with this, although in a sense he is "prodigal of his great life," it never occurs to him that he is squandering the most precious blood in the universe. He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied.

How august a work! The Saviour of every soul of man that ever shall be saved, from the first to the last of all earth's generations! There is no parallel to this conception. What breadth of view! This conception cannot have originated in the mind of John. He could not have swept back over the forty centuries of the past, and forward over the even yet uncounted centuries that were to come—over island and continent, tribe and nation, Jew and Gentile.

But it is not a mere negative deliverance that is contemplated by the Christ. From age to age man sighs for relief. The Brahman theology presents man as a fallen being, holding an existence individuated from Brahm by a real or an imaginary alliance with matter, yet never, in his many and painful transmigrations, losing the capability of a final absorption into the divine essence. This once attained, he reaches an existence as calm as a sea unruffled by a breath of air. He becomes in form and semblance what he was before in fact, a part of God. The billow sinks to the level of the placid deep; the rising smoke is lost in the quiet blue of heaven.

According to Max Müller and others, the Buddhists recognise no Brahm. They are thoroughly atheistic. But one may become Buddha and enter into Nirvâna.¹ By the Nirvâna their

¹*The Nirvâna.*—By collating the different articles of Max Müller in his "Chips from a German Workshop," we reach the following as his

canonical books appear to have meant annihilation, but a widely accepted opinion was that it meant a passionless existence, without desire, regret, or fear—such an existence as the Buddhist might have feigned a God to possess, if indeed there had been a God.

Very different from this is the thought of the Christ. The thrice-precious words of the Master are, "I give unto them everlasting life. Because I live, ye shall live also." The God of the Old Testament was a living God. The Hebrew verb "to live" was almost identical with the verb "to be." The former might be called an intensified form of the latter, as though living were an intense being. Through the abyss of eternity, before time was, and through the infinite voids of space before this island universe had arisen from amid the waters, there thrilled, as there yet thrills, a Life,—the life of God. The apocalyptic angel swears not by him who was, and who is, and who is to come, but by him that liveth forever and ever. In the Christ was life.

The coarse materialism of our day asks in vain, Whence is life? seeking in matter the source of that which springs from spirit. A worldly philosophy may rise to the conception of mental life, but it denies, or at least ignores, the life of the soul, the true spiritual life which Christ gives. But to his chosen ones the Master saith, Ye shall live! There is peace in his presence, but it is not the peace of absorption into the waveless sea of Deity;

final opinion: (1.) Gautama, the first, or at least the only historic Buddha.—*i. e.*, enlightened one,—believed in the immortality of individual souls. Every one *may* finally become, perhaps *will* finally become, Buddha, *i. e.* enlightened, and enjoy an endless, serene, passionless existence. This belief is indicated in the first and second of the Three Baskets, or collections of canonical writings of the Buddhists. (2.) His metaphysical followers kept refining on this passionless existence, until they reduced it by successive negations to absolute Nihilism. Müller quotes M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire as saying, "Nothing remained but to annihilate the soul." The Romish Bishop Bigandet, Apostolic Vicar of Ava and Pegu, says that Buddha leads man, "after all, into the bottomless gulf of a total annihilation." (3.) The common people did not adopt the Nihilistic view, but held to a happy state of endless being as the ultimate goal. Consult (besides the above named volumes) Müller's "Science of Religion, with Papers on Buddhism."

there is repose on the banks of the river, beneath the verdure and the bloom of the tree of life, but it is not the repose of annihilation. A life energetic, jubilant, unwearied, perhaps with intervals of quietude, and measureless calms of meditation interspersed among the activities,—may we not look forward to this as the life of heaven? A horizon of knowledge ever widening; a theatre of action ever enlarging; a fountain of holy affection ever deepening! In his presence there is fulness of joy; at his right hand there are pleasures forevermore.

The glory of this career transcends our utmost reach of thought. So much the more reason why it should constitute a worthy end to him who only can comprehend it in its fulness, and whose love prompts him to do for us exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think.

12. Thackeray has surpassed himself in the character of Henry Esmond. Henry was the son of a man of rank and fortune, but there was a bar sinister on his escutcheon, and his titles and estates fell to another. The wife of the kinsman who succeeded to his place and demesne, was a warm-hearted woman and very kind to the little Henry. He grew up to love her and was inexpressibly grateful for her goodness to him in the circumstances. In course of time, however, he learned that the bar sinister was a figment; he had been born in lawful wedlock, and he obtained legal proof of the fact. He had but to say the word; and his stain would be publicly removed and his due rank and wealth be restored; but his benefactress, now bereaved of her husband by a violent death—what would become of her? He locked the secret up in his bosom, and for her sake bore the shame and the loss patiently on. By some indirect way and without his connivance, she too learned the truth of the case and was overwhelmed with astonishment and admiration. An instance not unlike this is given by Dickens in his fearful Tale of Two Cities. A wretched inebriate, almost an outcast from society, was treated kindly by a young married couple in Paris. The reign of terror came. The young husband was sentenced to the guillotine, but by a ruse the sot took his place, rode on the tumbrel to execution amid the jeers of the canaille, and laid down his life for his friend.

Ah, yes, for a good man peradventure some would even dare to die; and pleasant it is to meet with a few such portraitures from the hands of those who have studied the human heart. Too often, alas, from the Medea of Grecian antiquity down to the Romola of the English yesterday, the artists seem to have dipped up their colors from the seething caldron of hell, and to have applied them to the canvas acrid and scalding.¹

Between these two extremes we have every intermediate grade of human character; but above self-sacrifice to a benefactor the dramatists and *littérateurs* either cannot or dare not rise. The outpouring of the tenderest love upon one's enemies, the voluntary enduring of long-continued reproach, insult, and persecution, ending in a bloody and shameful death, for one's bitter enemies, would have violated all probability. No such portrait could have been drawn, for there was no original to sit for it. Any attempt in that direction would have been justly decried as fantastic.

No, the uninspired writers have portrayed man; John has given us the lineaments of the God-man. One perfect example of this superhuman virtue has been seen on earth; one, only one in all the universe, exalting the name of Man above that of Archangel, and teaching us what we may become. For every human soul bears within itself the germs of the godlike, and the indestructible capacity of being born again into the image of Christ; and if this heroism of love to those who hate and revile and persecute us has been found anywhere on earth save in the great Exemplar, it has been exhibited in his followers, and wrought in their hearts by the same Spirit that wrought mightily in his. John did not invent this character. He could not have done so, if he had desired. He says, times without number, that it is a portrait from life, and this must have been true. The coldest logic confirms the truth of his declaration.

And yet this Christ is so far above the most exalted of natural men that many from that day to this have scoffed at it as no historical verity. Nor can any relenting sinner, though reared

¹In *Romola*, George Eliot even forgets the good taste of Euripides, and the criticism of Horace, *Nec pueros coram populo Medea trucidet.*

under the sound of the gospel, so believe in this love toward himself as to rest his soul thereupon, until he is taught the sweet lesson by the Spirit of God. Nor can they who have most profoundly meditated upon this surpassing theme do otherwise than cry out, Oh, the depth! Oh, the riches! Oh, the wonders of his love! Or, like the saintly Edwards, give up all articulate speech for broken sighs and tears.

13. How does the Christ of John deport himself during the period of his humiliation on earth?

John does not treat this part of his subject in vague generalities, as a wily impostor might. He comes unflinchingly up to the most difficult task ever set before a writer, and he must have failed if he had been an inventor and not a narrator. It is impossible for us to understand what is wholly outside of our own experience. If the angels are disembodied spirits, they cannot comprehend our mixed human life. Mind and matter are so diverse that *a priori* the possibility of their union would have been doubted, if not denied. The antitheses are certainly very startling, though long use and familiarity have taken off the edge of the novelty.

Some, we know not how many, of the angels have temporarily occupied bodies, and may thus have far clearer conceptions of human life in general, and of the work of Christ in particular. But neither angel nor man can be for one moment divine. Hence John was compelled to write of things totally outside of his experience, and could have done so fittingly only by revelation. The impossibility of understanding is even surpassed by the greater impossibility of originating. We may apprehend when we do not comprehend, and we may also apprehend when we could not have invented. If any revelation of God's nature and character be vouchsafed to us, there must needs be something in it that we can lay hold of, and yet it seems unavoidable that there should occur glimpses into the far off and the unfathomable. Our steps must ever and anon be arrested on the brink of giddy precipices of thought, and our vision lose itself in the immensity of the sky above us.

Such and so difficult a theme had John in the uncreated God-

head of the Christ, and the difficulty was immeasurably enhanced by the personal union of the Godhead with the complex unity of the manhood. A Christ so constituted must pass easily and naturally from the exhibition of weakness to that of infinite power; from a tremor approaching quailing to the eternal calmness of Deity. He sits wearied and thirsty by the well side—he, the Creator of all worlds—and cannot, at least does not, slake his thirst except with water drawn up by the feeble hands of woman; yet he declares to her his power to open in all our hearts a fountain (πηγή) of water springing up into everlasting life. He sinks into death, but is evermore the Resurrection and the Life. He loves Mary and Martha and Lazarus and John as we might, and he loves a world with an affection as far beyond our reach as is his creative power. One moment he weeps; the next moment he raises the dead. He is the Son of Man on earth, and the Son of God in heaven; or, more briefly, the Son of Man which is in heaven.

14. Christ now sitteth at the right hand of God, in the glory of the Father. Nineteen centuries have elapsed since he sat in the upper chamber with his disciples and said, "I have glorified thee on the earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." The prayer has been answered, and there is a continually increasing fulfilment of his last petition, "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me."

The mediatorial glory of Christ was obtained by means of his humiliation. The star sweeps downward through the mists of earth on the way to its subsequent elevation; and it is passing wonderful that a similar necessity existed in the divine government.

15. A great master of chiar'oscuro has painted Christ in the temple. On each hand the countenances of his enemies are obscurely seen as they shade off into the surrounding gloom. Behind him a column, a curtain, a recess of the temple are faintly descried amid the darkness. But in the foreground Christ

himself stands bathed in a flood of light, and his brightness reveals in subdued splendor the woman who was a sinner, kneeling forgiven at his side. If he had appeared in this dark world only as the one sinless being, he would have appeared glorious by the contrast. If without the sacrifice of himself he could have bestowed pardon on wretched sinners, he would have been seen as the forgiver of sins. But he did more than these. He came into a world where sin and death abounded, and by falling a victim to them, conquered both, and extorted from them the great honor of his name. Thoughtful minds have in all ages asked, and sometimes in sore dismay, Why has sin been permitted to enter God's universe? Death is here because sin is, but how came sin to have an existence? We construct our theodicies in the attempt

“To justify the ways of God to man.”

Yet, after all, unanswered questions arise, and we are constrained to pronounce the problem too high for our present stature, too dark for our present light. We can only stand within the great bulwarks of faith, and feel that the positive evidences of the holiness and justice, goodness and truth of the Eternal, are altogether irrefragable. The day may come when our eyes shall pierce through this mystery of all time, but now we walk by faith rather than by sight; by a faith, however, that is more rational than unbelief.

The Christ of John does not discuss this problem. It was once almost thrust upon him in the question, “Did this man sin, or his parents, that he should be born blind?” To which he made answer that the blindness was attributable to neither of these causes, but had occurred in order that the works of God should be made manifest in him. Christ accepts the situation of a world justly condemned, justly lying under God's wrath and curse. He endorses the righteousness of God in the whole matter. “O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee, but I have known thee.” He stands at the beginning, and by one omniscient glance surveys the past eternity wherein he dwelt in the bosom of the Father—an eternity holy, blessed, tranquil, compared with which “time is but an upstart novelty.” It is

too late for God to think of destroying his own throne by connivance at sin.

But if there be any explanation of the mystery of sin's appearing in the universe, *i. e.*, an explanation that we can understand, he does not divulge it. Either we cannot, or it is better that we should not, know it. Faith must come in somewhere; why not here? To the Christ all is light. There is no darkness in him; there is none to him. But out of these horrible evils he educes the chief glory that God has received from his universe. How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

15. The star of evening that swings down to the horizon and again mounts aloft, is not alone in the sky. Its motion is but a part of the movement of the entire heavens. And so, too, the redemptive work of Christ is not disconnected from the inconceivably vast onward movement of God's administration. What this connection is, and what are the relations of the various parts of the grand unity, neither our present information nor our present faculties enable us to know. This study lies before us in the coming cycles. There is much for us to learn, and, may it not be said, much for us to do. But now we have only the intimations of Holy Scripture, and these are to be handled soberly and with humility. Various scattered passages of the word point to our disenthralled and purified earth as the final home of the saved of our race. The argument, if not absolutely conclusive, is far stronger than would be supposed by one who has not duly weighed it. And we are plainly told of the abode of the blessed, wherever it shall be, that the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it. The Christ has in all ages manifested great interest in our little world. It is, it was, but a little spot in his universe, but he had chosen it as the place where he was to die, and he was to die only once in his eternity. "I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive forevermore."

The smallness of man's stature, and the minuteness of his abode, do not seem to have constituted an obstacle to the Christ. It is a beautiful thought of Chalmers that the telescope and the microscope were invented simultaneously; and while the former

taught us the prodigious magnitude of the worlds above and around us, the latter revealed a limitless downward progression of living creatures beneath us, every increase of microscopic power bringing within our range of vision infusoria that were too nearly infinitesimal to be seen before. So that man stands midway between two infinities. If God careth for the infusoria, and fashioneth their tiny frames with such masterly skill, how much more will he care for us?

The difficulty, however, is one that has been felt most in very recent times and by a very small number of minds,—the great mass of believers hitherto, and of unbelievers also, having no practical knowledge of telescopes and microscopes. The Christ is fresh from a whole eternity in which matter did not exist at all, and during which his consciousness was solely spiritual. What he loves and dies for is a mind that can know God, a heart that can love him, and a will that can choose him for an eternal portion. Nor could it signify anything to him whether that thinking, loving, willing personality inhabited a body six feet or six furlongs in length. We are dearer to him than pterodactyls, or ichthyosauri, or any other monsters of an earlier geologic period.

To him, too, whose dwelling place was and is immensity, it was a matter of the least concern whether his throne should be on a planet of the size of ours, or on a sun as large as Sirius, or amid the fainter splendors of a nebula like that of Orion. For the light of this vast and magnificent universe is to him but as that of a glow-worm amid a whole hemisphere wrapped in a starless and rayless night. Yes, he shall reign where he died, and the world of the cross shall be the world of the throne.

16. John gives the final touch to the conception of Christ as our Emmanuel. Christ stood in Eden, and, after the fall, appeared from time to time to the fathers. In the exodus from Egypt he advanced so far as to take up his abode with his people. A tent more sumptuous and more beautiful than the rest, and from Solomon's time onward a palatial temple in the holy city, marked the dwelling place of the Messiah. By another great step in advance he became bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. Then was fulfilled in a higher sense than ever before that

which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, "They shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." So he was and shall continue to be God and man in two natures and one person forever. In this sense he can never cease to be God with us. But after his resurrection, the place of God's special self-manifestation not being upon this earth, it became necessary for the risen Saviour to ascend to heaven, and sit at the right hand of the Father. All power in heaven and in earth was given unto him, and to-day he holds the sceptre of the universe. During this period of absence from the Church militant he is still present with the Church triumphant, and the latter is far the larger part of the Church universal. We on this side of the river are but a feeble host; beyond, the white tents of the redeemed stretch far and wide, till lost in the dim distance, and over them floats the banner of the Lamb that was slain. He has left us, but he has promised to return, and on this promise the Church militant rests lovingly, ever crying with John, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

John's account of the last judgment is brief, but inexpressibly grand. The great white throne, the Judge, earth and heaven fleeing affrighted from his face; the dead, small and great, standing before God, the open books, the eternal doom; the sea, death, Hades, grim dungeons of the dead, opening their hoary portals to the outward rush of unnumbered millions; the lake of fire. Then come the new heaven, and the new earth, and the holy city descending from God out of heaven. And now the idea of the Emmanuel is completed. The tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God—an Old Testament thought, in Old Testament language. And who that reads of his wiping away all tears from our eyes, and of there being no more death there, neither sorrow nor crying, neither any more pain, but feels as if this were almost too good to be true, and longs, with a great home-sickness, to be there!

17. At the end of the 20th chapter of his Gospel, John says: "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that, believing, ye might have life through his

name." Can we dispassionately consider this subject in all its bearings, and for one moment entertain the idea that John originated this transcendent conception; that he invented the miracles and discourses which so wonderfully sustain this divine-human character; that he conducts an imaginary hero through a life of humiliation, and a death of ignominy, yet ever keeps him great, great above the sons of men? Why does John never claim the credit of so superlative an achievement in invention? Why does he turn away the love of his readers from himself to Christ? There is only one possible answer to such questions. Another way of putting the matter: Is this conception from heaven or from hell? Is it of God, or of Satan? If the hosts of evil had been able to conceive so pure, exalted, and holy a being (which is impossible), why should they have offered their conception to the wonder and adoration of the universe, and exhibited themselves as the instigators of his murder; and then exalted him to the throne of God, and represented him as destroying wicked men and wicked angels (*i. e.* themselves) in a merited lake of fire; and finally as dwelling, with those who have believed on him, in a holy, blessed place, world without end, from which the unjust, and the filthy, the dogs, the sorcerers, the whoremongers, the murderers, the idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie, shall be excluded forevermore?

Ah, no! The Christ of John is the Son of God, and the Saviour of mankind. May he abide with us, and may we abide in him!

18. In his Lord Rector's address to the students of the University of Edinburg, Carlyle refers to "a book by Goethe—one of his last books, which he wrote when he was an old man, about seventy years of age—I think one of the most beautiful he ever wrote, full of mild wisdom. * * * * I have often said, there are ten pages of that which, if ambition had been my only rule, I would rather have written than have written all the books that have appeared since I came into the world." The main thought of the passage in Goethe appears to be, that reverence (*Ehrfurcht*) is "the soul of all religion that ever has been among men, or ever shall be."

“The first, and simplest,” says Carlyle, “is that of reverence for what is above us. It is the soul of all the Pagan religions; there is nothing better in man than that. Then there is reverence for what is around us or about us. * * * * The third is reverence for what is beneath us; to learn to recognise in pain, sorrow, and contradiction—even in those things, odious as they are to flesh and blood—to learn that there lies in these a priceless blessing. And he (Goethe) defines that as being the soul of the Christian religion—the highest of all religions.”

If by this Goethe meant, as he seems to mean, the priceless blessing which we may derive from subjective sorrow and suffering, it is a wise and noble thought. Thrice blessed is the ministry of pain; and wonderful indeed is it that the Most High has converted what was of old the penalty of sin into the means of sanctification from sin. Truly divine is the alchemy which transmutes the iron that enters our souls into a crown of gold upon our heads.

Yet this can not be considered the soul of Christianity. The highest of all religions, the only true religion, includes the three forms of reverence. In the second form, it bids us “Honor all men.” But the special peculiarity of Christianity is that it combines the first and the third, and presents as the object of adoration to men and angels a DIVINE SUFFERER. His humiliation is the pedestal of his glory. In him suffering becomes divinely beautiful as the robe of love. We had not otherwise known THE LOVE. But for the Christ and his cross the universe never could have known what love could be and do. The memory of his passion has left a trace of sadness on his countenance, and now we have Christ, the fairest one—Christ, the most beautiful. Even he was made perfect through sufferings, though in a sense different from that in which it is true of us, for he knew no sin. By suffering he was outwardly qualified to save, for it was the absolutely necessary ransom paid for our redemption; thereby, also, he was inwardly fitted to be our merciful and faithful high priest, and is the noblest of creatures, as well as God over all, blessed forevermore.

Goethe calls Christianity “a height to which the human species was fated and enabled to attain, and from which, having once

attained it, it can never retrograde." Rather, let us say, the conception of the Christ was one which the Godhead's eternal counsel and purpose foreordained to realise in time, in the person of the God-man; for without this realisation, even the Godhead (reverently be it said) could not execute his highest good pleasure. Let us say, too, that the heart of man was originally created with the capacity to receive this thought of God, and, having once received it, can never let it go. Nor can our race be persuaded that the thought was evolved from the depths of human consciousness. No, it came down from heaven. And so far is man from creating this transcendent conception, that he never rises to its level. The purest and noblest spirits on earth, after long communion with it, always find that its fulness is beyond and above them. They, most of all, cling with a passion of fondness to the Christ, and will never give up their belief, their trust, their adoration. Nor will the spiritual universe ever loose its hold of the great thought, or "willingly let it die." It is too late for that, now. The knowledge of it has already reached the angels. Those exalted beings bend over (*παρκίπτω*) and peer down eagerly into the mystery. So Peter informs us. Paul gives it as one part of the broad purpose of the gospel, that God's manifold wisdom should be made known to the principalities and the powers in heaven; and John copiously represents them as worshipping the Lamb that was slain.

If there be still other spiritual existences (and we can hardly survey the material heavens and doubt it; surely the uncounted worlds are not mere curious mechanisms; they or their satellites are, or shall one day be, inhabited); but, to speak with the utmost caution, *if* any beside earth-born and the angels can know God, they will, they must, know of the Christ. By this thought God has enriched his universe; and poor is he that does not possess it. Not more surely do the waves of light from our sun spread abroad through space until they sweep to the outmost verge of the realm of matter, and break only along the shores of nothingness and night.

Riches of our poverty, strength of our weakness, brightness of our joy, solace of our sorrow, dwell in our hearts, world without end.

L. G. BARBOUR.

ARTICLE II.

PRESBYTERIAN ORDINATION NOT A CHARM BUT
AN ACT OF GOVERNMENT.

[Having republished in our April Number one of two arguments delivered by Dr. Robert J. Breckenridge in 1843, we fulfil the promise then made to spread the other one before our readers at this time.]

ARGUMENT SECOND.

No one, Moderator, can regret more than I do the necessity of arguing a question like the one I have now submitted to this Synod, under the extraordinary and difficult circumstances which surround me. Nothing but the deepest convictions of duty could induce me to press upon the attention of this body a subject in regard to which it is painfully evident so many of its members are resolved to hear nothing, while so many more listen under the blinding influence of a foregone conclusion. Nothing but the impression that necessity is laid upon me could sustain me under the the interruptions and vexations, altogether without precedent in this Synod, which have consumed nearly one entire session, and so large a portion of another, in a struggle on the part of many leading ministers to prevent me from being heard at all, or even having liberty to put this great subject in a position which will insure the review of the court above. And you can easily imagine, sir, that at this late hour of the night, with a body worn down, a mind harassed, and a heart full of sadness, I am but illy qualified to acquit myself in a manner becoming either the subject or the occasion.¹ I am no novice, sir, in scenes

¹The reader is referred to the printed Minutes of the Synod for an official record of the facts, and to the Spirit of the XIX. Century, Vol. II., pp. 611—20 Nov., 1843, for a rapid description of the scenes alluded to. It is proper to say, once for all, that this report only pretends to give the *substance* of what was said by me in Synod. This I have endeavored to do as accurately as my memory would serve me.

of profound agitation, but I must say I have never witnessed one which seemed to me more needless, whether reference be had to the subject which has produced it, or the object towards which it has been directed. It is not in this manner that practical questions of great importance, which it is manifest the most of us have not examined, can be settled in a Church renowned for the thoroughness with which it examines everything, and the care with which all its fixed opinions are made up. It is not by such methods that its confidence can be weaned from those who are known to it only by their advocacy of its precious faith and scriptural order—an advocacy which never stopped to count the cost, nor waited to be enlightened by the law of majorities. Nor is it in this way that ministers can most clearly establish their exclusive title to the exercise of powers, which, they seem to think, are much too sacred to be shared with our ruling elders. Sir, I have seen and heard, both in public and in private, strange things since this body met. And while I deeply regret to be obliged to say what has now fallen from me, I should feel constrained to add much more, if I were not convinced that gentlemen will, upon reflection, see reason to regret a good deal that has been said and done; and especially, if I were not sure that they will hardly think of executing, in any event, either their threats of secession from the Church, or their intimations of arresting, by the discipline of the Church, inquiries and discussions whose whole object it is to vindicate the established order of that very Church, and to place it on the immovable basis of divine right.

I think, sir, the majority of this body has been misled in several incidental decisions rendered by it during the long struggle to suppress this subject; and that I have reason to complain of the effects of those errors as regards myself. But I should be unjust to my own feelings, and to the Synod, if I did not express my admiration of that spirit by which, mastering itself, it has at length put an end to those disorders which seemed designed to prevent a decision of this question, and has resumed the usual tenor of its business. It is equally foreign from my nature to trespass needlessly upon indulgence as to be violently turned aside from my convictions. Respecting, as far as my duty will

permit, what I cannot doubt are the wishes of this court, I will omit many things which I desired to offer to its consideration, and will observe, in what I cannot properly pass by, as much brevity as is consistent with any tolerable clearness of statement.

The most of those great truths which must, as it appears to me, control the decision of the present question, are held with a common consent in the Presbyterian Church and in most other Reformed Churches. God has always had a Church in this world; and when he first instituted outward ordinances for it, he did not then for the first time have a seed to serve him, but he then placed a visible and permanent mark of separation between them and a guilty world. When he added a written revelation and set up an abiding priesthood, these were new gifts bestowed upon his Church, and not the first calling of an elect people; and the whole Jewish economy was but a means whereby the covenant of grace was held forth and administered. To this Church of God, catholic and visible, the Lord Jesus ascending up on high, has given "*the ministry*," (Conf. Faith, Ch. xxv., Sec. 3,) that is, ordinary and extraordinary officers; and in our Church those officers held to be "ordinary and perpetual, . . . in the Church, are bishops or pastors; the representatives of the people, usually styled ruling elders; and deacons," (Form of Gov., Ch. iii, Sec. 2.)¹ Of these we all admit that the first class only have it in charge to preach the gospel of Christ and to administer the sacraments; that the two first classes only have any charge in the rule of the Church, and by consequence in the composition of those assemblies in which the power to rule is lodged; and that officers of the third class are neither public teachers nor church rulers.² The lawful vocation of these officers, and especially of ministers of the word, is not a subject of dispute amongst us; but it is commonly held that to be real it must be divine, and that the subject of it ought to have as the foundation of his purpose to preach the everlasting gospel an inward call and fitness imparted by the Holy Ghost. To make his outward vocation complete, he is presumed to be called to the

¹See also Ephesians iv. 11-13; 1 Cor. xii. 28-30; Heb. v. 4.

²See Form of Government, Chaps. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, &c.

spiritual charge of some particular church, by the members of that church,¹ and then the Presbytery under whose charge he is, being satisfied upon these grounds, and also upon its own independent judgment carefully exercised in each particular case, sets the candidate apart by *ordination* to the work unto which he and they and the people of God concur in believing the Lord has called him.

Our Church has always held, in accordance with the opinion of the Reformed Churches in general, that the office of evangelist is an extraordinary one, but contrary to the judgment of the European Churches, it has held that it is an office not extinct, and provision is made in our system for the ordination of evangelists in particular circumstances.² I concur fully in the truth of both these positions; but at the same time I am bound to say that in my opinion the practice which has long prevailed with regard to ordinations *sine titulo*, and which has grown to such an evil as to demand a vigorous intervention by the General Assembly to correct it,³ is eminently calculated to introduce into the gospel ministry persons neither called nor qualified for it, and who under the pretext of being evangelists, are too often open deserters of their covenanted calling. Nor can it be denied that by this means the proper influence of the people of God, in determining by their call, or in refusing to call, is rendered to a great degree nugatory in regard to ministerial ordination; and that a large body of nominal ministers, ordained without ever having received a call from any particular church, and employed chiefly in avocations which have little relation to the ministry of the word, are exerting, through many of our most important Presbyteries, an immense authority over the whole Church, while they have no right to exert a particle of authority in any church in particular. This is the more extraordinary when we reflect that such results are not only contrary to the whole scope of our system, but to express provisions of the

¹See Form of Government, Ch. xv., *passim*.

²See Form of Government, Ch. xv., Sec. 15.

³See Assembly's printed M. notes for 1841, p. 447 (Committee on Overtures, No. 11), and Minutes for 1842, pages 28, 29.

standards of those foreign Churches to whose law and practice appeal is continually made, when infractions of our standards are to be justified or explained away.¹ Sir, it is worthy of more than a passing thought, that such furious opposition should be made against the claims of that class of presbyters called ruling elders, whose vocation is unquestioned and their employment in their proper duties undisputed; while at the same moment another class of presbyters, called ministers *sine titulo*, of whom so considerable a proportion may be seriously questioned as to the regularity of their vocation, and still more gravely called to account in regard to the nature of their employments, are permitted, without question, to exercise the highest and most delicate prerogatives of the pastors and rulers of the Church.

The main point of this discussion, so far as the question is one of positive law, is one, in regard to which it would seem to be impossible there could be a difference of opinion amongst us. Where is the power of ordaining ministers of the word lodged under our Constitution? "The *Presbytery* has power to ordain, install, remove, and judge ministers." (Form of Gov., Ch. x., Sec. 8.) What *Presbytery*? Why, sir, beyond all doubt that *Presbytery* which is one of the divinely instituted assemblies declared in this same Constitution to be invested with power to govern the Church of Christ (Ch. viii., Sec. 1); that *Presbytery* defined in the same Chapter which declares its power to ordain, as being composed of many separate congregations, which, by their need of mutual counsel, invest presbyterial assemblies with their importance and usefulness, and declared to consist of *ministers and ruling elders* (Ch. x., Sec. 1 and 2); that *Presbytery*, thus constituted, which is so often and so prominently held forth throughout the entire Chapter which treats expressly of the ordination of pastors and evangelists (Ch. xv.); that *Presbytery*, to which, as constituted of the officers called of God to receive the fearful trust of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the

¹For the doctrine of the First Book of Discipline of the Scottish Church, see Duncan's Collections, p. 54-55; for that of the Second Book of Discipline, *Idem*, p. 71-2; for that of the Westminster Assembly and the Kirk of Scotland after 1645, *Idem*, p. 178-9.

power of Church censures is committed. (Confession of Faith, Ch. xxx., Sec. 1 and 2.) This, sir, is the body to which, by language as plain as language can be, the power to ordain ministers is confided under this Constitution. This power is confided to it *as a body*—not to its individual members; to it, *as the* body defined in the instrument itself; and to place the power in any other hands than those of an assembly composed of the pastors and ruling elders of the churches of a particular district, is to act in gross disregard of law which we have solemnly declared we believe to be in full accordance with the revealed will of God, and which we have sacredly bound ourselves by mutual covenants to observe. It is nothing to the present argument whether other ordinations be valid or invalid, though I readily admit them to be for substance good, even when they are irregular in form. It is nothing worth to enter into the questions so largely disputed in the Westminster Assembly about congregations fixed and congregations fluid—about a church state settled, and a church state unsettled; about the exclusive power of Presbytery and the concurrent power of Presbytery and consistory or church session in the premises. It is wholly beside the question, as matter of strict argument, what our own Church even believed or did before the formation of the present Form of Church Government, and its adoption in 1788; as much so as it would be to determine the powers of the present Congress of the United States by the practice or the theory of the government under the old Confederation, instead of doing it by a fair construction of the present Constitution. The true question is, What is the law of this Church as laid down in this book? And the answer is simple, clear, explicit—that the ordination of ministers of the word belongs, under our covenanted system, neither to pastors nor committees, nor nondescript things called quorums, nor church sessions, nor Synods, but to *Presbyteries*; and not to Presbyteries in the vague and general sense of the term, but to the Presbyteries of this Constitution. Nor can I conceive, sir, that a candid mind can doubt in regard to this point, after it has been plainly stated.

The *formal* parts of this ordination are stated with absolute

precision. A fast day ought to be observed in the congregation where the ordination is to take place previous to it. (Form of Gov., Ch. xv., Sec. 11.) The *Presbytery* being convened, a member ought to preach a sermon; the same, or some other member, should explain, enforce, and recapitulate the case; the person appointed to preside should ask the questions set down to be answered both by the candidate and the people (*Idem.*, Sec. 12 and 13). "Then the presiding minister shall by prayer, and with the laying on of the hands of the *Presbytery*, according to the apostolic example, solemnly ordain him to the holy office of the Gospel ministry." (*Idem.*, Sec. 14.) Who shall ordain him? "*The presiding minister*," in the name, by the authority, with the concurrence, in the bosom of the constituted *Presbytery*—as its Moderator—and not otherwise; so are the words written. Whose hands are to be laid on him that is ordained? "*The hands of the Presbytery*;" so again are the written words. What *Presbytery*? Why, beyond all the powers of human ingenuity and perversity to gainsay, the *Presbytery* of this Constitution; the *Presbytery* of this Chapter; the *Presbytery* that licensed the candidate; the *Presbytery* that received his call and and put it into his hands; the *Presbytery* that examined him and appointed a day to ordain him, and met for that purpose in the church that called him; the *Presbytery* that chose one of its ministers to preach, another to deliver a charge to the people, another to deliver a charge to the new minister, another to preside at his ordination. This is the *Presbytery* that lays its hands on him; and to assert the contrary—I say it without intending to give offence—is utter folly. But this *Presbytery* is a *Presbytery* which consists of ministers and elders—a *Presbytery* in which one elder from every congregation in the district has a right to sit as a member. Therefore, by the irresistible force of the very terms of the law, every elder present, and a member of the body, is as much bound to lay on his hands as any member present can be. Why, sir, would you stultify our fathers? Did they first define with the utmost clearness the term *Presbytery*; then invest the body so called with the power of ordaining ministers of the word; then, in a long chapter treating of this ordination in detail

use the word a dozen times in its defined sense; and then without notice or motive use the same word in the same chapter and touching the same business, in a sense not only inconsistent with their own definition of it, and their constant use of it, but in a sense flatly contrary to both? The thing is supremely absurd. We have in this city a municipal government which consists of a Mayor and two bodies called jointly the City Council. Suppose the Legislature of this State were to pass an Act of fourteen or fifteen sections, defining the power belonging to the municipal government over any particular subject, and directing minutely the manner of its exercise; suppose it should say in one section it meant by the words "municipal government" the Mayor and the two branches of the City Council, and then throughout the Act use the words confessedly in this sense, until it came to the fourteenth section, and in it should use the same words, in regard to the same matter, once more; now, sir, I demand of you, what would be thought of a man who could seriously contend that in this case the words "municipal government," used in the fourteenth section of the Act, really did not mean the Mayor and both branches of the City Council, but in fact meant only and singly the first branch? Will you say, no man would venture upon so marvellous a folly? Then why, sir, shall we have a thing just as preposterous forced upon the Church, in the name of reason, of our Constitution, and of the word of God?

A good deal has been said and written to prove that the views held by me are essentially Congregational, and that the ordination contended for by me is Congregational ordination. Various bodies, calling themselves Congregationalists or Independents, have adopted a threefold method of ordination. Some have contended that the brotherhood in each congregation must ordain; which is strict Independency. But, sir, have I not put forth all my strength, here and elsewhere, to prove that ordination appertains to government, and that church government is *jure divino* in assemblies of Presbyters, both teaching and ruling? Others have contended, as did most of the early English Independents, that ordination is in the hands of the teaching and ruling officers of

each particular congregation. But, sir, have I not always, and earnestly, testified that the ruling assemblies, and, of course, the ordaining assemblies of the Church, are classical and synodical, as well as congregational, and that ordination regularly belongs to the classical—that is, Presbyterian assemblies? The Congregationalists of America, in their early platforms, directed that in “calling and choosing a pastor,” the particular church should “consult and advise with the pastors of the neighboring congregations;” and that in ordaining him and setting him apart to his office, “’tis ordinarily requisite that the pastors of neighboring congregations concur with the preaching elder or elders, if such there be.”¹ That is, they held ordination to the ministry to be in the hands of ministers only; which is precisely the doctrine against which I am contending—precisely the doctrine of those who denounce me as a Brownist! [Here the Rev. Dr. Culyer interposed, and said that the practice of the New England churches at present is to ordain by councils, composed both of ministers and lay messengers from the particular churches, and that in the act of ordination the ministers alone imposed hands.] Moderator, I have carefully examined this subject, as it is contained in formal and public acts, and I do not see how I can have been misled in regard to it. But the testimony of my excellent friend being to matter of fact, of which he says he has personal knowledge, of course I take it as unquestionable; and I beg him and this Synod to observe how my argument is strengthened by the information he has given us. Why, sir, Congregational ordination, as now explained, is precisely the ordination which the construction of the Assembly of 1843 established, as taught in our standards: ordination by an assembly of ministers and others, in which all but the ministers stand aside when hands are imposed, and they alone perform this act. Indeed, ours is the more unwarrantable of the two; for our ordaining assembly, thus broken into fragments, is a real church court, while the New England council is but a special and occasional assembly; our ruling elders are

¹ See Heads of Agreement, and Articles of Church Discipline, agreed on at Saybrook, September 9, 1708, Ch. ii., Sec. 4 and 5, p. 109; Edition of 1810 of Saybrook Platform.

scriptural presbyters—ordained officers, set apart to compose such assemblies—while the Congregational lay messengers do not pretend to be presbyters, and may be only private members of the churches. No, sir; the principles for which I contend are strictly Presbyterian principles; the ordination they establish is a purely Presbyterian ordination; nor am I able to comprehend how these principles and this ordination can be rejected, without falling off on the one side to the final grounds of Prelacy, or, on the other, to those of Independency.

It cannot escape notice, that, if ruling elders are denied the right of imposing hands in the ordination of pastors and evangelists, it must necessarily follow that they ought to be prevented from taking any part in every other portion of these ordinations. The ground upon which they act in the matter at all, under this Constitution, is, that they are declared to be a component part of of the Presbytery (Form of Government, Chap. x., Sec. 2); that the Presbytery is declared to have power to ordain ministers (*Idem*, Sec 8); and that “the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery” is declared to be a formal part of this ordination (*Idem*, Chap. xv., Sec. 14); and it is a ground altogether impregnable. If the laying on of hands be the only essential part of ordination, or the main part of it, then the more clearly this is proved, the more important is it that ruling elders be not illegally ousted of their rights, and the more manifest is it that this right is inherent in their office—since, if this is ordination, this is the very thing they are commanded to do. But, on the other hand, if the imposition of hands is any part at all of ordination, then, manifestly, the body which has the entire power of ordination has power to perform this part of ordination; and, therefore, ruling elders have it upon the same ground precisely that preaching elders have it, namely, that they are members of the body to which the right appertains; and to deny this involves either that imposition of hands is no part of ordination, or that ordination is not by the Presbytery, both of which are absurd, and contrary to express law: or that ruling elders may be denied any participation in a part of ordination, which is expressly declared to belong to the whole Presbytery; and if this can be done, then they can, on the

same grounds, be deprived of all participation in all parts of ordination, and that act cease to be presbyterial, and become merely hierarchic, as to every part of it; which is precisely the tendency of the greater part of the arguments I have heard and read on the other side. Furthermore, upon the same grounds precisely, the ruling elders ought to be deprived (and if they tolerate the present encroachment, they will be deprived at last) of all right to take any part in installing, removing, and judging ministers, as well as in ordaining them; for the whole four powers are of one and the same class, and are embraced and invested by a single clause (Form of Government, Chap. x., Sec. 8,) of the Constitution. There is full as much sense in the notion that an elder cannot take away the ministerial office because he cannot give it, as in that so current amongst us, that he cannot give it because he has it not himself; and there is far more reason to say he shall in no case take part in installations than to prohibit the imposition of his hands, since the latter act is only and always presbyterial, while the former one may be done by committee. (Form of Government, Chap. xvi., Sec. 6.) And surely it is far more evident that when ministers are installed by a committee of ministers, ruling elders can have no right to take part in removing them, seeing they had none in placing them, than it is that they cannot impose hands in ordination, even though ordination be an act of Presbytery only, and they members of the body. The truth is, sir, the whole matter resolves itself into one of these four propositions: either the imposition of hands is not a Presbyterial act, which is exactly contrary to the words of the Constitution; or Presbyterial acts may be performed where there is no Presbyterial authority, which is absurd and revolutionary; or ruling elders, when members of Presbytery, must unite in the act, which is true; or you must show an explicit statement in the Constitution, not only that a Presbytery is good without them—which the Synod asserts and the Constitution denies—but that even when they are present, they are denied this right; that is, that even when members, they are not members.

Extraordinary as the attempt is, gentlemen of high character in the Church have been found willing to undertake the proof of

the proposition that ruling elders, when members of Presbytery, are, *pro hac vice*, not members of it. They try to show this, first, analogically, as a thing that might be; for as there are other rights of which they are deprived, they might also be deprived of this; and the instance taken is, they cannot be moderators of the body. I reply, this is by clear law of the Church; and as that law was requisite in order to obtain that result, the absence of any such law in regard to the point before us, is conclusive of the case. But seeing the law is positive against the thing which the analogy is supposed to prove to be possible, it is preposterous to argue for what might be, in the very teeth of what is. The Constitution might have allowed ministers to be ordained by committees of ministers; it chose another plan, and required them to be ordained by Presbytery; and it is argued that the elders may be ousted from Presbytery, of which they are members, because the plan of ordaining by committees, of which they were not members, might have been adopted. This is mere trifling. Another ground of argument is sought in a play upon the word "*ministry*," used at the close of the ordination, thus: "Prayer being ended, . . . *all the members of the Presbytery* in their order (shall) take him by the right hand, saying, *in words to this purpose*, We give you the right hand of fellowship to take part of this ministry with us" (Form of Government, Ch. xv., Sec. 14); and it is urged that *ministry* in this clause means ministry of the word, and therefore elders cannot use it. What then? Suppose they cannot do this, how does that prove they cannot impose hands? They cannot preside, but does that prove they cannot do something else which is different? Again, the man is already ordained; our argument is not about what may be done after, but in the act of ordaining. Again, suppose some other suitable word which an elder could use were substituted for the word *ministry*—the order being "*words to this purpose*;" how then? Again, the order is "*all the members of the Presbytery*;" are elders not members? But, chiefly, the whole sophism rests on an error of fact. The word *ministry* is, no doubt, in its popular use often, perhaps generally, applied to the ministers of the word; but our standards, and those of other Presbyterian

Churches, and our Bible, too, use it technically to mean all the divinely ordained officers of the Church. Our Confession says, "Christ hath given *the ministry* oracles and ordinances of God for *the gathering and perfecting* of the saints in this life to the end of the world," (Ch. xxv., Sec. 3,) and our Form of Government declares that pastors, ruling elders, and deacons are the ordinary and perpetual officers of the Church, given to it by Christ, as already abundantly proved; therefore these standards must contradict themselves, or else in them, and so in this place, the word *ministry* does not mean simply the ministers of the word. The *Second Book of Discipline* of the Kirk of Scotland is equally explicit: "According to the parts of this division, (to wit, of the Policie of the Kirk,) ariseth a sort of threefold officers in the Kirk, to wit, of ministers preachers, elders governors, and deacons distributors. *And all these may be called by a generall word, ministers of the Kirk.*" (Ch. ii., Par. 2.)¹ Yes, sir, and our brother Paul is more explicit even than our brother Andrew Melville; for knowing that the Master had laid down and enforced in his own inexpressible humiliation the great truth that *minister* of the Church and *servant* of the Church are the very same thing,² he expressly declares that all the gifts of him who ascended far above all heavens, were for a work which he expresses by a word borrowed from the name of the humblest office in the Church—a *deaconry*—a *ministry*³; and seeing that he had called Christ himself *a minister, a servant*⁴ for the truth of God, using the same word, when he speaks of himself and even of his apostolic office, he goes out of the circle of ecclesiastical phraseology, and selects a word lower than the lowest he could find there, to say, "So account of us as of the *ministers*⁵ of Christ." And has it really come to this, that *ministry* no longer

¹ See also in Niemeyer's *Collectio Confessionum*; *Confessio Belgica*, Art. xxxi. *Confessio Helvetica posterior*, Art. xviii. *Confessio Bohemica* (1575), Art. xii.

² Matt. xx. 26-28, *διάκονος*—*δούλος*.

³ Eph. iv. 8-13.

⁴ Rom. xv. 8, *διάκονον*.

⁵ 1 Cor. iv. 1, *ὑπηρέτας*—the humble official attendants upon magistrates and courts.

means a service, *minister* no longer a servant? and that the preaching elders of this Church shall separate themselves from the profane herd of ruling elders, when the more sacred functions of their common rule are to be discharged, because the former are above that rank which Christ attributes to the highest, or because the latter are below even that service which, as the very humblest, Paul, in his humility, attributes to himself? And what shall justify this torture of our Constitution, that, in the midst of its groans, ministers who are unwilling to be classed with other servants of the Church may find some dubious sounds which they can interpret so as to favor their exalted conceptions of their official rank? *The practice of the Church! The practice of the Church!* What Church, sir? The same Church that declared the office of deacon to be divine and perpetual, and through a century and a half practised that it was neither one nor the other? The same Church that declared the pastoral office to be not only divine and permanent, but the first of all in "dignity and usefulness," and after a century and a half not one-third of all its ministers had ever been pastors? The same Church that provides only for the ordination of pastors and evangelists, and then fills its Presbyteries with ministers who are neither one nor the other? The same Church that binds its evangelists by the most solemn vows to labor in frontier and destitute settlements, that is, to be real missionaries, and allows these same so-called evangelists to concentrate about the great marts of population, business, and wealth, and to spend their lives in utter disregard of the cries of our hundreds of vacant churches, themselves absorbed all the while in secular pursuits? The same Church that, by solemn and deliberate treaty, provided for the abolition of the office of ruling elder, which office it professed to believe was *jure divino*, and covenanted to allow Presbyteries to be formed in direct violation of what it professed to believe was the divine model of Presbytery, and for six-and-thirty years tenaciously held by these monstrous stipulations? And as for the pretended practice—what is it? That elders *shall not* impose hands in the ordination of ministers of the word? I deny that any such practice ever did, or, from the nature of the case, ever could exist,

independently of clear law ; or if it existed, could be proved in the manner here attempted. That elders *did not* so impose hands might be a practice and might be proved ; but that they *should not* is a long step farther ; and the moment this principle has been attempted to be asserted as the sense of the Church, it has created an excitement which it will require better arguments than the previous question to allay. That elders *did not* impose their hands *actually*, is asserted with great confidence to have been the uniform practice ; the very *general* practice it may have been ; the *universal* practice I have personal knowledge it was not, and that in portions of the Church the most thoroughly imbued with the principles of our system. That *potentially*, whoever did impose hands, did it as the act of the whole body, and therefore of the elders in the body, is just as clear as that when the candidate is ordained by the Moderator presiding—as by the words of our book he is—the ordination is potentially that of the body, and so is Presbyterial ; and this is one manifest proof of the absurdity of talking about a practice that elders *should not* impose hands. Can any case be produced of elders having been turned out of Presbytery when the body was about to proceed to an ordination ? Can any man produce an act of the General Assembly before 1843 sanctioning so portentous an outrage ? If, so, let us have it. And suppose, sir, it could be proved with absolute certainty that elders never did lay on hands, would it be our duty to make the law conform to that practice ? or ought we not rather correct the practice by the law ? And suppose the provisions of the law were as vague as they are clear and precise, and one construction would favor the previous practice and understanding of the Church, while an opposite one accorded with the great principles of our system, and with the word of God ; who could hesitate in such a case ? I am fully persuaded that the opinions of the men who framed our system can be shown from their decided and well considered acts to have been wholly inconsistent with the view of this subject which is attempted to be fastened upon their memories ; but I am also bound to say, that if every man of them were sitting in this Synod to-night, it would be your duty and my duty to take their

testimony as to the meaning of this instrument not a jot farther than that testimony accorded with the sense of the instrument itself. We have sworn to this Constitution, not in any hidden, reserved, or implicit sense, locked up in the minds of those who drew it up, and capable of being brought to light only by putting the thing to the rack; but we have sworn to it in its own sense, held forth in its own terms, and made obvious by the just consideration of all its parts, according to the fair, true, and simple meaning of the whole. And, sir, we should never have heard of the opinions of our fathers, and the practice of our Church—tradition and infallibility in Presbyterian Church courts—if gentlemen had been able to meet this question, upon the law and the testimony, either of the Church, or of the Church's glorious Head.

The methods of wresting the plain sense of written instruments, which I have now considered, and which, as you well know, are, as applied to our standards, and to the present case, common to nearly all who have lately spoken or written against the rights of our ruling elders, incompetent as they are in their own nature, and empty of all force, yet have a show of respect for the forms of reason, and for the established order of the Church. They pretend to ascertain the actual sense of actual law. But gentlemen take much higher grounds when such as these fail them, and with all their nervous anxiety for the reputation of the fathers of our Constitution, they do not hesitate to bring them and their handiwork to a very summary issue, by a very summary process. The ruling elder—so they argue—is, from the very nature of his office, incompetent even to assist in the ordination of preaching elders, and therefore it is impossible the Constitution can mean to say he ought to be allowed to do any such thing as impose hands on them. This, sir, is not to imitate, it is to judge our fathers; it is not to interpret, it is to try the law; it is not to execute, it is to make a Constitution. Yet I willingly meet the issue; and having, as I humbly conceive, proved that the law is what it is, I will venture to offer some of those considerations which satisfy my mind that it ought not to be different.

The earliest national Confession of the Kirk of Scotland, that

read in the face of the Scottish Parliament and ratified by the three estates of the realm on the 17th of August, 1560, declares that the word of God truly preached, the sacraments rightly administered, and discipline executed according to the word of God, are the infallible signs of the true Church. (Art. xviii. and xxv.) The sacraments, adds this venerable Confession, can be rightly administered only by "lawful ministers, whom we affirm to be only they that are lawfully appointed to the preaching of the word, into whose mouth God hath put some sermon of exhortation, they being men lawfully chosen thereto by some Church." (Art. xxii.) *John Knox* and four other persons composed this Confession; the same hands composed the *First Book of Discipline*. Treating expressly of the ministers of the word, this early platform of Church Order and Discipline declares that "the lawful vocation standeth in the election of the people, examination of the ministry, and admission by both." And then afterwards that, "In their admission . . . other ceremonies, except fasting with prayer, such as laying on of hands, we judge not necessary in the institution of the ministry." (Ch. iv., paragraphs 1 and 2.) About twenty years after the adoption of this book, the *Second Book of Discipline* was drawn up by *Andrew Melville*, and adopted by all the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the kingdom. It has been made the basis of more numerous and solemn national acts than any other paper, perhaps, of merely human origin; and as far as I can discover is still in full force in the Scottish Church and kingdom. This remarkable work treats in the same chapter, and as one general subject, the admission of all persons bearing ecclesiastical functions, to their office, and declares that "vocation or calling is common to all;" that "ordinary or outward calling hath two parts—election and ordination;" that election is the choosing by "the eldership and consent of the congregation;" that "ordination is the separation and sanctifying of the person appointed to God and his Kirk, after he is well tried and found qualified;" and that "the ceremonies of ordination are fasting, earnest prayer, and imposition of the hands of the eldership." (Ch. iii., par. 1, 6, 10, 11.) Such is ordination according to the doctrine of that venerable

Church whose standards have furnished so large a portion of our own, and such it is, essentially, as held by all the Reformed Churches, and I may add by the primitive and apostolic Church. There is no charm here—no mystery, no incantation, no juggle, no *opus operatum*, no symbolical hocus pocus, no transfer of a virus, no pretence of a flux of spiritual influences—nothing about a transmission of anything. The whole is simple and grand. God chooses his servants by an inward vocation, and designates a mode by which their outward calling may be regularly sealed, in a lawful election, and a solemn dedication of each to his appointed work; and this is all. What there can be in the doctrine of ordination properly conceived that should make one shudder at the idea, as at profanation and sacrilege, that a ruling elder should be presumed competent to aid in the ordination of a preaching elder, is to me altogether incomprehensible. Or if gentlemen insist that I do not fairly state the case—or the exact point of their objection, and are in earnest when they make a distinction between the act of imposing hands and all other parts of ordination, why let us give them the benefit of this correction. And what is there in the nature of this act, which was entirely rejected by the early Scottish Church, that renders it improper for a scriptural presbyter, yea, a scriptural bishop, to take part in it? To deny that the elders of the New Testament are *presbyters* is mere nonsense, for the English word is only a translation of the Greek one, and is just the same as to say an elder is not an elder, or to say a presbyter is not a presbyter. To deny that the elders of the New Testament are bishops is to contradict the very words of the divine record, for the very same men and offices have both words indiscriminately applied to them, and to set up Prelacy upon a foundation stronger than its own advocates assume. To take refuge under the distinction held by Presbyterian Churches in general, that there are two classes of scriptural elders, namely, such as rule only, and such as both rule and labor in word and doctrine, is but to betray ignorance of the whole subject. For you will be obliged to go a step further, and either show that ordination does not appertain to the power of *regimen* in the Church, but to the power of *order*—which is stark Popery;

or else that those who are elders simply *for rule*, do not belong to those bodies which have the entire *regimen* of the Church in their hands—which is stark nonsense. Sir, I do beseech this Synod to consider these obvious truths, every one of which is so perfectly simple as to be, upon our common principles, pretty nearly self-evident, as soon as it is put clearly before an unprejudiced mind. Let it be once conceded, as it is on all hands, that imposition of hands, if practised at all, is a part of the ordination service, and then it follows irresistibly, from the truths just stated, and from each of them separately, that ruling elders ought to lay on hands, and, therefore, that our law is right. *Presbytery* imposes hands in ordination; elders are of right members of that body; therefore they must necessarily impose hands. *Presbyters*, when met in Presbytery, ordain by the imposition of hands; elders are presbyters, and do meet in that body; therefore they must impose hands. *Bishops* are presbyters with cure of souls, and therefore sit as members and unite in imposing hands; elders are presbyters, with cure of souls, and so are bishops, and therefore must impose hands. The power of *order* is a several power, such as the power to preach, administer sacraments, &c.; but imposition of hands, with every other part of ordination, is a presbyterial, that is a *joint* power; therefore a minister of the word does not impose hands as a minister, nor as exercising any power of *order*, but as a ruler, that is an elder, and therefore upon the same ground as elders of the other class, that is ruling elders. All power of *regimen* is *joint*, that is, presbyterial, for the whole rule of the Church, as I have largely demonstrated in a former speech before this Synod, is in assemblies; but imposition of hands, and every other part of ordination, is a presbyterial, that is a *joint* power; and therefore all who have the power of rule must have the right to impose hands.¹ And, sir, if we look at the

¹ The reader is referred for a very clear and learned demonstration that ruling elders are both presbyters and bishops, to Dr. Miller's Essay on the Ruling Elder. That upon the ground of their being rulers, they imposed hands, is clearly proved in the Essay of Mr. Thornwell, referred to in the previous speech. See also Second Book of Discipline, and Owen's Gospel Church, for the nature of joint and several power. And see also the Spirit of the XIX. Century for October, 1842, for a fuller statement.

subject in the opposite aspect, it is equally overwhelming. Are these elders scriptural presbyters? If not, let them depart from your Church courts. Are your Presbyteries scripturally composed when teaching and ruling elders meet together in them? If not, let us break up our system, and confess our errors like honest men. Does the right of ordination belong to the power of *order*, and is it transmitted ministerially by the imposition of hands? Then let us turn Papists at once, and establish the sacrament of orders. Is parity a distinctive feature of Presbyterianism? Then how shall we defend this more than prelatie imparity? For the highest churchman on earth admits all presbyters to be by order equal—all bishops to be of the same rank; nay, while their prelates ordain their presbyters, they allow other presbyters to assist and impose hands. If these are our opinions, and we are determined to make our standards utter such principles as these, let us at least avoid the charge of handling the word of God deceitfully, by citing and stereotyping texts in a sense the opposite of our belief. Our Form of Government (Ch. viii., Sec. 1 and 2) quotes Acts xv. 6, to prove the government of the church to be *jure divino*, in assemblies congregational, classical, and synodical; and then in Ch. x., Sec. 1, and Ch. xi., on the title, it quotes the same passage to prove that, *jure divino*, classical and synodical assemblies are composed of pastors and ruling elders. In Ch. xv., Sec. 14, 1 Tim. iv., 14, is quoted to prove that in ordination the hands of the Presbytery ought to be imposed; and in Ch. x., Sec. 1, the same passage is quoted to prove that many congregations are united in one Presbytery composed of pastors and ruling elders. So that holding ruling elders to be incompetent to impose hands, we quote a passage which proves that Presbytery ordains by imposition of hands, and quote it again to prove that ruling elders as well as preaching elders were in that Presbytery. And holding that the power of regimen held by ruling elders does not qualify them to act in a matter which falls immediately and absolutely under the power of an assembly having rule, we quote a passage to prove, in the first place, that this assembly has the power of rule, and in the second, that ruling elders were in it! The passage in Timothy puts it

out of dispute that the body which ordains is a Presbytery, and that it ordains with imposition of its hands; while that in Atts is equally conclusive that it had jurisdiction, and that the elders who sat in it were all neither more nor less than presbyters. Here, sir, I may boldly take my stand. These marginal citations clearly prove by Scripture that the doctrine asserted in our standards is that which I assert before you now, and that the men who put them there and have kept them there understood these standards to teach this doctrine. Assemblies which have rule in the Church—which are composed of teaching and ruling elders, and are therefore called Presbyteries—ordain ministers of the word by the imposition of the hands of their members without discrimination. This is the doctrine of these standards and of God's word. And, sir, I invoke your solemn consideration of the state of the question to which the whole argument conducts us. The whole office of the ruling elder is involved. His power to ordain depends on his power to rule, and they stand or fall together. His position under our Constitution and by the word of God is determined by the same argument, and will be decided by the same vote. With him falls the grand peculiarity of Presbyterian, and, as I believe, of Christian, Church Order. And if the opinions now predominant in this Synod prevail over the Church, a revolution in every part of your ecclesiastical practice and opinion must follow, perhaps insensibly, but not the less fatally; and the final assumption of all authority into the hands of the ministers will bring after it those results and that ruin which we have seen in all ages flow from that frightful calamity.

I will venture, Moderator, to go a step farther in this investigation, and meet in its germ what seems to be the radical error of those who deny the principles for which I contend. Their immediate error lies in a misconception of the power which is exercised in ordination, and from thence, very naturally, a mistake arises as to the depositories of this power. I have entered the less fully into this part of the case, both because I have clearly exhibited its principles in my argument before the Synod on the question of *jurisdiction* as involved in that of a *quorum* of Presbytery, and because of the painful and embarrassing circumstances

in which I am addressing you. But I have probably said enough to make it apparent that the denial of this right of ruling elders, for which I plead, must rest at last, if it has any rational foundation, upon the double assumption that ministerial ordination depends upon and is related, somehow or other, to the *potestas ordinis*, and that this dependence and relation are such that it is the *potestas ordinis* of ministers of the word only that is available in the ordination of other ministers of the word. The question of imposition of hands is only the touchstone that reveals the existence of these two fallacies, either one of which, fairly pursued, annihilates the whole fabric of that church order, whose fundamental principles, both as they are rational and as they are scriptural, are that ordination, as well as jurisdiction, is not a several power, but a joint one, and that both are in the hands of assemblies constituted, not of one, but of two classes of elders. But there is an error behind both of these, and to which both are traceable—as to the very tenure of all power held by the officers of the Church of Christ. If the power held by the assemblies or the officers of the Church was absolute in its nature, and held in the way of sovereign and inherent right, there might be a very remote approach to plausibility, perhaps, in a great deal that has been said and written on this question. But, sir, all the powers we hold, or can hold, in the Church, are utterly and immeasurably removed from the nature of absolute authority. All power is absolutely in Christ; he gave—*but only in trust*—to his inspired apostles authority to found and shape his kingdom; to that kingdom he gives officers, who are not inspired; and to these he gives—*but also in trust*—powers very much inferior, both in kind and in degree, to those he gave, in trust and temporarily, to his apostles. The apostles, far above us in all respects, had nothing to *transmit*, in any proper sense of that word, as of themselves, or even as officers of Christ's Church; but when Christ chose to add to them other apostles, they numbered one of them with themselves¹—they gave another the right hand of fellowship

¹ That is on the supposition that Matthias was, in any true sense, an apostle. The competency of the apostles to do what they did in his case—especially before the descent of the Holy Ghost—the almost total subse-

after he had been, independently of them, for many years an apostle. So we, as ministers of the word, or as rulers in the Church, have nothing to transmit. Our business in this respect is simply, when God shows to us that he has chosen another minister, another ruler, to add him to our number, to give him the right of fellowship; to do this by such acts and such significant ceremonies (of which we suppose the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery is one) as the first, the great servants of our Lord have, by his orders, instituted. The mode of arguing that men cannot impart what they have not, and, therefore, elders cannot act, implies that we can impart what we have, to wit—if the argument has any sense—our divine calling, and sufficiency, and unction from above. But will any Presbyterian maintain a doctrine so monstrous? And yet, upon any other ground, the sophism is a mere play on words. For what sane man will venture to say a trust can never be executed unless the trustee has exactly the same interest, both in kind and in degree, that *he* has upon whom the trust terminates? For example, that Christ could not, either permanently or temporarily, empower kings to select prophets, or prophets to select kings, preachers to select rulers in the Church, or rulers to select preachers, or both unitedly to select both, just as readily, as simply, yea, reverently speaking, just as rationally, as to direct preachers to select preachers—he himself, by his Spirit, his providence, and his word, for ever superintending the whole? Why, sir, even under the Jewish economy, when a priesthood was not only divinely instituted, but continued in a right line from Aaron by a special providence attesting that divine institution, and intrusion into it was punished by death, the priests were subjected to the inspection and the decision of the elders, who were judges and rulers, and of whom not a single man was, by any necessity, a priest himself, in order to ascertain

quent silence in regard to him, the probable limitation of the true apostolate to the number of twelve, and the transcendent claims of Paul to be the twelfth, are some of the reasons which cast doubt on the vocation of Matthias. But, admitting it to have been proper and valid, he was chosen by means of an *extraordinary* appeal to God, and was simply *numbered* with the rest, according to the argument of the speech.

the reality of their call of God, as to birth, age, physical, social, and ceremonial facts, which settled the right of each particular priest to be admitted to offer sacrifice; and Moses, who was no priest, but a ruler, consecrated Aaron and his sons. Those priests were, by a divine law, entitled to their office; but the conditions of entrance, and the proof of their claim, must necessarily be passed on by some competent authority, which authority was the elders of Israel. So with us, a ministry appointed of Christ, and its members called and qualified by Christ, have a divine right to the exercise of the functions belonging to their respective offices; but it necessarily must be that some competent authority in the Church must pass upon these facts, and the Christian people and the elders of the Church are that authority—the former by their call, the latter by their ordination, attesting and giving outward regularity to the vocation of each person in particular. The whole notion of a *transmitted* authority in the Christian ministry is utterly fallacious; and the whole assumption that, if there was such a transmission, it must be through a succession of the same description of persons, is a second and still more absurd fallacy, built upon the first. Nor are these fallacies barren speculations. We see their first influence in the violent advocacy of principles in our own Church which are wholly subversive of its order, and in the harsh and intemperate conduct and sentiments which so remarkably accompany those principles; and we may read the fearful record of their progress and results in every age and period where the hierarchic spirit and doctrine have been engrafted upon Christianity. Sir, the whole conception is as thoroughly at war with history as it is with reason and with Scripture. There is not only no such doctrine in God's word, but there is no such ministry upon the earth; and if the right to preach or to rule in the Church of Christ depends on our ability to trace a transmitted authority through the imposition of the hands of other preachers or rulers, then it is manifest that there is not in the world one person who has the right either to rule or to preach. The moment it is proved that these rights are *transmitted* rights, which must come to us only through officers like ourselves, back to the Saviour, that moment it is proved that there is not under the sun

anything approaching to a valid ministry; for, as to the matter of fact, not only is it utterly impossible to trace back any such succession—and so the proof is fatally defective—but it is capable of the clearest proof that every existing line of such pretended succession has been repeatedly and incurably broken. As it regards this pretended transmission, it is perfectly notorious that the leaders of the glorious Reformation of the sixteenth century came, every one of them, out of the Church of Rome; that they renounced, every one of them, that Church as the synagogue of Satan; that they relied, every one of them, on the extraordinary nature of their own vocation to justify their acts, and not on any ordination they ever had from Rome; and that in the exercise of the powers vested by Christ *in his Church*—which is his body—they established, one and all, the broad foundations of truth, on which we stand until now. Here, sir, is the only succession that the nature of the case admits—the only permanent, available, scriptural succession; the succession of heaven-descended truth, and of the glorious fellowship, the redeemed host to which officers and courts are both alike given; the succession of Christ's doctrine and Christ's people—now here, now there—sometimes on the throne of Constantine, sometimes in the dungeons of the Inquisition—sometimes fully organised, sometimes disorganised—but everywhere the inheritors of the promises, the depositaries of the faith, the witnesses for the truth, the royal priesthood. To his Church the Saviour has given a form of administration; to it, officers, to conduct its affairs; but the succession is neither in the form, nor in the officer, but in the truth, and in itself.¹ And when the form is corrupted or debased, it is its prerogative to restore it; and when the officers are extinct, or are apostate, it is its prerogative, obedient to God's providence, and guided by his indwelling spirit, to call forth from its bosom new teachers and new rulers. Again and again has it done both—shut up to the necessity by a divine *constraint*, and rewarded for its obedience by the divine smiles. And, sir, I pray God it may never be forgotten, that in the primitive Church the hierarchic spirit first

¹ See Turret in III., pp. 240–9. Loc. 24, Quæ. 23. Magdeburg Centurians, Cent. I., pp. 292, 391, 514; Cent. II., p. 130; Cent. III., p. 254.

manifested itself, and laid the first principles of Prelacy and Popery by the well-meant but fatal error of selecting one of the presbyters, and giving to him the sole power of ordination²—an error slight in its extent, compared with what we shall commit, if we, instead of a temporary and prudential, though illegal and dangerous, elevation of a single minister above his class, should by one blow divide into two different orders the presbyters of the Church, and while we elevate one above the Church itself, degrade the other from the exercise of the common functions of their office. The act that converts Presbyterian ordination from an exercise of church power into a charm will work sorrow and ruin, when you and I, Moderator, shall have long ceased from our labors, and will be cited by our mourning children with an emphasis little according with the temper in which those around me have received my earnest warnings.

I think, sir, I have now shown that, by our law as it stands, the principles of the minute I have submitted to this Synod are clearly established, and that the more closely we apply the tests of reason, of history, and of Scripture, the more evident it is that our law is right. The work of ordaining ministers of the word is, and ought to be, the work of a Presbytery constituted by teaching and ruling elders; and the imposition of hands belongs to the same body which performs all the rest of the work. The doctrine and practice of other Reformed Churches have been confidently appealed to as conclusive against the view which I take of this subject. The *practice* of other Churches I do not pretend to have sufficiently examined into to speak with confidence about it; nor indeed does it appear to me a point of sufficient importance to be worthy of discussion, under the circumstances. If there was a total absence of written law, if that law was vague, if there was any tolerable certainty that the practice of Churches always accorded strictly with their own law, if there was the least pretext that all the particular churches do not require frequent reformations themselves, or if we had certain information, and a uniform practice, there might be some inducement to look

² See Hieron, ad Evagrium. Also, Magdeburg Centuriators, Cent. II., p. 125.

into this idlest, vaguest, weakest part of the most uncertain of all rules of duty—the opinions of men as weak, as ignorant, and as sinful as ourselves. The *doctrine* of other Reformed Churches I have considered as standing in a different light, and have carefully examined it, especially as it is set forth in their public and formal-standards. There are many reasons why these authorised and carefully weighed statements are worthy of our profound respect; for, to state no more, they were drawn up by men, and approved by Churches, whom God evidently called to a glorious mission, and their influence in giving shape and tone to our own formularies was very great. After all, however, their relations to us and to this question are but collateral; for the word of God is our rule of faith; the standards of our own Church are our covenanted bond of union; and in the light of them, we have not hesitated to reject important principles which were held with unanimous consent by the Reformed Churches of Europe, and to establish others which were denied by them all. I say not these things, sir, as fearing the testimony which these venerable witnesses, and all others, back to the apostles, who are recognised as parts of the elect Church of Christ, may bear, for the course of my studies has not left me ignorant of the sentiments of God's people in past times; but I say them in all candor, and because I love truth more than victory. I the more willingly proceed to this portion of the case, because I am persuaded that this testimony is not only more for me than against me, in itself considered, but because the distinct rejection by the framers of our constitution of such parts of the doctrine of older Reformed Churches as was opposite to the principles held by me, is no mean proof that I rightly interpret our own standards.

¹ I will begin with the Reformed Church of France—a Church which has suffered for the Lord Jesus the most and the longest of

¹ The reader is notified that this portion of the speech is reported much more fully than it was delivered—the Synod being thin (though the audience was large), the hour drawing on towards midnight, and other causes, which need not be repeated, conspiring to render its delivery useless, if not improper. I have hesitated about going into this part of the subject; but, on the whole, it seems best.

all the Churches of the Reformation; a Church which furnished, in less than ten years, more than two hundred thousand martyrs, and in whose bosom many particular congregations could count their confessors by tens of thousands.¹ Sir, there is no portion of the history of the visible Church of Christ upon which the serious mind lingers with more profound interest than that, which records the wonderful dealings of God with the Christians of France. In defiance of the whole power of Rome, and of a succession of persecuting sovereigns, they spread abroad with such astonishing rapidity that the National Synod of 1571, in which *Beza* presided, could count 2,150 churches, the greater part of which had two ministers, and many of them five or six;² and they shot their roots so deeply, that two centuries and a half of war, persecution, exile, and civil infamy, aided by frequent and wide-spread apostasies, great and dangerous departures from the simplicity of the gospel, and an original constitution by no means perfect, have failed in extirpating them from the soil of France. The confession of this Church was drawn up, as is generally supposed, by *John Calvin* himself, and was adopted by several of its National Synods, including the first of the twenty-nine, which met at Paris on the 15th May, 1559. By its ministers of the word were ordained by committee, which always consisted of two pastors deputed by a provincial Synod or a Colloquy (Presbytery) (Discipline, Ch. i., Can. 8); they were never ordained before being admitted by a Synod or Colloquy, and if by the latter, seven pastors must be present (*Idem*, Can. 4); never without the consent of the people, and never without a particular flock (*Idem*, Can. 6 and 10). The Colloquy consisted of neighboring churches, and was constituted of their ministers and an elder from each (Ch. vii., Can. 1); and their provincial Synod answered to ours (Ch. viii., Can. 1). The Consistory corresponded with our church session, and consisted of the pastors and elders of the particular church (Ch. v., Can. 8); but these particular churches were often very large, many of them having more than 10,000 members,

¹ Quick's Synodicon, Vol. I., Introduction, pp. 59, 60.

² *Ibid.*

³ See it, Synodicon, Vol. I., pp. 6-58, Introduction.

and they had generally a plurality of pastors. The Consistory, as well as the Colloquy and the Synod, had power to suspend ministers of the word—yea, to depose them outright (Ch. i., Can. 19 and 50, and Ch. v., Can. 19 and 32); and I greatly fear, sir, if some of our leading divines were to come under the scope of some of these canons, it might go ill with them; for example, Chap. i., Can. 19, against all secular pursuits, that too much hinder “them in the principal duties of their ministerial office,” such as the practice of law or physic, the teaching of youth, or “any other worldly distracting business,” which are the cases stated in the canon. This platform differs from ours in many particulars, and in many more from the interpretations forced upon ours. By it, ordination is by *committee* of two ministers, instead of by the Presbytery with imposition of its hands; it is by *pastors* only, who are the only sort of ministers of the word admitted into the church courts, instead of by three ministers without charge, as defined by our last Assembly; the Colloquy must consist of at least *seven pastors*, instead of three unemployed ministers, which, gentlemen say, are sufficient; by it, the church session could suspend, yea, “depose out of hand,” ministers of the word—a notion so revolting to our late General Assembly that they declared ministers to be not church members at all, rather than allow their names and sacred persons to fall under the notice of a church session; and, above all, by it, ruling elders are expressly held not to be perpetual officers in the Church (Ch. iii., Can. 7; also, Ch. xi. of the Second Synod of Paris, 1565). All these things bear a strong resemblance to the well known peculiarities of *Calvin*; and, following the general principles on which they rest, he engrafted into the discipline of the Church of Geneva their most aggravated form.¹ He held, and avowed his belief,

¹ The government of the Church of Geneva was established by a municipal law passed by the “Syndics, the small and the grand councils, and the assembled people of Geneva.” By it, persons seeking the ministry of the word were examined by the “company of pastors” in their weekly meeting, elected by the same body, with the concurrence of the small municipal council, announced from the pulpits on one Sabbath, and if no objections were made, presented before the pulpit the next Sabbath, and prayer offered by the officiating minister; afterwards, being taken to

that "imposition of hands" is "*a sacrament in true and legitimate ordinations;*"¹ an opinion difficult to reconcile with his general sentiments, and altogether peculiar to himself, but which, it is easy to see, would naturally lead to exactly such practical results as I have stated from the French Confession. Let it be observed, also, that whatever there is peculiar in this platform is so by express law, and that in so far as its provisions are opposed to the principles for which I contend, they are opposed also to the express law of our Church; for if ruling elders are not perpetual officers of the Church, and if imposition of hands in legitimate ordinations is a sacrament, then, indeed, it is true enough that neither elders nor Presbyteries should impose hands, but that *pastors* only should do it. The whole argument, therefore, is conclusive to this: that, even according to the judgment of Calvin and the Reformed Church of France, our views of the office of the ruling elder, of the nature of ordination, of the power of the Presbytery, and of the total separation of Church and State, which in Geneva were strictly united, necessarily oblige us to allow the imposition of the hands of the ruling elders; and the adoption of the principles of that great man and the practice of

the council, they took a minute and comprehensive civic oath before the Lords Syndies; and thus their examination, institution, and form of induction were complete, without one word about a Presbytery, an elder, or imposition of hands by anybody. The elders were elected from year to year by the small council, with the advice of the ministers; there were twelve of them—two from the small council, and ten indiscriminately from the Councils of Sixty and of Two Hundred; they were proclaimed from the pulpits to allow of objections, and were confirmed by the Council of Two Hundred, and took the civic oath. Synod, Presbytery, Colloquy—there was none. The Consistory, or church session, was made up of "the elders, with the ministers," and there seems to have been one for the whole city. By the "Summary of Doctrine, &c.," it is explicitly taught that "the church ought to be governed by *the pastors*, who have charge of preaching the word and administering the sacraments." See Les Ordonnances Ecclesiastiques de L'Eglise de Geneve, passées et revues au Conseil General, le 3 de Juin, 1576—A Geneve, 1609. The whole system is as different from ours as well can be, both in its principles and its details.

¹Institutes, Book iv., Ch. 19, Sec. 28 and 31, p. 626-8, of Vol. ii., of the edition of the Presbyterian Board of Publication.

that noble Church, from whom we have ventured to differ in these particulars, would oblige us to alter entirely our principles upon these four important points—that is, to refuse elders the right of imposing hands, upon the united authority of the Churches of France and Geneva, it is necessary to hold that they are not perpetual officers, that imposition of hands is virtually a sacrament, and that it appertains, not to the Presbytery, but to a committee or other meeting of pastors, appointed by some competent authority, civil or ecclesiastical, and that the State itself has paramount authority in the premises. It is needless to say that the doctrine of the Church of France is to be sought only in the past. For one hundred and eighty-five years no National Synod has met; since the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, one hundred and fifty-eight years ago, no ordinary and regularly constituted church court has been lawfully convened; and for one hundred and eight years of this period, from 1685 to 1793, the Reformed religion was prohibited by law, and persecuted unto blood in that deluded land. In 1814 Napoleon restored this Church of martyrs to the condition essentially in which it now stands; for the freedom of religion secured by the charter of 1831 has proved, under the growing influence of Popery in France, a mere illusion. At present, the ruling elders of the French churches are created by the civil law, being a certain number of persons in each church who pay the most taxes to the State, and the ordinations of its ministers are performed by meetings of ministers convened spontaneously for this purpose, as necessity requires; so that it is virtually, and has been for about two centuries past, a Presbyterian Church robbed of the power of setting up or continuing the regular administration of its affairs. Would to God that its day of deliverance had come; and until it does come, let the Reformed world remember these dear brethren in bonds, and unitedly plead their glorious cause at the throne of our common Saviour.

I pass next to the most remarkable Confession to which the Reformation gave birth—the one which undoubtedly deserves to be called more emphatically *the Confession of the Reformed Churches* than any other composed during the sixteenth century. At a period of great difficulty and doubt, when the hatred of the

Papists burned with intense fury, and the bitterness of the Lutheran section of the Protestants against those who followed Zwingle and Calvin was excited to a degree that seems to us now inconceivable, the Confession commonly called the *second or latter Helvetic Confession*, drawn up by *Henry Bullinger* of Zurich, and put forth under the auspices of the Elector Palatine Frederick, then the Chief Protector of the Reformed, was, during the year 1566, adopted by all the Churches of the Helvetic Confederation, with those of their allies and dependencies, embracing Geneva, which did not then form a part of the confederacy, but whose national Church, with Theodore Beza at its head, subscribed this Confession. During the same and the following year the Church of Scotland, the Churches of Poland, of Hungary, and in general the body of the Reformed throughout Europe, adhered to this Confession, as embodying the grand peculiarities by which they were separated from the Lutherans on the one hand, and still more widely from the Papists on the other.¹ The 18th Chapter of this Confession treats "*Of the ministers of the Church, and their institution and offices,*" and occupies seven pretty closely printed pages. After a page and upwards of precedent matter, it treats of the "*Ministers of the New Testament,*" which, it says, "are called apostles, prophets, evangelists, bishops, presbyters, pastors, and doctors;" which defining in that order, it says of *bishops*, "they are inspectors and overseers of the church, who dispense food and necessaries to the church;" of *presbyters*, "they are elders (*seniores*), and as it were senators and fathers of the church, governing it with wholesome counsel;" of *pastors*, "they keep the fold of the Lord, and provide for it necessary things;" of *doctors*, "they instruct and teach true faith and piety." And the conclusion is that these are the present ministers of the Church, and these their names. A little further on the subject treated is, "*That ministers are to be called and chosen;*" they are to be chosen "by the church, or by those deputed for this purpose by the church;"—such persons only as are described in 1 Tim. iii., and in Tit. i., are to be chosen. "*Et*

¹See the Confession itself, pp. 462–536 of Niemeyer's Coll., and some account of it in his preface, pp. lxiii–lxviii.

qui electi sunt, ordinentur a senioribus cum orationibus publicis, et impositione manuum: And those who are chosen ought to be ordained by elders, with public prayers, and imposition of hands." (Pp. 507-8.) Towards the end of the Chapter, discipline in general and discipline amongst ministers is treated, and then Synods incidentally, in which "the life and doctrine of ministers ought to be diligently inquired into. Those who sin are to be reprehended by the elders (*senioribus*) and brought back to the way, if they are curable, or *deposed* . . . if they are incurable." (P. 512.) Now, sir, according to the doctrine of the Reformed Churches in general, are there any officers whose duty it is to be church governors? In your own Constitution you say there are, and that their office is to rule, and their name is ruling elders. (Form of Gov., Ch. v.) And this renowned Confession bears you out. Is there any Presbyterian Church which holds that there is a class of ruling officers whose special duty it is to be senators, governing the church, and these officers are not elders? If there is, tell us its name. But here we have amongst the permanent officers of the Church, a class set down, called from the Greek *presbyters*, from the Latin *seniors*, in English *elders*, who are the especial governors of the church, and to whom, by this Confession, it specially appertains to ordain all ministers, and that with imposition of hands. This is just the doctrine which I have endeavored to set forth—that *the power of ordination is in church rulers*, and therefore in *all elders*, because elder and ruler are essentially one. And as if to put the matter out of dispute, the subject is closed with the declaration that they who *depose* and they who *ordain* are the same.¹ Sir,

¹ See the whole subject of imposition of hands largely treated by Selden in his Commentary on Eutychius, Sec. 10, in Vol. II., pp. 435-44 of his works. See also De Moor Com. in Johan. Marek, cap. xxxiii. De Regimine Ecc., Sec. 16. This worthy old drudge (De Moor), arguing that elders and deacons ought not to be ordained with imposition of hands, says, quoting Spanheim, "Nec satis esse credit pro dignitate et prærogativa ministerii sacri, si eodem quo ipsi pastores ritu rusticelli sæpe et cerdones et idiotæ inaugurentur." Tom. vi., p. 330. Certainly if the Dutch ministers considered it disgraceful that farmers, tradesmen, and numsculls should be ordained by the same rite they were, it is

when I remember that this Confession had the immortal names of *Knox*, *Beza*, and *Bullinger* subscribed to it, I am consoled under the deep affliction of not being able to agree with gentlemen whose acquaintance with the repositories of truths which many think ought to decide these questions, has at length extended to a sight of the books, and whose discrimination has led them to argue, as if the order of the Church of God depended on the distinction between the *quorum* of a Presbytery and the Presbytery itself.

It would be easy to establish the same doctrine from other Confessions—for example, those of the Bohemian Churches, of 1535 and of 1575, and various Professions of the Polish and Lithuanian Churches of the following century. I pass, however, to the Kirk of Scotland. In the first and many succeeding General Assemblies of that Kirk, the great majority of the members were ruling elders. Indeed, in 1560, when the first one met, there appear to have been only twelve Reformed preachers in the whole kingdom.¹ By the First Book of Discipline, which was adopted in 1561, imposition of hands in ordination was, as we have already seen, declared to be unnecessary, and for about twenty years seems not to have been used. It is also true that during this period there was not in all Scotland a single Presbytery, according to our ideas of such a court, nor anything exactly answering to it.² It is not important to us now to inquire how far these defects might impair the *regularity* of ordinations considered merely as to their form, since I should hope no one here would venture to contend that their substantial *validity* could be in any degree affected by them. Yet it is obvious that in such a condition ordinations, as now in France, must have been performed in some way which it would puzzle sticklers of various descriptions to bring within the rules of their respective

quite natural that American ministers should consider it an impeachment of their dignity and prerogative to have this rite performed by such folks.

¹ Hetherington's Hist. Church of Scotland, pp. 84, 88, 89.

² See Baillie's Letters (edition of 1842), Vol. II., p. 505 and p. 182, and Hetherington, p. 182.

theories. Perhaps they ordained by Synods—which, indeed, are but Presbyteries at last; and, having, in primitive times, been only occasional and extraordinary, have for several centuries been stated and ordinary courts. Perhaps they did it by a sort of parochial presbytery, or church session of some collegiate charge, or some joint meeting of two or three adjacent congregations, by the whole body of ministers and all the elders of them, which was a sort of model out of which the “elderships” of the Second Book of Discipline grew; and if they did, they had, if we dare credit learned men, the example of all primitive antiquity,¹ if not of the churches founded by the apostles themselves, if their order is rightly expounded by the Westminster Assembly;² for that venerable Synod, so far from denying, has indeed by implication, if not in terms, admitted, strange as the doctrine may sound to this Synod, that any single congregation that cannot conveniently associate, may assume to itself all and sole power in ordination, though this is a proceeding very requisite to be avoided, when it can be conveniently.³ Perhaps they ordained by the General Assembly itself; we know certainly that the time-honored Assembly of 1638 did, *ex mero motu*, in open session, depose two archbishops and four prelatie bishops, and that various Assemblies since have exercised powers commonly allowed to go along with the power to ordain. Or possibly they ordained by committees of church courts, up even to the Assembly; for I find that the Assemblies of 1642 and 1643 did both empower a committee sent to Ireland “to try and ordain such as shall be found qualified for the ministrie.”⁴ And it is not a little remarkable that the “Petition of the Distressed Professors in Ireland,” which led to these appointments, should have contained a prophecy, which, at the end of two centuries, is fulfilled before our eyes. “The day may come,” say these faithful men, hoping against hope in

¹ Sir Peter King's Inquiry into the Primitive Church, Ch. iv.

² See its Chapter headed “Of Classical Assemblies.”

³ Form of Gov. of the Westminster Assembly, third paragraph of the division entitled “Touching the power of ordination.” Duncan's Collections, p. 177.

⁴ Printed Acts, p. 152 and p. 191.

the midst of the ruin of their Church and the desolation of their country, brought about by the papal massacre of 1641, "the day may come when a General Assembly in this land may return to you the first fruits of thanks for the plants of your free gift."¹ The day has come, sir, and nobly has the Church of Ireland redeemed the obligations of this ancient pledge. As I have allowed myself to be seduced into this train of observation, I may as well say in the same connexion, that my views upon the whole question to which they relate will be entirely mistaken, if any one supposes that I call in question ordinations performed in either of the ways referred to. I do not. What I contend for is, that ordination is in the hands of all such as have rule in the church; that regularly this power is to be exercised by Church assemblies in which these rulers sit; and that ruling elders cannot be deprived of their part in this act of authority when they are present and members of the court. It is true I have, on a previous day, attempted to prove that, according to our written law, there can be no Presbytery in our Church without the presence of ruling elders, and that this law is good and right in a settled Church state; and it plainly follows from that argument, that if our Presbyteries cannot constitute, manifestly they cannot ordain, in the absence of ruling elders. But the converse does not follow; for ruling elders might not be indispensable to the constitution of the court, and yet it might be a gross outrage upon law, upon truth, and upon propriety, to make them stand aside as incompetent, when they are present as members; and it is upon this obvious distinction that I have thought it worth while to argue this question, after the decisive vote of the Synod against the former minute.

The *Second Book of Discipline* put the whole subject of Church order and discipline in the clearest possible light. Spiritual authority, intrusted by God through Christ to his gathered Church, and having its ground in the word of God, is to be executed by those to whom the government of the Church is, by a lawful calling, committed. This authority is divided into *potestas ordinis* and *potestas jurisdictionis*, the *several* and the

¹ *Idem*, p. 150.

joint powers of which I have had occasion to make such frequent mention, both of which are exercised by men only in the way of a ministry under, and a service for, Christ the Lord. (*See Ch. i. throughout.*) The second chapter treats at large of the powers of the spiritual commonwealth as they are divided into "doctrine, discipline, and distribution," and committed to "the ministers or preachers, elders or governors, and deacons or distributors," all of whom are "called by a general word, ministers of the Kirk;" and the distinction between ordinary and extraordinary offices is pointed out, and "the four ordinary functions or offices in the Kirk" are set down as "the office of the pastor, minister, or bishop, the doctor, *the presbyter or elder*, and the deacon." The third chapter treats of the mode of admitting persons who bear ecclesiastical functions to their office; from which, having before cited such passages as show the necessity of calling and ordination, and what they are, it need be only repeated here, as involving the immediate point at issue, that "the ceremonies of ordination are fasting, earnest prayer, and *imposition of the hands of the eldership*." The only question, then, is to ascertain who this "*eldership*" is, and here there is no room for mistake, since the seventh Chapter treats expressly "of Elderships, Assemblies, and Discipline." "Elderships and Assemblies are commonly constituted of pastors, doctors, and such as we commonly call elders." (Sec. 1.) "*Assemblies* are of four sorts; . . . they are of particular kirks, one or more, or of a province, or of a whole nation, or of all and divers nations professing one Jesus Christ." (Sec. 2.) In Sec. 14 it is said that by "the elders of the particular congregations, we mean not that every particular parish-kirk can or may have their own particular *elderships*, especially in landword; but we think three, four, more or fewer, particular kirks may have one *eldership* common to them all, to judge their ecclesiastical causes." The power of *election* of all who bear ecclesiastical charges within the bounds of particular elderships, and also their *deposition*, belongs to them, constituted of many pastors and elders as just expressed. (Sec. 21 and 22.) "Provincial assemblies we call lawful conventions of the pastors, doctors, and *other elders* of a province, &c." (Sec. 28); and

they also have "power to depose office bearers of that province, &c.," (Sec. 28,) and all other powers of the particular elderships. (Sec. 29.) The General Assembly is the convention of all the kirks of the realm, and seems to have the amplest powers belonging to them all. (Sec. 30-34.) Now, of the doctor it is said, that it does not belong to his office "to preach to the people, to minister the sacraments, and to celebrate marriages," but that "*being an elder*, as is said, he should assist the pastor in the government of the kirk, and concur with the elders his brethren, in all assemblies." (Ch. v., Sec. 5 and 6.) The pastors are said to be called "presbyters or seniors, for the gravity in manners which they ought to have in taking care of their spiritual government." (Ch. iv., Sec. 7.) And of elders it is said, "*Their principal office* is to hold assemblies with the pastors and doctors, who are also of their number." (Ch. vi., last Section.) There is no direct statement in the instrument as to *which* eldership it especially appertains to ordain all persons who bear ecclesiastical functions; perhaps it might by its terms appertain to every Church assembly lawfully called and constituted. But the evident burden of the whole places this power in the hands of the *particular eldership*. But let that be as it may; seeing that elders, *with* pastors and doctors, constitute them all; seeing that it is the principal duty of the elder to hold assemblies, in which both pastors and doctors unite, not because they are pastors or doctors, but because they also are elders; seeing that imposition of hands is by *the eldership*; seeing that the ordination of pastors, doctors, elders, and deacons, is put on the same general ground; seeing there is no intimation of an ordination in any other manner; and seeing that elders—seniors—are emphatically presbyters; it does seem to me to be the very height of absurdity and an absolute contempt of common sense, for any one to contend that according to the principles and the very terms of this instrument, ruling elders are not permitted to impose hands in the ordination of ministers of the word.

I proceed to the standards of the Westminster Assembly—the most noble monument of the seventeenth century. That I may avoid the imminent danger of expatiating upon a subject so pre-

cious and so glorious as that furnished by the labors of this immortal body, I will confine myself strictly to the point at issue. At least three of its formularies throw light upon it. These are its Directory for Ordination, Directory for Church Government, and Confession of Faith; which, according to Hetherington,¹ were presented to the English Parliament, the first on the 20th April, 1644, the second about the middle of November, 1644, and the third on the 3d of December, 1646,—a sequence which it is of some consequence to observe. The citations I shall make from these three instruments are from the copies contained in Duncan's Collections, edition of 1771. In the first of the three instruments, it is declared that, "every minister of the word is to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong." (Duncan, p. 176.) It is added that he ought, when ordained, to be assigned to some particular church or other ministerial charge, and that he ought to be examined and approved by those who ordain him. (P. 177.) This, if it is to be taken without further examination of the sentiments of the body, is in the last statement exactly in accordance with our system; in the second principle, it is utterly contrary to our whole practice; and in the first, and as gentlemen on the other side suppose conclusive, definition, it requires us to go much further than has yet been contended for; for not only imposition of hands, but ordination itself is explicitly declared to belong to "preaching presbyters." Is that, sir, the doctrine of our Church? If not, let us beware. As yet they only quote this Directory to prove that imposition of hands belongs to "preaching elders;" how long will it be before they quote it to prove—what it plainly asserts—that ordination also belongs to them? As we proceed we find this definition, "The power of *ordering the whole work* of ordination is in the *whole Presbytery*;" and a few paragraphs afterwards it is repeated that "the preaching presbyters . . . are those to whom the imposition of hands doth appertain." (P. 177.) The business of the *Presbytery* is only to *order the work* of ordination, and in this *the whole Presbytery* must act; but as above defined and

¹ Hist. Westmin. Assem., pp. 152, 209, 244.

here again, the *preaching presbyters* must ordain. I demand again, sir, is this our system? The two heads of *Doctrine* and *Power*, under which the foregoing statements occur, are then thrown together, and under the 11th and 12th Sections of this united head we have these two important propositions: “*In extraordinary cases something extraordinary may be done.*” “. . . *There is at this time . . . an extraordinary occasion for a way of ordination for the present supply of ministers.*” (P. 179.) True enough, sir; but it sets the whole matter on a new foundation. Are we in a state of civil war? Have we no church courts in America, as there was not one in England when this Directory was drawn up? Do our fifteen hundred ministers and two thousand churches furnish no *present supply* of persons to constitute a single Presbytery? If not, there is indeed “*something extraordinary,*” and we may perhaps lawfully do the extraordinary things allowed by our last Assembly. Next comes the practical detail, which is minute, and in most respects admirable. “The Presbytery shall come to the place, or *at least* three or four ministers of the word shall be sent thither from the Presbytery, &c.” (P. 181.) “The Presbytery, or the ministers sent from them *for ordination*, shall solemnly set him apart . . . by laying their hands on him.” (P. 182.) “In the *present exigencies, when we cannot have any Presbytery formed up to their whole power and work;*” thus it concludes, adding a mournful description of the times, and therefore recommends that “some godly ministers in or about the city of London be designed by *public authority*” to ordain ministers. (P. 184.) What public authority? The Long Parliament, of course, for that time, and all other civil authorities in all other places, when the like necessities justify it. Is this our system, sir? But, passing this by, is it not obvious that we have in these extracts four several modes of ordination, namely, 1. By ministers spontaneously met; 2. By Presbytery not fully formed; 3. By committee of ministers sent from Presbytery; 4. By a permanent committee of ministers appointed by the state? And is it not equally manifest that the whole Directory contemplates the extraordinary posture of affairs then actually existing around them, to meet which the Parliament

asked the advice of the Assembly, and to provide for which, in the best manner they could under the circumstances, they responded in this Directory? During the seven months which elapsed between the sending up of this Directory for Ordination, to the Parliament, and the giving in of the Directory for Church Government, the subjects most fully discussed in the Synod were the officers and the assemblies of the Church, and the whole ground covered by the Independent and the Erastian Controversy was thoroughly examined. In the Directory for Government, therefore, we have the more matured decisions of the body; their advice for a permanent and not for an extraordinary Church state; and in it we have every principle I could desire in the maintenance of my present argument. We have the Supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus clearly asserted; the *jus divinum* of Church government distinctly held forth; that government in the hands of assemblies, and those assemblies composed of officers, all instituted by Christ; those officers declared to be teaching and ruling elders; the classical assembly, which is our Presbytery, defined to consist "of ministers of the word and such other public officers as are agreeable to and warranted by the word of God to be church governors," (Duncan, p. 173,) and many congregations defined to be under this "*Presbyterial government*" (p. 174). Here, sir, is everything. The power of ordination cannot possibly appertain except to the power of jurisdiction or that of order; it must be a joint or it must be a several power. If the Westminster Assembly held in its matured judgment, with all the Reformed Churches of the world, that this power is where the regimen of the Church is—in bishops, if the regimen is in them according to the Prelatists; in the brotherhood, if the regimen is in them according to the Independents; in pastors, if the regimen is in them according to Calvin; in the presbyters of each congregation, if the regimen is in them, according to Owen; in assemblies, if the regimen is in them, according to the general doctrine of Presbyterianism;—then by defining doubly that elders are the governors of the Church, and that they form *jure divino* a part of the governing assemblies, they decide, *ex vi termini*, that they must unite in ordinations. But if they held with the Papists, that

ordination appertains to the power of order, and is a sacrament in the proper sense, then having adopted the absurdity, which upon this hypothesis it obviously is, that a Presbytery could ordain at all, which it could no more do than it could preach or baptize as a Presbytery, still the elder must, upon the hypothesis, have power to ordain; for he is defined to be *by order* entitled *jure divino* to membership in the body to which *by order* ordination appertains. That is, he is *in ordine* of the presbyters; he is of their *ordo*; he can aid *ordinare*, that is, in putting another person into the *order* of presbyters. So that these principles and definitions cannot stand without, upon every conceivable hypothesis, drawing after them one of two consequences, namely, that an elder is no elder, which is absurd, or that, when a member of the ordaining body he can impose hands in all ordinations. At the end of more than two years and a half from the completion of the Directory for Ordination, the Assembly finished its noble Confession of Faith. In the sixth Section of its first Chapter it declares that the word of God is our complete rule of belief, and thus sends us at once to it for our Church Order, and stamps with its reprobation the outcry about the practice of the Church. Or, if it supposed, contrary to its decisions, that the points now discussed are only matters common to human actions and societies, in that case it bids us go to the light of nature, Christian prudence, and the general rules of the word, neither of which, I believe, sir, will carry us very far in the theory that ordination is more or less than an act of solemn ecclesiastical authority, by which the Church, through her ordinary tribunals, confesses, attests, and records a calling which is not of her, but of God. In the third Section of Chapter xxv., it declares that the *ministry*—all the official servants of Christ in the Church—as well as the oracles and ordinances of God, were given by Christ to the catholic visible Church, a glorious truth. The Church has servants; but on earth she has no masters, no fathers, no head. The officers are appointed of Christ; the men qualified to fill them are not begotten from father to son, as was the Aaronic priesthood; nor fitted by a corporate descent, as contended for by Prelatists; nor magically and indelibly stamped by means

of incantations, after the dreams of Rome; but they are chosen, anointed, and sent of God, and the spouse of the Lamb, when she discerns the evidence of their heavenly mission, seals it by her willing and joyful attestation. Strange work would it be, indeed, if three deserters of the ministry could discern Christ's work more clearly, and attest it more faithfully, and seal it more precious to the Church, than the whole multitude of our ruling elders put together. In Sec. 1 and 2 of Chapter xxx., the doctrine laid down is that the divinely ordered government of the Church in the hands of divinely instituted Church officers, has been invested with the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and its power to open the kingdom to penitent sinners is defined to be "by the ministry of the gospel and by absolution from censures." Now, sir, will you tell me if ruling elders are disqualified from even assisting at the ordination of ministers, how is it possible for them to open the kingdom by sending forth a ministry of the gospel? And thus their power with these keys, in the way of mercy, is simply to relieve backsliders from censures; but to go beyond that is *ultra vires*. Why, sir, are elders church officers, forming any part of the Church government? Then they are of those who send ministers; and then if any part of the vocation or mission of any part of the ministry is imposition of hands, they must impose hands, or they must lay down the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And here, sir, though other portions of this Confession are equally clear to my purpose, I am content to rest the argument as to these standards. The conclusion is as affecting as it is obvious: let the elder surrender his office, or let him vindicate its sacred rights and duties. If his office is of man, he has no warrant to be here; if it is of God, let him beware how he permits it to be shorn and dishonored in his hands. I speak, sir, as one who ought to know the heart both of the ruling and the teaching elder, for I have served, however unworthily, in each class. I think I speak—I feel—with profound impartiality when I say there is no danger in our day of the ruling elders engrossing the peculiar functions of the teaching elders, but that there is an imminent hazard of the opposite result. Alas! sir, when you shall have settled it as the law of

our Church that jurisdiction in general is complete without ruling elders, and the right of ordination in particular is irrespective of them, there will remain little else to settle in order to divest them of all real authority in the Assemblies of the Church.¹

The effect of the decisions at Westminster upon the previously existing standards of the Kirk of Scotland, which is the next point to be considered, was much less than is commonly supposed. It is well known that "unity and uniformity in religion amongst the Kirks of Christ in the three kingdoms" of England, Scotland, and Ireland, "was propounded as a main article of the Large Treaty," and was "afterward, with greater strength and maturity, revived in the Solemn League and Covenant," by which all the parties stood "straitly obliged to endeavor the nearest uniformity in one form of church government, directory of worship, confession of faith, and form of catechising." The Scottish Assembly of 1645, in its Act of February 3, for establishing the Westminster Directory for the Public Worship of God—from which Act I have made the preceding quotations—distinctly asserts that the obtaining of this unity and uniformity was, "in point of conscience, the chief motive and end of our adventuring upon manifold and great hazards for quenching the devouring flame of the present unnatural and bloody war in England, though to the weakening of this kingdom, within itself, and the advantage of the enemy which hath invaded it, accounting nothing too dear to us, so that this our joy be fulfilled."² In point of fact, the uniformity so ardently desired was never attained, however great may have been the sacrifices and even changes which

¹ They who desire to go behind the record and examine the process by which the Assembly at Westminster arrived at the conclusions contained in their authorised standards, will find ample materials in the XIII. Vol. of Lightfoot's Works, the II. Volume of Baillie's Letters, the III. Vol. of Neal's History of the Puritans, Hetherington's Hist. of the West. Assem., &c., &c. Upon mature examination of the whole case, I feel no difficulty in saying, that I think I shall be able to maintain the ground here presented, by the fullest examination of all such collateral proofs, whenever the discussion takes that shape.

² Printed Acts of the Church of Scotland, p. 257.

Scotland was willing to make in its pursuit; and until it should be attained, all the Acts of the Scottish Assembly had only a provisional force, dependent upon that event, and not one of them repealed any existing standard of the Kirk. In the very Act cited above, it is provided that even in regard to this Directory for Worship, which was fully set up by law in England, the Books of Discipline, and even the Acts of Assembly, should receive no prejudice in such particulars as were not otherwise ordered in the Directory; and in regard to two points touching the Lord's Supper—namely, coming to the table or not, and the distribution of the elements by the ministers or by the communicants amongst themselves—the doctrine of the Directory is denied. In the Act of Assembly of August 27, 1647, approving the Confession of Faith,¹ the doctrine of the Confession is denied in one important particular, and its silence in another is noted with protestation. Both these points throw light on the question now under discussion. In Ch. xxxi., Article 2, of the Confession, a power is conceded to the civil magistrate to call Synods, and to “ministers of Christ, of themselves, by virtue of their office,” to hold them; but the Scottish Assembly says, expressly, these doctrines are true “only of Kirks not settled or constituted in point of government,” and that “neither of these ought to be done in Kirks constituted and settled,” for in them the magistrate may consult the regular church courts, which are free to assemble and constitute “of ministers and ruling elders meeting upon delegation from their churches.” The same principle manifestly controls every sort of church court, which, by this comprehensive and well considered *caveat*, can neither meet nor act, and, of course, can not ordain, except they be composed of ministers and elders, and meet by delegation from their churches. It is worthy of all consideration that the doctrine of this part of the Westminster Confession, explained away by the Church of Scotland, was totally rejected by our Church, and the whole article containing it omitted, as will be seen on comparing the two Confessions. The other point called in question in the Adopting Act of the Scottish Church relates to the supposed want of sufficient explicitness in

¹ See the Act, pp. 351–3, of printed Acts of the Church of Scotland.

the Confession on the subjects "Of Ecclesiastical Officers and Assemblies," which, adds the Act, "shall be no prejudice to the truth of Christ in these particulars, to be expressed fully in the Directory for Government." This Act, I have before said, was adopted in August, 1647; but on the 10th of February, 1645, two years and a half before, an Act was passed, "approving the propositions concerning Kirk government and ordination of ministers,"¹—the latter of which had been laid before the Parliament of England in April, and the former in November, 1644, as I have already shown. This Act of 1645 has also its caveats. First, it denies the doctrine taught by the Westminster Synod, that doctors or teachers have the power of administering the sacraments; secondly, "as also of the distinct rights and interests of *Presbyteries and people in the calling of ministers*," it protests that its present approval "shall be no ways prejudicial to further discussion and examination;" and thirdly, the whole result is to depend on the fact that this Westminster Directory, both for Government and Ordination, "shall be ratified, without any substantial alteration, by an ordinance of the Honorable Houses of the Parliament of England." This event never happened, according to the terms of this Act; and the Scottish Kirk was so far from considering its work ended by this committal, that we find the Assemblies of 1646, 1647, 1648, and 1649, successively occupied with earnest endeavors to perfect that part of the covenanted uniformity which related to church government; and in the last named year, after the Westminster Assembly had finally dispersed, a separate "Directory for Election of Ministers" was adopted.² By this Scottish Directory of 1649, the whole superintendence, and work of trying, placing, admitting, and ordaining ministers, is plainly and expressly laid upon *the Presbytery*—the Presbytery of the Scottish standards; and not a word is said of the extraordinary methods, allowable because of the extraordinary times, held forth in the Westminster Directory for Ordination. None here, sir, can be ignorant of the calamities which, for so long a period, commencing about the time to which this examination has

¹ See it in the printed Acts, pp. 269-70.

² See it in the printed Acts, pp. 469-70.

brought us, overwhelmed the Church of Scotland. The events which followed the execution of Charles I., and the rise of Cromwell to supreme power; the sad disorders attendant upon the controversy between the Protestors and the Resolutioners, the Covenanters and the Malignants; the long intervals during which the higher judicatories of the Church were not permitted to assemble;¹ the frightful persecution under Charles II.; the woful condition of the Church under the Revolution Settlement under William and Mary, and the corrupting influence of the Acts of comprehension;² the subjugation of the Church to the civil government during the reign of Queen Anne, and the long and fatal supremacy of the Moderate party;³ these sad events placed the Church of Scotland, from 1650 down to 1833, a period of 183 years, in a position which renders her written testimony valueless, compared with her early and glorious acts, and gives to all arguments drawn from her practice, during her subjugated, her suffering, and her corrupted periods, an air of bitter irony or deliberate reproach. The illustrious men who, in 1843, have stood for the ancient and sacred liberties of the Scottish Church, are worthy of our sympathy, admiration, and love; but even they see but dimly many truths which have been familiar to our Church for a century and a half, and have, if I may say it with becoming modesty, more need, by far, to learn of her, than she of them, many things touching questions like those it has been my duty to submit to this Synod.

We are now brought to the last link in the chain of this protracted deduction. During the latter part of seventeenth century and the first years of the eighteenth, the Presbyterian emigrants to this continent began to gather themselves into those societies

¹ The Assembly of 1690 was the first regular and legal one that had assembled for about forty years. Hetherington's *History Church of Scotland*, p. 554.

² For a clear account of the state of the Kirk at the period of the Revolution of 1688, and the influence of the settlement then. see Hetherington's *History of the Church of Scotland*, pp. 544 and 555-60.

³ For the general character of Moderatism, and its influence upon the Kirk and the eldership, see Hetherington's *History Church of Scotland*, pp. 703-4 and 669-70.

which formed the nucleus of our present wide-spread organisation. We have the Minutes of our first Presbytery as far back as the year 1706. Upon a careful examination of the volume of Records published by our Board of Publication, which, as you know, sir, contains the proceedings of this Presbytery up to 1717, and from that time onward to 1788 the proceedings of our first Synod up to the organisation of the General Assembly, I find repeated declarations of the faith of the Church. To mention no others, I may refer to the years 1729, 1736, 1741, 1745, 1751, 1758, 1786, and 1788,¹ as having been signalised by very formal declarations in this regard, made under various circumstances of great importance and solemnity. On all these occasions the Westminster standards are referred to as containing, substantially, the faith of the Church both as to doctrine and order; but they are always so spoken of as to show that it was these standards as connected with and controlled by the standards and acts of the Church of Scotland, to which allusion was had; and, generally, so as to be taken rather substantially than rigidly as the standards of the American Presbyterian Church. Though approved by the Church of Scotland, the Westminster standards did not supersede in that Church her own more ancient platforms of faith, order, and discipline, which were made the basis of her most formal acts and of her legal settlement as a national Church, once and again, long after the Westminster Assembly had been dissolved and the Presbyterian Church of England had been subverted. These are important facts, not vital to my present argument, but needful to be borne in mind in order to a correct understanding of the whole subject. Our early Presbyterian ministers and population were chiefly from Ireland and Scotland; they came bearing with them the standards of the Scottish Church, and they came, so far as they were Scotch, from the bosom of that Church, virtually disorganised under Cromwell, persecuted almost to extermination by Charles II., corrupted by the revolution settlement, or torpid under the sway of Moderatism; and they brought with them an ecclesiastical practice modified by all these adverse circumstances. Their condition here was, moreover, in all respects extraordinary,

¹See these Records, pp. 93, 125, 155, 158, 202, 232, 286, 519, 546.

and they were obliged to do as they could, rather than as they would have preferred; a fact recognised by themselves in every movement during the first ninety years of their existence as an organised Church, up to the formation of our present constitution. I do not, therefore, wonder to see in their records a gradual development of the principles which now distinguish our system; a continual strengthening of the great truths of Presbyterianism; a steady movement from a condition of incipient life and irregular action upwards to a firm, settled, and well ordered strength, such as the careful student cannot fail to discern as he traces them from 1706 to 1788. From the beginning we find no recognition of that principle of the Westminster Directory for Ordination, that the civil power could designate a standing body of ministers to ordain; none of that which teaches that a Presbytery imperfectly constituted may ordain; none of that which asserts that it appertains especially to the ministers of the word to impose hands; none of that which declares that ministers casually met may regularly ordain. The first ordination recorded is one by the Presbytery itself; but the mode afterwards practised seems to have been by a committee of ministers appointed by the Presbytery, or by the Synod. If either branch of this fact should be thought important, it may diminish the significance of the exclusion of ruling elders from these ordaining committees to know that it does not appear that any ruling elder was ever appointed on any sort of committee during those eleven years whose records we have, although it is certain they sat in every Presbytery, except the first, and highly probable they sat in it;¹ and the influence of ordination by committee upon the present question is altogether with me; for the constitution which abolished the practice can hardly be supposed to confirm the principle on which that practice rested. As soon as we find the Synod called to consider questions connected with ordination, we find the distinctive principles of the Scotch, and not those attributed to the West-

¹The commencement of the old MS. record is lost; the part in which the presence of elders is recorded in all the other meetings being torn off; and as they were present always afterwards, the presumption is violent for their presence here.

minster, standards, every where taken for granted: ordination by church courts, and by committees appointed by them, concurrent powers of Presbyteries and Synods in ordinations; but nothing at all about assemblies of ministers by virtue of their office ordaining other ministers; nothing of a permanent body of ministers distinct from a church court or independent of it, appointed either by civil or ecclesiastical authority for this purpose. As we advance, we find the present features of our system more clearly developed; the claims of the Presbytery as the proper ordaining body distinctly asserted, and even vindicated as exclusive, and virtually conceded by the Synod.¹ At length we come to the termination of what may be called the forming state of our Church. In the year 1785, a large committee, at the head of which was the great John Witherspoon, and amongst whose members were the leading men who had for years before represented what some may call extreme Presbyterian opinions, was appointed to "take into consideration the Constitution of the Church of Scotland and other Protestant Churches, and agreeably to the general principles of Presbyterian government, compile a system of general rules for the government of the Synod, and the several Presbyteries under their inspection, and the people in their communion." During the years 1786, 1787, and 1788, this subject occupied the earnest attention of the Church, the Presbyteries, and the Synod; and at length resulted in the formation of our present Form of Government and Discipline. Synchronously, the subjects of the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, the Directory for Public Worship, the division of the Synod, and the erection of the General Assembly, were happily concluded, and the Church placed in the condition which

¹ See a remarkable instance on pp. 443-5 of Printed Records, year 1773, growing out of the question of the reception of foreign ministers. Many ministers, with Francis Allison at their head, call "the duties of ordaining and admitting ministers" "essential rights" of Presbytery; others, with Matthew Wilson at their head, say these powers belong *only* to Presbytery; others, headed by Dr. Rodgers, simply dissent from the obnoxious act of Synod; and that body, in its answer, concedes the general principles set forth upon this point by the dissenting members.

she has occupied till the present time.¹ Here, sir, is our system—a system compiled by men of great learning and abilities—men known in this and other countries for their devotion to the Presbyterianism of the sixteenth and seventeenth, rather than that of the eighteenth century; a system founded upon the great and general principles of Presbyterian government, with all the light which a thorough survey of the state and laws of all Protestant Churches could elicit, and especially modelled with a reverent consideration of “the Constitution of the Church of Scotland;” a system pondered during years of careful study and observation, and embodying the ripe fruits of the experience of almost a century of successful effort in new and extraordinary circumstances, by a Church wonderfully raised up of God in this new world; and at last adopted with a common consent, as a rule revealed of God, illustrated and confirmed by an immense experience, and commended by all the lights of reason and knowledge. Sir, it is a glorious system—worthy to be better known by those who profess it; to be more carefully observed by those who administer it.

So far as the provisions of this Form of Government bear upon the present question, I have already largely expounded them. It only remains to compare its actual definitions with those of the various platforms which I have passed in review, and especially with those of the Westminster Assembly and the Church of Scotland. To do this in detail would require much time, and seems to me to be needless. Every form of expression found in the Forms of Government adopted by other Churches, which can be tortured into a rejection of ruling elders from the work of ordination, is excluded from ours. Every principle which looks in that direction is omitted. Every form of words needful to invest them with this authority is inserted, and that not unfrequently in the place of words more or less doubtful in other forms, or where other forms are silent. Every principle upon which this divine right reposes is set forth with perfect distinctness. If it belongs to the great and general principles of Presbyterian government that ordination is in the hands of

¹ See printed Records, pp. 512-547.

Church rulers, then ordination is here put into their hands; for upon those principles this Constitution was avowedly formed. If it was ever taught by other Protestant Churches; if it was ever held by the Church of Scotland; if it belongs to the Church order divinely revealed; if it can be vindicated from the general rules of the word; then upon all and upon each of these conditions it must be found here, for so did our fathers compile this instrument and set up this government. Yes, sir, it is here. And the more thoroughly we comprehend the whole subject, the more largely we contemplate the principles which govern the case, the more minutely we examine the opinions and the actions of past generations, the more manifest it is that in the nature of the case it cannot be otherwise. Why, sir, upon the very arguments most pressed on the other side, and upon those principles considered the most forcible against my view of the subject, it seems to me that it is only necessary to state the matter plainly in order to end the dispute. Gentlemen say it was the habit of our Church to ordain by a committee of ministers only for nearly a century. Grant it; and the answer is, that half a century ago this practice, which never had law to support it, was prohibited. Now, sir, how far does such a state of the case go to prove that ministers only ought to ordain? Gentlemen contend that by the definitions of the Westminster Synod it belongs to teaching elders to impose hands in the ordination of other teaching elders, and that the standards of that Synod are essentially ours. Grant it, and grant even that these definitions were meant to exclude ruling elders, to apply to a permanent and not to an extraordinary Church state, and that the standards containing them were strictly adopted, as they stood, by our early Church—neither of which propositions can be proved; and the answer is, that more than fifty years ago our Church, upon mature examination, adopted a Constitution, which declares that the imposition of hands in such ordinations is in, *not* the teaching elders, but the Presbytery; and that the Presbytery is composed, *not* of teaching elders, but of teaching and ruling elders. And how far, sir, does this state of the case go towards excluding ruling elders from the exercise of the disputed power? Why, sir, look

at this logic. When ordination was by *committee*, ministers only ordained; now the law requires ordination to be by *Presbytery* composed of ministers *and elders*; therefore, *ministers only* must still ordain! Again: The *Westminster Directory* says the *preaching presbyters* must impose hands in ordination; *our Constitution* says the *Presbytery* must do it, and says, moreover, the Presbytery is composed of ministers *and ruling elders*; therefore, the ruling elders *must not impose hands*! Truly, sir, we are fallen upon disjointed times, when a learned ministry is carried away by fallacies like these.

Moderator, there are two things which I have sought in vain throughout the entire history of Christianity. I can find no pure Prelatical Church; I can find no Presbyterian Church that continued pure without a pure and honored eldership. Sir, these are portentous truths; or if I err in regard to them, I will bow in thankful docility to any one who will condescend to set me right, and thus remove a frightful danger from the Church of Christ. Prelacy, sir! Look at the bloody track of the Church of Rome; look at the centuries of deadness and superstition which have blasted the Greek and the Oriental Churches; look at the whole history of Anglican and Anglo-American Episcopacy, its worldliness, its formality, its hereditary subjugation to an unconverted ministry, rendered more glaring by a very small remnant of God's dear children who have been always found in her to save the whole mass from putrefaction; look, too, at every Presbyterian Church whose principles led it to disparage the eldership, whose ministers, catching the spirit of hierarchy, subjugated or dishonored these representatives of God's people, or even whose misfortunes deprived them of this greatest of all safeguards thrown like an impregnable bulwark about the Church in her state militant. Sir, I can show you a Church kept pure, almost without ministers of the word, for years—nay, for generations; look at the history of the Covenanters—since 1660. But can you show me any Church of ours, or any Church at all, which continued long pure without a pure and honored eldership? All the glory and all the spiritual power of Calvin and of Geneva have ended in an Arian Church. Cen-

turies of persecution found the Church of France, at their close a Socinian Church. In the Scottish Church the whole reign of Moderatism has been attended with a subjugated and an unconverted eldership. In England, without an eldership to breast the storm of the restoration, the Puritan churches perished like Jonah's gourd. In our own land, the period of strength and of the power of sound doctrine in the churches of New England was the period of their elderships; and since they passed away, every absurd and idle thing has found a resting place in the churches of the Pilgrims. In our very bosom, for six and thirty years, the churches of the *plan of union*, the churches of committee-men, were the nursery of every disorder; and when the time of reform came, by the good hand of our God over us, it was by the power of the elders, most emphatically, that it was accomplished; and it was the region without a pure and an honored eldership that, having fallen from the truth, fell away from the Church. Oh! sir, let us not deceive ourselves in regard to a matter so vital to us all. If jurisdiction in general be complete without an eldership, that eldership is superfluous; if the power of ordination in particular is too sacred for the eldership, then the eldership is dishonored before God and in the sight of his Church. And think you that a superfluous and a dishonored eldership can stand before God, or continue faithful to his Church? And we, sir—what more do we preaching elders need, after having usurped exclusive jurisdiction and exclusive ordination? What more has the Church to surrender to us?—what other barrier to erect against us? “Limitations, cautions, triennial parliaments, may do much,” said that great, calm, wise, far-sighted man, Alexander Henderson;¹ “but we know that fear of perjury, infamy, excommunication, and the power of a national Assembly, which was in Scotland as terrible to a Bishop as a Parliament, could not keep our men from rising to be Prelates.” And what, sir, shall “keep our men from rising to be Prelates,” after engrossing the essential powers of Prelates, imbibing the fundamental doctrine of Prelates, and overthrowing the firmest bulwark against Prelates? Alas! sir, was not the primitive Church once free? Were not

¹ Hetherington's Hist. Westmin. Assem., p. 305, Appendix i.

the men who corrupted and betrayed her men of like passions with ourselves? Are not these priests of Oxford and of Rome as good by nature as the best of us? Why, then, shall we be blind to the terrible lessons of the past, insensible to the sublime uniformity with which all moral causes operate, deaf to the humiliating proofs of our own weakness and depravity, which cry aloud to us on every hand? Bear with me, sir, if my emotion carries me too far. It is my deep conviction that I should distrust myself which so emboldens me to implore my brethren not to remove this great safeguard of the Church which our Redeemer has purchased with his most precious blood.

Moderator, my duty is done; a duty which the circumstances around me have made one of the most painful and embarrassing of my whole life; a duty which, in faithfulness to my own character and position, to the interests of the Church, and to the cause of truth, it seemed to me I could not omit. It remains for this court to decide whether, according to our covenanted principles, Presbyterian ordination is a charm or an act of government; whether it appertains to the Presbytery or to the ministers of the word. As your judgment shall be in regard to these propositions, so must your vote be upon this minute, which, in the fear of God, I submit to you.

According to the explicit faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, the Lord Jesus has given to his visible Church "the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world" (Confess. Faith, Ch. xxv., Sec. 3); this "ministry" consists, in a settled Church state, of "bishops or pastors, the representatives of the people, usually styled ruling elders, and deacons," who are "the ordinary and perpetual officers in the Church" (Form of Gov., Ch. iii., Sec. 2); the two first named classes of officers, to wit, pastors and ruling elders, constitute the "congregational, classical, and synodical assemblies," by which, in accordance with the Scriptures, the Church is to be governed (Form of Gov., Ch. viii., Sec. 1; Ch. ix., Sec. 1; Ch. x., Sec. 2; Ch. xi., Sec. 1; Ch. xii., Sec. 2); to this government, in the hands of the aforesaid officers, the Lord, as King and Head of his Church has committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Confession of Faith, Ch. xxx., Sec. 1 and 2), to be used expressly, amongst other ends, "for the gathering and perfecting of the saints," as before set forth. To this end, the ministry of the word, a part of that general ministry given by the Lord Jesus to the visible

Church, is to be perpetually kept up therein, "to the end of the world;" and it particularly appertaineth in our Church to "classical assemblies," called Presbyteries, and not to other sorts of assemblies, and especially not to one or more ministers of the word individually considered or casually met together, "to ordain, install, remove, and judge ministers" of the word (Form of Gov., Ch. x., Sec 8); which classical assembly, or Presbytery, is rightly constituted of ministers and ruling elders, and cannot legally act except when at least "three ministers and as many elders as may be present belonging to the Presbytery" constitute "a quorum competent to proceed to business" (Form. of Gov., Ch. x., Sec. 2 and 7); and which said Presbytery, in the ordination of ministers of the word, is to lay its hands—that is, the hands of all its members, or of any part thereof on behalf and as the act of the whole, and so of the Presbytery itself, that is, of the same Presbytery to whom the power of ordination appertains—upon the candidate in his ordination (Form of Gov., Ch. xv., Sec. 14).

But inasmuch as the General Assembly of 1843 did, on the 25th day of May last, decide by yeas and nays 138 to 9, *non liquet* 1. and excused from voting 2, to adopt an Overture No. 14, declaring that the Constitution of our Church does not authorise ruling elders to impose hands in the ordination of ministers (printed Minutes, p. 183); now this Synod, believing the said decision to be wholly erroneous in itself, and most injurious in its practical tendency, as well as inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our Church Government, does hereby, and in virtue of its inherent powers (Form of Gov., Ch. xi., Sec. 4), propose to the General Assembly, in the way of Overture, the repeal of said Overture No. 14, adopted by the Assembly of 1843, and the adoption of a minute stating—

1. That the whole work of the ordination of ministers of the word belongs regularly and properly to a Presbytery composed of preaching and ruling elders.

2. That the Presbytery which should impose hands is the same as that which performs all the rest of the work of ordination.

ARTICLE III.

MAN'S SYMPATHY WITH MAN, AND THE MEANS OF GRACE.

All the ordinances of God referred to by the general expression, "the means of grace," are as well suited to the end of winning men to embrace heavenly wisdom as if they were designed to be the efficient causes in the great work of gospel persuasion. Suppose an educated gentleman, say twenty-one years old, has never before seen a Bible, and that the sacred volume is now before his eyes, and he is perusing its divine pages for the first time. He knows that the Church receives the book as the very word of God, and he cannot help forming some general idea of its style and structure and contents. How signally must most of such a reader's expectations be disappointed! The historical form, the progressive, time-consuming development, the minute, human, often revolting details of the inspired production; the local, definite, narrow direction of many of its composing units; the Jewishness of its psalms and prophecies, and of much of its narratives and laws, would broadly contradict his pre-formed impressions. Not only so; he would find the whole mode of the Bible to be the opposite of what he has looked for in a divine revelation. He would wonder to find it a book of principles rather than of statutes; a book which relies on reason more than on authority; a book not addressed to church officers, with the exception of one or two small parts, but to individuals in their private capacity; a book constantly requiring the exercise of judgment and discrimination on our part in order to be useful to us; a book not only encouraging but demanding investigation, and the full and free exercise of all the powers of the soul in reference to its claims, its doctrines, its duties, and its application; a book which on the side of its authorship is *thoroughly human*, while it claims to be absolutely divine. Yet however perplexed our supposed student may at first be by these strange discoveries, he may soon come to see in them all only a

VOL. XXXIII., NO. 3—11.

most beautiful, humbling, and worship-inspiring display of divine prudence and wisdom.

Among all the contradictions of an *a priori* judgment in reference to the character of a revelation from God, not the least striking is the prominence of the human element on the side of its authorship. The Psalms of David are far more truly the utterances of the sweet singer of Israel than are Moore's melodies the utterances of Erin's most musical bard. The songs of the poet may or may not vent his own convictions and sentiments. Not so the hymns of the prophet. He really saw the visions he records; he had the convictions and the feelings he inculcates; he experienced the sorrows he recounts, and basked in the hopes he communicates. In David's Psalms we have David's unique personality brought to bear upon our spirits as truly as we have the word of God. So, too, the Epistles of Paul have more of the Apostle of the Gentiles in them than the "*Letters to His Son*" of Philip Dormer Stanhope have of their titled author. In them Paul himself, in his own marked individuality, lives, and breathes, and thinks, and feels, and worships, and persuades. They are Paul's spirit, and temper, and faith, and hope, and love, and zeal, placed before us alive and palpitating and mightily working. In nearly all the sacred books their human writers appear not merely as the accredited pensmen of the Spirit, but as veritable authors. With perfect freedom and boldness they come before us in their own personality, and reason and reprove and exhort with all freedom of mind and emotion. And what is further very remarkable is that the most pious student of the Holy Scriptures is, other things being equal, the most likely to excel in his admiration of the lofty, poetic genius, the fervid overpowering energy, intellectual and logical, the deep and mighty pathos of the men chosen by God, not only to write, but also to be, his revelation; and who, because thus chosen, give, so far as they give any, a true indication of their experience and characters. How different; for instance, the relation of the "*Night Thoughts*," and the scorn of worldly ambition they profess, to the real life of the servile courtier who penned them, predominated as it was by an appetite for earthly

preferment too greedy to be nice in reference to the way of its gratification! How different this relation from that of the book of Ecclesiastes to the life and biography of its royal scribe! How little does the one let us into the experience of its author; how greatly the other! How different the relation of the writings of Lord Bacon to Macaulay's view of this philosopher's real character, from that of the writings of Paul to Luke's presentation of the apostle's experience and real predominating aspiration! Indeed, it is not too much to say, if only it be said reverently, that so far as the infinite disparity between the two personalities, that of Jesus Christ and that of Paul, will allow, the latter is as largely revealed in the Scriptures as the former. But let us imagine that our supposed novice reads the first verse of the twelfth chapter of Romans, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, etc." Would he not be apt to say, Why, this is the word of Paul himself! The amanuensis has the audacity to obtrude himself and to use his own influence. Not content to be the mere instrument by which the Holy Ghost reveals the bearing of the mercies of God on human duty, this apostle in his own person beseeches me. Is this a manner befitting even the private secretary of a human monarch, and how much less one expected to write under the dictation of Almighty God, and who is the instrument of revealing the will of the King of kings, the Sovereign of the universe?

The explanation of this wonderful paradox is the law underlying all saving ordinances, *that God uses the sinner's sympathy with the human as a means of lifting the sinner up into sympathy with the divine.* By the fall the life of holiness was expelled from man's heart, and enmity to God introduced into its place. But man was not by the fall thus alienated from his fellow-man. Social morality, and what we distinctively call the natural affections, survived the dire catastrophe of Eden. The fallen man is not dead to the convictions of a soul formed like his own, considered merely as the convictions of his fellow mortal, or dead to the sufferings or pathos of a being having a body and soul like his. He still believes in humanity and friendship and patriotism and philanthropy. The parental, the filial, the social,

the humane elements of his life remain, and retain great liveliness and susceptibility. Hence in God's first approach to the sinner he uses as his agent, not simply a man but, humanity—the mind and heart of a man in full exercise and demonstration and display. By this agency he appeals to the sinner's sympathy with the human, and thus moves him towards sympathy with the divine. "Ye became," says Paul, "followers of us and of the Lord." First of us, and then, by means of us, of the Lord. First sympathy with us, your fellow creatures, in our intellectual and emotional experience, and in our painful desire for your welfare, and then from this you moved onward under the gentle, unfelt, and, save by after reflection, unnoticed impulse of the Spirit, to full direct sympathy with God. This is an explanation of the human element in the Scriptures on the side of their authorship, so far as the work of conversion is concerned. As to the regenerate, it may be remarked that they, alas, often become torpid on the divine side, practically dead to the direct appeals of God, and even worse, under the power of an evil conscience, averse to hearing the divine voice; and that when they are in such a condition they need the love and zeal and painful pleadings of humanity, as what they can best be aroused and attracted by, to the exercise of holy consideration and faith. Hence the Lord sent Nathan unto David, instead of arresting the prayerless, guilty, torpid-souled king by a direct voice from the throne of heaven. But the *progress*, and even the *perfection* of Christian character do not annul the law which regulates the influence of spirit upon spirit. On the contrary, in what the Scriptures reveal to us of the worship of heaven, we have reason to believe that the law of sympathy has in the world of perfect holiness its largest influence. One who has taste to appreciate external beauty standing alone gazing upon a lovely landscape, and drinking in its loveliness, is delighted. But let him go again to admire some equally lovely scene, but not alone; let him have with him one whose taste he knows to be of the most refined, cultivated, and poetic order; let both look and admire and exchange feelings and thoughts by eyes and lips. Does he not see and feel now what he never could have perceived and felt were he alone? So it is

that "the things which are above" are better appreciated when contemplated in fellowship with those who are most exquisitely affected by them, and who are objects of our reverence, confidence, and love. We better comply with the exhortation, "Be followers of God as dear children," for having been imitators of or sympathisers with his holy apostles and prophets. And thus it is that the epistles of Paul, for instance, are much more valuable to the most advanced Christian for having Paul himself living in them.

But not alone in the structure of revelation do we find a provision made for engaging the sinner's sympathy with the human to aid in the great work of converting and sanctifying the sinner. The manifestation of our Saviour's humanity, as made in Palestine, and as recorded by the Evangelists, is evidently designed to appeal to man's sympathy with humanity, and is so applied in apostolic sermons and epistles. The humanity of our Lord was indeed necessary to a far higher end; but much in the history of its manifestation was not necessary to the atonement, so far as we can see, but was written, doubtless, for the purpose of touching and awakening man's sympathy with the human, and of thus leading the sinner on to sympathy with the divine. Here, too, we first become followers of the man, and then are, in an inscrutable way, enabled to perceive the infinite preciousness of the divine Saviour. The practice of praying to the departed saints is unnecessary, unwarranted, and dangerous. Yet it obtains; and its existence proves, that such are the inferences which the sinful heart is apt to draw from the purity of Jesus and his separation from sinners, and such in man, the sinner, the antipathy to perfect holiness, and such the fear inspired by one so evidently and fully in communion with the Supreme Lawgiver as Jesus appears to be, that it is manifestly wise in God, as well as a merciful condescension to our weakness, to make his first approach to the sinner through one who has been involved in a common ruin with himself, and who is as really a sinner as himself. The human writers of the Scriptures are indeed no longer sinful, but it is as sinners, as men not perfectly sanctified, that they address us in the Sacred Scriptures. Moreover, whatever in the way of a powerful appeal to man's sympathy with the human in behalf of re-

ligion the world has been deprived of by the death of inspired men, is fully made up to us by the organisation, and ordinances, and officers, and endowments, and prescribed life of the Church, and, very especially, by *her living ministry*. The saying of Christ, "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil," is as applicable to the great law of social influence as it is to the moral and positive laws of revelation. It has been said that "the flutterings of an insect's wing send its vibrations to the remotest orb in the great field of space." Be this as it may, that man influences man is a law whose operation is coextensive with our race. No one is either above or beneath the modifying touch of this subtle, all-penetrating, and ever-flowing element of power. By it man multiplies his moral self—gives immortality and universality to the ideas that spring from his intellect and the principles that shape his life. The words that drop from his lips fall as pebbles into the centre of a placid lake, creating a series of undulating and ever-widening circles over the whole expanse. Thus the spirit of past generations throbs in us, and down through posterity it shall flow and be the moral life blood of the men that are to be. Whether conscious or unconscious, designed or unintended, man's influence on man is constantly operating. Through the channels of physical relationship and of universal interdependence; through the love and authority of the parent and the affection and duty of the child; through the diversity of intellectual powers, mental attainments, secular positions, and of the ages and general capabilities of men; by the voluntary language of the tongue and the pen, and the involuntary expression of the lip, the brow, the eye, the tone of voice; by all that is contradistinguished as the natural language of the sentiments, does the character of the individual pour itself out upon the world, and through the ear, the eye, the understanding, the sensibilities, the instinct of imitation, the desire of approbation, and through all that in one man corresponds to the feelings and impulses of another, and makes them contagious, does the world receive from its intelligent constituents, according to the measure of each, that powerful, assimilating, though intangible fluid, of sympathetic influence, to send it forth again in constant circulation. This

great law of sympathy Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil—that is, to make its operation a blessing instead of a curse to the race of man. Accordingly, the end for which he established his Church almost wholly resolves itself into the utilisation and direction, unto the promotion of God's glory through the gospel, of man's sympathy with the human, or man's influence upon man. Who can fail to see that a recognition of this great law underlies the statement and command of the Redeemer when he says to his disciples, the representatives of his Church, "Ye are the salt of the earth; ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven." The Saviour assumes that men have a tendency to notice and feel all striking manifestations of human thought and emotion; and from this premise he infers that when the members of the visible Church zealously reveal and illustrate the character of their Father in heaven, their works can no more escape the notice and attention of men before whom they are done than could a city set on a hill remain unseen; and that there is a powerful tendency in such an earnest Christian life to bring men to glorify the God of the Church, and hence that it is such a means of saving sinners as the Spirit of wisdom and grace will accept and bless.

What has now been said must suffice to direct attention to the human element in all the means of grace, as beautifully manifesting divine condescension and prudence, and as being of very great importance in God's method of converting and sanctifying sinners. But while this has been the immediate, it has not been the principal end aimed at in our discussion. The result we have reached has all the time been pursued as containing an answer to the most important practical questions that can be asked relative to the work of the Church as a propagandist of truth and a co-laborer with the Holy Ghost in seeking the salvation of men.

It is from the value attached by God himself to man's sympathy with the human as a means of begetting in him sympathy with the divine, of bringing him to the knowledge of the truth,

that architecture and music and posture in prayer and eloquence, derive their importance in relation to the mission of Christians; and their adaptation to this end is the standard of their perfection. Our doctrine tells us that art has a place, and defines the place it has in the operations of Christianity. When either by excess or imperfection, it fails to prepare for the reception of the truth, it fails of its legitimate end; and when it hinders the perception of truth, it is a positive evil. It should, on the one hand, be suited to awaken man's sympathy with man, and, on the other, to awaken it so that it shall be a preparation for and an advance towards sympathy with the divine. The Church's appeals to sinners should have in them art enough to gain their natural emotions; but it should be such art as will gain these emotions, not as an end, but as a means—as the means best adapted to lead souls to the perception of the truth and the experience of spiritual emotions. The Church should use art as a means of saying to men, I beseech you be reconciled to God; and moved by the mercies of God through Jesus Christ, present your bodies, living sacrifices, holy and acceptable to God, a reasonable service.

The great means of saving sinners is the preaching of the gospel. There are in preaching as in all the means of grace two elements—the divine and the human. If you take either away, what you have left is not the divine ordinance of preaching at all. But granting that the truth of the gospel is essential to preaching as a means of salvation, the inquiry is very important, What must the preacher himself supply in order that his deliverances may be what God demands? To this inquiry attention to the human element of the Bible and on the side of its authorship gives answer that the preacher should contribute to the sermonic deliverance not only the results of a mind skilful in inward composition and the display of a refined and nice invention and the product of a rhetorical pen and well adapted action; that not all the elements of the dramatic grace of authors and actors combined, which constitute the perfection of theatrical mimicry of the real, would suffice to make one true sermon, even although they may produce a discourse full of God's truth, and

containing no error; our doctrine teaches that the preacher must, in a proper way, put into his sermon his whole humanity—all in him that is suited to awaken the affections of his auditors; that the direct immediate end of preaching is to bring men to feel with the preacher in reference to his intellectual and spiritual experience of divine things. It is for the sake of the sinner's sympathy with the human that God calls and ordains men to preach. Were that sympathy of little importance in the sight of God, we can see no reason why instead of preachers he should not have given us a great commentary on the Scriptures, to be read for themselves by all who can read, and to be read to all others by persons appointed to that comparatively very simple and easy duty. Besides, it is only when we regard the ministry as a provision immediately directed to the enlisting of the sinner's sympathy with the human in behalf of religion that we see any compensation for the evils necessarily proceeding from the appointment of sinful men to preach the gospel. How many grievous scandals, how many cruel persecutions, how much bitter controversy, would have been kept out of the history of the Church, had God sent the inhabitants of the other world, who are free from infirmity and sin, to be our instructors in the knowledge of salvation! If, then, it is to man's sympathy with man that preaching is to be immediately addressed, it is easy to see that perfection in the art of preaching requires that the preacher bring his whole humanity to bear on his hearers in favor of divine truth. It is plain from this that in order to be a preacher at all, the man's humanity must be engrossed, occupied, pervaded, dominated by gospel realities, personages, and glories. This leads us to submit that, so far as the human element in preaching is concerned, its perfection lies in its thorough, sanctified individuality. The preacher himself must operate on his audience—*himself*, not as wrought by the force of mere fancy into a sentimental frame of pulpit fervor and piety, but himself as actually confronting eternal realities, and moved by a perception of their nature and grandeur, as different from any exercise of the fancy as seeing with our bodily eyes and hearing with our bodily ears are different from the illusions of a dream.

“Eloquence is the emission through speech of all the soul's virtues, energies, of thought, of sensibility, and especially of will.” Can a human soul be thus active, moved upon, engrossed in one pursuit, tax its every nerve to the uttermost, and not display marked individual traits? Not if it is true that diversity in unity is a law of creation, and that God has never made two souls any more than he has made two faces that are not distinguishable.

Let the next question be, What is the Christian's best preparation for winning souls to Christ, whether he be a preacher or a private member of the Church? Our doctrine of sympathy plainly answers: a desire for the glory of God and the good of our fellow-men, so strong that it must express itself—yea, compel its subject to oppose his whole weight against the downward movements of the sinner, and apply his whole force to move him heavenwards. When men see that you are yourself deeply impressed by the claims of God and the preciousness of Jesus Christ, and that you sincerely long that others should be thus impressed also, the principle of sympathy will mightily tend to incline them, and, under the grace of the Holy Ghost, will actually incline them, to take your views of religion, and to feel and obey as you do. Men will judge by our lives whether our words are sincere, and truly express our feelings. Paul's entreaty was sustained by his constant conduct. Men knew that his words unveiled his heart; hence their power. Ah, it is a sad thing when a Christian's life is such that he dare not say to his brother, “I beseech thee, serve God.” If the earnest desire of a Christian heart may be the effectual means of another's salvation, how important is it that we should keep our religious emotions and interest always in a lively condition!

“I've known the pregnant thinkers of this time,
And stood by, breathless, hanging on their lips,
When some chromatic sequence of fine thought,
In learned modulation, framed itself
To an un conjectured harmony of truth;
And yet I've been more moved, more raised, I say,
By a simple word—a broken, 'easy thing
A three-years' infant might say after you—

A look, a sigh, a touch upon the palm,
 Which means less than I love you * * * than by all
 The full-voiced rhetoric of those master mouths."

But, finally, our doctrine contains the answer to the tremendous question, What is the most pressing need of the perishing world in which we live? We see, in the light of Paul's entreaty, and of the human element in the Scriptures, and in all the means of grace, that what is most needed by perishing men is to have the most powerful appeal to their sympathy with the human made to them in favor of Christianity. How then is this appeal to be made? The structure of the Bible, the records of God manifested in the flesh, and the very design of the Church as taught in the Scriptures, in answer point to an embodiment, an incarnation, a living manifestation of the truth by the Church of Jesus Christ. Suppose the Church and the truth to be one, somewhat as the humanity of Jesus and the Divine Logos were one; that she manifested the truth as Jesus did the divine nature; or, if this too far transcends the power of our poor aspirations, suppose the Church to be under the influence of divine truth as Paul the apostle was, to realise her mission as he did his; suppose Zion to travail with an agony proportioned to her profession, her promises and work, what results might we not expect to behold! See what happens in a particular congregation when the members of the church feel and manifest a deep and operative interest in the salvation of souls. Every revival of religion proves the inestimable value of hearty, earnest, and vigorous appeals made by the church to the sinner's sympathy with the human in favor of religion. The sinner's sense of the reality and importance of religion is very apt to be graded according to the church's earnestness in promoting the divine glory. That old, hoary, oft-quoted aphorism, "Great is the truth, and it will prevail," should find some iconoclastic Carlyle to test its merits and show how far it should be permitted to shape our hopes. Moral truth can prevail over moral error only by meeting it in its own form. When error clothes itself only in abstract theories and fine speeches, then truth may put it down by abstract arguments and eloquent harangues. But when error concretes not alone with the brain, the

tongue, and the folio, but with the very life of men, is ensouled and embodied in them, then, if truth is ever to prevail, it, too, must become flesh, and dwell amongst men; it must dominate all the capacities and powers of the Church. To overcome paganism, irreligion, and wrong religion and sin, truth must operate in and through the Church, as these operate in and through the world. Let the Church's mind move in charity, rest in Providence, and turn upon the poles of truth, and then its light will so shine before men that they will see her good works and glorify our Father in heaven.

But, even as things are, how tremendous is the human appeal made to each one of us, urging us to receive and enjoy the mercies of God. There is the appeal of prophets, and apostles, and evangelists, addressing us under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; there is the appeal of the man, Christ Jesus, speaking on earth, and from heaven—an appeal of blood and agony, and of victory and glory; there is the appeal of many martyrs of the primitive Church and the Reformed Church; there is the appeal of what the Bible has wrought in reference to man's temporal interests; there is the appeal of home, of Sabbath-school, and Church; there is the appeal from the glorious Humanity, which is this day enthroned above angels and archangels, and vested with unbounded dominion. Can we remain unmoved, while thus entreated to be reconciled to God, and to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, a reasonable service!

FRANCIS P. MULLALY.

ARTICLE IV.

DR. THORNWELL AND OUR CHURCH POLICY.

At the Staunton Assembly, in the discussion of Retrenchment and Reform, the minority sought to strengthen their position by claiming that Dr. Thornwell had advocated the principles which lie at the basis of their movement. This was denied with emphasis by the majority. The January number of this REVIEW has placed the question before the Church in such a light as to awaken an interest in the minds of many as to what were Dr. Thornwell's views on the matters at issue. The most satisfactory way to settle the question, perhaps, would be for THE REVIEW to republish in full Dr. T.'s writings and discussions upon the subject. As this, however, is probably impracticable, it may answer the purpose to present copious extracts from his *Collected Writings*. It must not be thought amiss if the same quotations which have heretofore been presented shall appear again in this article.

There are three points on which the minority claimed the concurrence with them of Dr. T.: as to ministerial Secretary-Treasurerships; the employment of deacons by the higher courts of the Church; and the direct conduct of the evangelistic work of the Church by the Presbyteries. It is the object of this paper to ascertain how far this claim was well founded.

I. As to the propriety of putting ministers, as Secretaries and Treasurers, over the general work of missions. The minority questioned the propriety of this plan for two reasons: 1. Because it gives to ministers, *as such*, the power of jurisdiction; and, 2. Because the financial duties of a Treasurer do not pertain to them.

We do not differ as to ministers' possessing, *as elders*, the power of jurisdiction. The majority and the minority are at one upon this point; because it is one of the essential elements of the Presbyterian system, distinguishing it from Prelacy. The majority, however, do not admit that in fact the Secretaries of our

Executive Committees exercise the *potestas jurisdictionis*. We do not propose to argue this point, but simply to see what Dr. Thornwell thought of it. He says:

“The parity of the ministry is a fundamental principle among all Presbyterians. Whatever differences superior piety, learning, and talents may make in the *man*, we allow no difference in the *office*. We tolerate no official authority in one minister above another. Our system does not admit it. But the fact is unquestionable, that the various officers of our Boards are invested with a control over their brethren, and a power in the Church, just as real and just as dangerous as the authority of a prelate. They constitute a college of ecclesiastical functionaries who determine the character and shape the destinies of the Presbyterian Church in these United States of America. * * * We will dare venture the assertion that there is not a Presbytery in the land which possesses so real a power, and which can exercise it so speedily and efficiently, as the Corresponding Secretaries and Executive Committees of our different Boards. * * * From the very nature of the case, this undue accumulation of power in a few hands must always be the practical result of this system. This single fact shows that it is rotten to the core, and utterly alien from all our habits, feelings, and associations as Presbyterians. The machinery which no human wisdom can put into operation, without destroying the official equality of the ministry—which always and inevitably works a few men to the uppermost seats in the synagogue—may answer for Papists and Prelatists, but it is death to Presbyterianism.”—*Collected Writings*, Vol. IV., pp. 156–8.

The answer to this is, that Dr. T. is here speaking of Corresponding Secretaries of Boards, and not of such officers at the head of Executive Committees. This is true, and should not be overlooked or forgotten. If, then, these officers of our Executive Committees do not possess, and do not in fact exercise, the powers of jurisdiction—do not appoint missionaries, nor designate their fields of labor, nor authorise all appropriations and expenditures of money in the general work of the Church,—they do not fall under the criticism of the extracts above quoted.¹

¹While it is foreign to the purpose of this paper to discuss any of the questions raised in it, (the design being to simply give Dr. Thornwell's views,) our respect for the venerable Secretary for Foreign Missions is so great that we shall endeavor to answer his inquiry as to the prelatival powers of Corresponding Secretaries and Executive Commit-

Again : The minority objected to the imposition of financial duties on ministerial Secretaries, and claimed the support of Dr. T. for this opinion. This is what he says :

“The Corresponding Secretary and the general agent of these Boards are discharging the peculiar functions of neither minister, elder, nor deacon. They certainly are not pastors, and are just as far from being evangelists. They do not claim to be ruling elders, and much less would they submit to be called deacons in the sense of our Book. What, then, are they? Where are their mixed and heterogeneous functions recognised as belonging to any single individual, from the first to the last of our Constitution? They combine into one discordant whole some of the duties of every officer acknowledged in our system—they are two-thirds deacons, one-sixth elder, and one-sixth preacher. The duties, and not the name, make the office. You may call them *ministers*, and ordain them as such; but if they do not discharge, constantly and faithfully, the duties of ministers, God assuredly does not regard them in that light, and man should not. * * * The temporary business of a secretary or scribe in any public meeting we understand; the temporary agency of a pastor for a specific purpose we acknowledge to be scriptural; but the appointing of men to a permanent and standing vocation, in which it is impossible to be faithful in any of the standing offices of the Church, we do not understand; for we have not so learned Presbyterianism.”—*Ibidem*, pp. 149, 150. See also p. 211.

We do not know that there is any reply to be made here by the majority; for there is no difference, in this respect, between the ministerial Treasurer of a Board and of an Executive Committee.

tees. As the minority presented this point very tenderly and very respectfully, and on the suggestion of Dr. Thornwell, it would be sufficient to refer Dr. W. to pp. 149–154, 156–8, Vol. IV., *Thornwell's Collected Writings*.

As he desires information as to the specific prelatial powers committed to our Secretaries and Executive Committees, we would refer him to pp. 152, 153, especially. The appointment of missionaries, the designation of their fields of labor, and the control of the purse of the Church, are there set forth by Dr. Thornwell as the presbyterial or episcopal powers exercised by Secretaries and Executive Committees of the old Church. If such or similar prerogatives are not now enjoyed and exercised by these officers in our Church, they do not fall under Dr. Thornwell's censure, that “the tendency of their practical working is to introduce a system of virtual-Prelacy.”

II. The minority held to the propriety of using the deacons as the general financial officers of all the Church courts. The majority objected on the ground that deacons are limited, in their sphere, to their own congregation, and, in their functions, to the care of the poor. It was claimed that Dr. Thornwell sustained the minority in their view.

First, as to *function*. Dr. T. says :

“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. If all our Boards were converted into mere benches of deacons, commissioned only to disburse funds under the direction of the spiritual courts, there would be no serious grounds of objection to them.”—*Ib.*, p. 155.

“But it seems that deacons are to be intrusted with nothing but the care of the poor. Is the reviewer (Dr. Smyth) yet to learn that the common method of instruction pursued in the Scriptures is to inculcate general truths by insisting on their particular applications, rather than dealing in abstract statements? * * * As, then, it is frequently the method of Scripture to teach by example, where is the impropriety in supposing that the attention to the poor, enjoined upon the deacons, was intended to include the whole department of secular business with which the Church was to be concerned? * * * It must be perfectly obvious to every candid mind that the entire secular business of the Church was intrusted to the deacons.”—*Ib.*, pp. 200, 201.

Again, as to the *sphere* of the deacon. The minority contended that his sphere was coextensive with his functions; and that, as “the whole department of secular business” properly belonged to him, he should be employed as the financial officer of the higher courts. They claimed that Dr. Thornwell had taught the same doctrine. Here is the proof:

“Our Book, however, 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 the 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 the apostles.”—*Ib.*, p. 155.

“That deacons are officers elected and ordained in particular churches, is true. So are elders; but as there is nothing in this fact inconsistent

with an elder's acting for the Church at large in our ecclesiastical courts, so there is nothing to prevent the deacon from exercising his peculiar functions in a wider sphere. * * He must either admit that the Presbyterian form of government is unscriptural, or that deacons may act for Presbyteries as they act for their particular congregations. * * * The idea that a deacon cannot attend to the secular business of the Presbytery or Assembly, without being removed from his particular congregation, is perfectly ludicrous and absurd."—*Ib.*, 199-202.

III. But the chief point of interest is as to the proper agency to which the Church should commit the conduct of its missionary operations.

In all matters of controversy, it is important that the issues shall be exactly and clearly made. Two plans have been advocated for the carrying on of the evangelistic work of the Church: the one by a central agency, the General Assembly; the other by a distributive agency, the Presbyteries. The former plan is susceptible of two modes. As the General Assembly is not a permanent body, is in session only about two weeks in the year, and is too large for executive work, no one has thought it possible that the various evangelistic enterprises could be conducted directly by it. It is necessary that it should intrust the work to some smaller, permanent body. Just here the views diverge. According to the one, the central agency, in direct charge of missions, should be an independent organism, a permanent commission of the General Assembly, known as a Board. According to the other, it should be a dependent organ of the Assembly, an Executive Committee.

We may properly say, therefore, that three plans of conducting our missionary work have been proposed and advocated: 1. By Boards, organised commissions of the Assembly; 2. By Executive Committees of the Assembly; 3. By the Presbyteries.

The Northern Church employs the first; our Church uses the second; the advocates of reform contend for the last, except as to foreign missions. So far as centralisation is concerned, these plans are graded. The first embodies it fully; the second has less; while the third is an emphatic protest against it.

It is manifest that the holders of the first view would be diametrically opposed to the last, and, if forced to give up their own,

might compromise on the second. So the advocates of Presbyterian management would contest every inch with the Boards, and, if compelled to do so, would accept the Executive Committee. The second is clearly the compromise ground between the others as extremes. Before the disruption, the contest was between the first and second plans, the Boards and the Executive Committees; in our Church, it is between the second and third, the Executive Committees and the Presbyteries.

The question as to Dr. Thornwell is, which of these three plans he preferred. It can be still further simplified by eliminating the first. No one doubts that he was opposed in principle to the Board system. This narrows the issue to the question, Did Dr. Thornwell prefer the central agency of the Executive Committee, or the distributive agency of the Presbyteries?

The advocates of the Presbyterian plan put themselves to the greatest possible disadvantage in thus narrowing the issue, for the reason that, in the great discussions in which Dr. Thornwell engaged, the Executive Committee and the Presbyterian plans were never brought into direct conflict. It would be entirely sufficient to show that Dr. Thornwell favored the Presbyterian plan. This was all that was asserted at Staunton. Nevertheless, the issue as thus made is accepted, and we are to see whether Dr. Thornwell not only preferred Executive Committees to Boards, but Presbyteries to them both.

For the reason just given, it is needful to notice that Boards and Executive Committees have certain features in common; to imitate Dr. Lefevre, they are both species of the same genus, central or General Assembly agency. As species of the same genus, they must have common marks, and must also have differentia, by which they are distinguished. They agree in being agencies of the General Assembly; in having as their executive head a Secretary; so far as Foreign Missions is concerned, in their general powers; and in having a central treasury. They differ in the degree of their dependence upon and subordination to the General Assembly.

In settling the issue now made, it will be pertinent to quote Dr. Thornwell, in his argument against Boards, only so far as he

objected to what they have in common with the Executive Committees. His objections to the points in which they differ will, of course, not be pertinent.

The important point is as to the *powers* of the Boards and Executive Committees. If they have powers in common, and Dr. Thornwell objected to these powers, then he objected seriously to both forms of the central agency plan. Our Executive Committee of Foreign Missions is empowered "to take direction and control of the Foreign Missionary work, subject to such instruction as may be given by the General Assembly from time to time; to appoint missionaries and assistant missionaries; to designate their fields of labor, and provide for their support; * * * to authorise appropriations and expenditures of money," etc. Dr. Thornwell: "Look at the following grant of power to the Board of Foreign Missions in the 4th Article of its Constitution: 'To the Executive Committee, etc., shall belong the duty of *appointing* all missionaries and agents; of designating their fields of labor; to authorise all appropriations and expenditures of money,' etc. These powers, it will be observed, are identical. Now, Dr. Thornwell's criticism:

"This ample investiture of power renders them to all intents and purposes ecclesiastical courts. They exercise dominion in the Lord's house. To say that this is not their true character, because they are responsible to the General Assembly, would be to deny that the Presbytery is an ecclesiastical court, because it is responsible to the Synod. . . . The possession and exercise of power must distinguish a court. . . . Here is unquestionably the power of judging of the qualifications of ministers—their fitness for particular stations; and here is a right conveyed to control and manage and direct their labors. . . . The Assembly unquestionably had no right to take from the Presbytery its constitutional authority and to vest it in any other organisation. . . . It is plain that, under the present system, so far as Presbytery from being the radical and leading court, which in all Presbyterian Churches, according to Dr. Miller, it is, the Boards themselves are all in all, and the poor Presbyteries are dwindled down into mere auxiliaries—hewers of wood and drawers of water."—*Ibidem*, pp. 151-4.

The next point in common between the Boards and Executive Committees is the Central Treasury, from which the missionaries are supported. Dr. Thornwell objected to this:

“For this business it is supposed that the Presbyteries are wholly unqualified. It has been frequently admitted that while everything connected with the spiritual aspects of Domestic and Foreign Missions falls appropriately within the province of the Presbytery, there is no adequate arrangement in our Book for conducting the pecuniary matters of the various stations with efficiency and success. This we apprehend is a great mistake. In the first place, the Constitution provides that the judicatory sending out any missionary must support him. In the second place, the Book provides that our churches should be furnished with a class of officers for the express purpose of attending to the temporal matters of the church; and these deacons might be made the collecting agents of the Presbytery in every congregation, and through them the necessary funds could be easily obtained and without expense. For transmission to foreign parts, nothing more would be necessary than simply to employ either some extensive merchant in any of our large cities, who for the usual percentage would attend to the whole matter, or a committee of deacons appointed by the Assembly for the purpose.”—*Ib.*, p. 154.

Again, the Boards and Executive Committees being alike in that they both require all the churches to contribute to a common fund, from which the missionaries are supported, Dr. Thornwell had another objection:

“It is obvious that whatever system of arrangements for accomplishing this purpose may be adopted, it should give the fullest security that the contributions of the Church go to support *nothing but the gospel*. The people should know the character and sentiments of the missionaries sustained by their liberality. But what security do the Boards give? None but the endorsement of the Presbytery or Presbyteries that ordained the evangelists. The Assembly has virtually declared this to be no security by requiring every Presbytery to examine ministers from any other Presbytery coming within its bounds. . . . We, therefore, leave our churches in fearful uncertainty as to what they are actually sending to heathen lands in the name of the gospel. . . . This difficulty would be obviated by carrying out the provisions of our Book. The Presbytery that sends a man *would know him*; the churches within its bounds would know him, and consequently would know what they are supporting.”—*Ib.*, p. 166.

The quotations so far are taken from Dr. Thornwell's first publication on this general subject. To his views, as thus expressed, Dr. Smyth, of Charleston, S. C., made vigorous opposition in a rejoinder. It will comfort the feeble minority of

to-day to know that Dr. Smyth stigmatised Dr. Thornwell's ideas as "perfectly chimerical," "mere theoretical hypothesis," "built upon the most Utopian and gratuitous assumptions," "a novelty, an innovation," "unscriptural, unconstitutional," "preposterous in the extreme," "altogether visionary." We shall quote only one passage from it, as showing how he understood Dr. Thornwell:

"The propriety and necessity of Boards or *committees of any kind* for the management of the various benevolent operations in which the Church is engaged, . . . is the question before us. We are thus earnest in calling attention to this point, *which is so clearly laid down by the objector himself*, because in a subsequent part of his discussion he argues against our organisation on the ground that the Boards, as distinct from Committees, are unnecessary. Such an agency, call it either a Board or a Committee, as he maintains, is directly subversive of the Form of Government embodied in the Constitution of our Church."—*Ibidem*, p. 594. [The *italics* are ours.]

Did Dr. Smyth misunderstand and misrepresent Dr. Thornwell? Did Dr. Thornwell repudiate this construction of his position? Let us turn to Dr. Thornwell's rejoinder, and learn whether he repudiated this statement of his views:

Page 194: "The Presbyteries are courts acknowledged by our Constitution; deacons are officers recognised in every particular congregation, and capable of being employed in the service of the Presbyteries and the higher tribunals of the Church. If one Presbytery should be too feeble to support its missionaries, provision is made in our Book for its obtaining assistance from neighboring Presbyteries. This is certainly the plan, and the only plan, contemplated by the framers of our Form of Government."

"Why cannot the Presbyteries accomplish this work just as efficiently as the Boards? . . . Is there anything in this too hard or too mysterious for a Presbytery to perform? The money must be collected from particular congregations, and I do not see why the demands of a Presbytery should be less respected than the authority of a Board. . . . We are next to consider the number of ministers to be sent forth. Why cannot the Presbyteries count them as well as a Board? And why cannot the Presbyteries support them just as comfortably? The money, after all, must be collected from the various churches under the care of the different Presbyteries, and, for aught I can see, this matter can be attended to just as well by those who have the immediate charge of those churches as by a body five hundred miles off. . . . The reviewer's

proposition was that Presbyteries are inadequate to send the gospel to the heathen; the proof is, that sending the gospel to the heathen includes a great many particulars, and not a solitary reason is given why these particulars, so elaborately detailed, are beyond the capacity of the Presbyteries to manage or conduct. . . The plan insisted on is, that the courts of the Church, the *Presbyteries*, are to do the business now done by the Boards, and to employ these deacons, according to God's appointment, as their financial agents."—Pp. 196-9.

"If the Boards have committees to carry out the details of their plans during the interim of their sessions, what is to prevent the Presbyteries from adopting the same arrangement, and what is to hinder the Presbyteries from meeting just as often as emergencies may require? In Chapter XVIII. of our Form of Government, such a committee in each Presbytery seems to be contemplated; and this, by the way, is an additional proof that our fathers intended to intrust the whole work of missions to the care of the Presbyteries. . . Before closing this article, I wish to present a few additional considerations showing that the Presbyteries ought to take the whole business of missions into their own hands: 1. The first is, that the Constitution of the Church absolutely requires it. . . Now this power is expressly given to the Presbyteries, and to the Presbyteries exclusively; and hence, by necessary inference, the Presbyteries are the missionary agents contemplated by our system, The Synods and General Assembly cannot directly interfere until the Presbyteries have done their work," &c. . . "How undeniably plain, then, that our Constitution never contemplated any other agencies for missions but Presbyteries."—Pp. 203, 204, 212, 213.

These passages have been quoted in wearisome abundance, to show that Dr. Thornwell, not by a chance expression, but again and again, pronounced in favor of the Presbyterian plan; even after Dr. Smyth had said that, in doing so, he condemned Executive Committees as General Assembly agencies, as well as the Boards.

It will be observed that, while Dr. Thornwell does not limit himself to Foreign Missions, he gives that department of Church enterprise special prominence in the discussion. He tells us, page 193, why he does so: "As the work of Foreign Missions is confessedly the most difficult enterprise with which the Church is intrusted, if it can be shown that she is perfectly competent to conduct this department of labor without foreign assistance, extraneous agencies will hardly be demanded for any other part of

her duty." He then proceeds to show, as we have already seen, that the Presbyteries can, and should, directly undertake it.

We shall now examine the reasons presented by the majority as showing that Dr. Thornwell did not really believe in the Presbyterial, but preferred the Executive Committee plan. These are summed up in the writings, acts, and biography of Dr. Thornwell, and the testimony of Drs. Adger and Girardeau. We shall consider them in the order thus given.

First, the *writings* of Dr. Thornwell. There were two entirely distinct discussions of this question, in which Dr. Thornwell took a part. The first was, as it were, private, carried on in the periodicals of the day. In this, Dr. Thornwell had Dr. Smyth as his antagonist. The second was public and official, in the General Assembly at Rochester, in 1860; that is, it began there, and was continued in the *Princeton* and *Southern Presbyterian Reviews*. Here Dr. Hodge was his opponent. The issues in the two discussions were quite different, and it is in *an ignoring of this fact* that all the trouble has occurred. In the first, which was inaugurated by Dr. Thornwell, it was a comparison of the Board and Presbyterial plans of evangelism. The Committee plan is hardly mentioned. In the other, it is the Board and Committee plans that make the issue, and the Presbyterial plan is not even broached.

Now, it is manifest that, in the first discussion, Dr. Thornwell favored the Presbyterial plan. It is equally clear that, in the second, he favored the Committee plan. How is this? we naturally inquire. Did he change his views? This is possible. There is a sense in which it is presumptively true that he did. There is doubtless room for a difference of opinion among intelligent people on this question. If he at first thought the Presbyterial plan the right one, and afterwards saw reason to repudiate it for the Executive Committee idea, then let us honor him for acting upon it. But there is another sense, in which the presumption is against the change of his views. Here we make two points: 1. That there is nothing in the second discussion which is necessarily inconsistent with what he said in the first. This is a very important fact. The meaning is this: he could prefer the Pres-

byterial to the Board plan, and, at the same time, with perfect consistency, prefer the Executive Committee plan to the Boards; or, to state the same truth somewhat differently, he could prefer Executive Committees to Boards, and yet prefer the Presbyterial plan to either. Is not this so? The two discussions are not inconsistent. The same man, with the same views, might have conducted both. If this is so, surely the presumption is against the change.

2. But again, if Dr. Thornwell, in his later days, did really change his judgment on this question, so far as to repudiate his earlier published views, would he not have distinctly said so? Was he not under obligation to say so? The fact that he did not, and that his later utterances are consistent with his earlier, demonstrate that he still maintained the views held in the Smyth discussion. Still, it may be asked, Why did he not bring them forward at Rochester? Why did he not advocate the Presbyterial plan there, if he still held it? A satisfactory answer can be given to this by remembering that Dr. Thornwell claimed to be a practical man. He held it wiser to contend for a possibility than to fight a windmill. He doubtless knew that but few would follow him in advocating so radical a change as from the Boards to the Presbyteries. He might hope, however, for success in urging a substitution of Executive Committees for the Boards; and it would have been a step in the direction of his real preference. A half loaf is better than no bread, is a principle on which we are often compelled to act.

This will properly introduce, and, at the same time, meet, the second argument of the majority—that Dr. Thornwell's last acts prove that he favored the Executive Committee plan. They certainly do prove it. If he had not favored this plan, he would not have moved its adoption at the Augusta Assembly in 1861. But why, and how far, did he favor it? Was it in preference to the Presbyterial plan? or was it simply because he preferred it to the Boards? In the light of what has been already said and seen, it seems clear that he favored this, as knowing that the Presbyterial plan was in advance of this age, and that it was then either the Executive Committee or the Boards.

Moreover, just here a fact showing his adhesion to his former views in one of the issues between the majority and minority, is seen in the act above noticed. In the Constitution of our Committee of Foreign Missions, doubtless through him, it was provided that deacons might be chosen as members of the Executive Committee. This was one of the points for which he contended in the Smyth discussion.

As a further fact, showing that Dr. Thornwell's coöperation with the Executive Committee plan does not necessarily prove that he preferred it, it may be stated that he was from time to time a member of the Boards of the old Church. He coöperated with the Boards while he denounced them. Why might he not, then, have coöperated with Executive Committees, while preferring Presbyterial management?

In this connection, moreover, we should remember that Dr. Thornwell was always ready to submit to the majority. Clear proof of this is seen in the Rochester debate. He there said: "My brother twits me with supporting the Boards while professing to be conscientiously opposed to the principles of their constitution. Would he have us to be factious? Moderator, I never have said to my brethren, to whom I promised submission in the Lord, 'I cannot submit, I will not submit!' I will submit to my brethren, even where I think they are mistaken, if the submission be not sinful."—*Ib.*, p. 233. You see it further in the fact that he withdrew his protest which he had submitted against the perpetuation of the Board system. He was not an uncompromising theorist. This conciliatory spirit explains his acquiescence in the Executive Committee plan. The same reflections will explain what is adduced by Dr. Palmer in his *Biography*.

Now, finally, reference is made to the editorial comments of *Drs. Adger and Girardeau* prefixed to the discussion of the Board question. Let us have this testimony and see its force:

"Touching the employment of deacons in the general service of the Church, the conduct of missions by Presbyteries, and the unscripturalness and unconstitutionality of Boards, Dr. Thornwell was content with urging his views earnestly; but he made it a principle through

life always to submit to his brethren in matters of established and recognised policy. His temper had in it no spice whatever of the seditious or the radical. As to the conduct of missions, while insisting on the competency of the Presbyteries, and preferring their control to that of Boards, he did not object on principle to the Assembly's undertaking the management of that work, provided that its control was *direct* through a mere Executive Committee. No man had more to do than he with the organisation of our present Executive Committees. In fact, his principles regarding Boards have been fully and cordially adopted by our Church."

It is probable that every statement here, as meant by its distinguished authors, is true. What does it aver? 1. That Dr. Thornwell's views concerning Boards have been adopted by our Church. This is manifest, as we have no Boards. 2. That he assisted in the organisation of our Executive Committees. This is manifest, as he moved the resolutions organising them. 3. That he believed in the employment of deacons in the general service of the Church, and preferred the conduct of missions by the Presbyteries; but in these matters submitted to the majority of his brethren.

The conclusion seems to be, that Dr. Thornwell, at one time, strongly favored the Presbyterial as "certainly the plan, and the only plan, contemplated by the framers of our Form of Government," asserting that it was "undeniably plain that our Constitution never contemplated any other agencies for missions but Presbyteries;" and that he either changed his views or was inconsistent, if at any future date, he preferred Executive Committees, except as a concession to the views of his brethren.

Reviewing the whole field, it is manifest that Dr. Thornwell put himself on record as opposed to ministerial Secretaries and Treasurers; as holding the deacon to be the general financial officer of the Church, to be used as such by all the courts, Assembly as well as Session; and as advocating the conduct of missions directly by the Presbyteries. The minority were justified in quoting him as sustaining them in these views.

Whether he and they are right on these questions is a different matter. He was a fallible man; he may have been wrong. Many of his expressions but few will approve, and some of his

arguments the minority would not now present. His position on Foreign Missions is not held by the minority. The propriety of his views is one thing; that he held them is quite another. Many that hold the position of the majority will doubtless agree that Dr. Thornwell did maintain the views of the minority on the points here set forth.

J. A. QUARLES.

ARTICLE V.

A BRIEF REPLY TO DR. WILSON ON OUR HOME MISSIONS.

Our beloved and venerable brother, the Secretary of Foreign Missions, in his article on Home Missions, in the April number of this journal, referred so pointedly to the present writer as to make it necessary for him to rise to a personal explanation. His profound respect and affection for his life-long friend, and his knowledge of the paramount influence wielded by him all over our Church, demands that he make the effort to roll off from himself the weight of the criticism and the censure with which he feels that he is in danger of being crushed. Dr. Wilson says of the present writer: "The charge of combination for mutual protection was preferred against the Secretaries at the last (Staunton) Assembly, and when proof was demanded, it could not be brought forward; but the speaker explained that it was to the *liability* to such abuse of power that he had special reference;" and then came an *argumentum ad hominem* about Seminary Professors, levelled against both the writer and Dr. Dabney.

Now, it is not denied that the present writer did say that "the fellow-feeling natural to these executive agencies, as children of a common mother, results in a combination of influence for each other, and to resist criticism." It was expressly declared, however, that it was not intended to charge "the conscious formation of any corrupt 'ring power.'" The "tendency to combination," it was said, "was uncalculated and unconscious, and, therefore, the more a subject of solicitude." "It was not the fault of the

men; they are good men and true, honorable, and incapable of calculated usurpations; it is the fault of the system. Yes, you have an established system of central agencies, all of which have a common life, and when you touch one of them, all of them feel and resent it."

This was the charge. But, so far from its being correct, as alleged, that "when proof was demanded it could not be brought forward, and the speaker explained that he spoke of a *liability*" merely, the fact is, that he proceeded in this wise to give the proof of what he said: "What is there, in the nature of the case, to make it certain that your Education work, for instance, is arranged in the best possible way? And yet, if it is proposed," (alluding to a well-known case.) "to make any changes therein, your Secretary of Foreign Missions, and every other secretary, will be found quick to come forward in defence of the established system." All this is correctly reported just so by Dr. Dapney, in his review of the Staunton Assembly in this journal for July, 1881, pp. 552-3. Still further, it will be found there that the speaker went on to maintain that it was certainly not well, as a permanent arrangement, to concentrate three out of four of our Executive Committees in one corner of the Church, viz., the Synod of Virginia, and two of them in the one city of Baltimore. And then he added: "Last year, at Charleston, a strong effort was made to separate them; but, to every observant eye, there was a rallying of the forces which effectually prevented it."

It is plain, therefore, that there *accompanied* the allegation proof enough from two well known cases. But when Dr. Wilson replied to the speaker, it is his distinct recollection that, so far from demanding and not receiving proof, he acknowledged the truth of the charge as made against himself by asking the speaker whether he could expect that a father would be indifferent to the prosperity of his own children? He claimed, in part, at least, the paternity of the system of these committees, and said it was quite natural (as of course it is) for him to rush to their defence whenever assailed.

Touching the *argumentum ad hominem* it is manifest that our brother misapprehends what is objected to the power conferred

on our Secretaries. Evidently he conceives it to be insinuated that the Secretaries have not enough "piety and good sense" to prevent them from attempting to "pervert the power intrusted to them to the accomplishment of selfish or ambitious ends." The Professors have (he avers) even greater and more "special advantages for exerting extraordinary powers" than the Secretaries. But against the Professors there are no charges that they abuse their opportunities, and "why should the Secretaries of our benevolent schemes not stand on the same high ground of confidence before the churches?"

Now, he who supposes that power is ever free from the danger of being abused is, of course, ignorant of men and of affairs. And he who imagines that we can intrust the education of our rising ministry to any men who are competent to be their instructors, and no danger of abuse be involved in the committing to them of such a high and sacred trust, is, of course, unlearned in the history of the Church's past. But it has become, after serious misgivings for a long time on the part of wise men, the settled judgment of the Church that in no other way can we educate our ministers so advantageously as in seminaries under theological professors. The writer is not aware that any amongst us hold that there is a single principle violated or endangered by setting apart men to be teachers in our schools of the prophets, albeit great power is thereby intrusted to them. But there are not a few, and some of them good and true and wise men also, who maintain that our system of Secretaryships does violate or endanger some important principles of Presbyterianism. Some of them insist that our Secretaries of Home and Foreign Missions have committed to them the power of governing other ministers which makes them of the nature of *prelates*; while others again maintain that these officers, being ministers, are yet charged with financial duties, which makes them, on the other hand, of the nature of *deacons*. These are certainly very serious charges to bring against our system of Executive Committees and Secretaries of the same, and they are such as nobody pretends to allege against our system of education by theological professors. So that it would be by no

means "easy and natural," as Dr. Wilson alleges it would be, to reason from the one system to the other, and his *argumentum ad hominem* falls to the ground.

Our honored brother closes his article with a rather severe diatribe against controversy. He says we are suffering from overmuch of it. This is not a graceful appendage to the elaborate specimen of controversial writing he has just given us. Moreover, he has all along done perhaps as much controversy *for* as almost any two other men have done *against* this system. How can any one blame him for it? But if he means to cry out against controversy, let him first stop controverting himself. And let him give those who oppose his views credit for equal honesty with himself. His brethren who differ with him should not be twitted with "a natural love for controversy for its own sake." They may be no less sincere than he is. And we would fain hope that in the end good, and only good, will come out of all these discussions.

One thing is certain, we stand in great need of finding out what is the best way of managing the operations of our Church, and if there is any better way to do this than for brethren to compare views with one another, we do not know it. It is not controversy respecting what Dr. Wilson calls "the scaffolding of the superstructure," "our Church order and discipline," our "organisation," our "orthodoxy," our "creed;" it is not discussion about Presbyterial action or Assembly action; it is not debate about "Our Church Policy, whether to be progress or petrification?" or "Our Home Missions, how shall they be conducted?" it is not the amount or degree of attention given to these questions, whether they be of the *scaffolding* only, or of the *superstructure* itself, which will account for the fact that our methods draw forth for all the various objects of our Church less than one dollar on the average for each church member. Because during the year ending April 1st, 1881, which was pre-eminently a year of sharp criticism and earnest discussion amongst us, such as Dr. Wilson intimates must destroy confidence and cripple our agencies, there was actually a considerable though still an inadequate progress. And so it has been this

year now closed. Notwithstanding Dr. Wilson's lamentations over the harm that his controversy-loving brethren have been doing, he and his colleague, Dr. McIlvaine, publish that the past year has made an advance over the preceding one; and in *The Missionary* for April we read from his pen: "It is gratifying to witness the growing interest among our Christian people in the cause of Foreign Missions." We must needs, therefore, discount somewhat from our brother's complaints against free discussion. And so he obliges us to withhold somewhat of full assent to his predictions that the separate and independent management of its own Domestic Missions by each Presbytery "will lead to the entire overthrow of the Domestic Missionary work, and that at no very distant period." And when he tells us so gravely how profoundly he is "impressed with the conviction that if the policy [of Presbyterianial action in Home Missions] he is opposing becomes prevalent, it will lead necessarily to the weakening of all those bonds which now hold our beloved Church together and ultimately, if not restrained by the providence of God, lead to its disintegration," we are disposed to be thankful that great, good, and wise men so often make mistakes.

Here let us refer to another great and good and wise man, the late Judge Thomas Thomson, of Abbeville, South Carolina, who expressed to the writer his "profound conviction" that these Executive Committees run every General Assembly of our Church that is held. He said no observer could fail to notice how we have created a system of powers which completely regulate and govern our Church through her Assembly. Here are half a dozen bodies, he said, officered by our best and ablest men, which always pull together, and draw the Church any way they choose her to go. Now, Judge Thomson was not infallible; but, on the other hand, he had no parental responsibility for this system which blinded his eyes to any dangers that may attend it.

Our respected brother tells us that "from the organisation of the Southern Presbyterian Church he has always contended for coöperation through the General Assembly in carrying on her general schemes of benevolence." And he tells us plainly what he means by *coöperation*. It is that "*all the funds raised in the*

churches for this purpose [Home Missions] should be placed under the control of this Committee for the benefit of the whole Church." He wants all the Presbyteries "to allow all their funds to go into the Central Treasury, and receive back again such a proportion as will place all the poorer Presbyteries, so far as this particular fund is concerned, on the same footing with themselves." This, he contends, is "the broad and solid foundation upon which all Christian coöperation ought to rest, and that the future prosperity, not to say the permanency, of our own branch of the Church depends, under God, upon the steady maintenance of this great principle." If we will send all our Domestic Missionary funds to Baltimore, to be there divided out as the Committee of Sustentation (which had also the whole charge of the Foreign Mission work in its hands) shall consider right and proper, then he confidently predicts that our Church will live and prosper; but if we will not do this, then his "profound conviction is, the entire overthrow of the Domestic Mission work, and that at no very distant day, and the complete disintegration of our beloved Church"!!

Can Dr. Wilson bring himself to conceive of the possibility of ever getting our Presbyteries to agree to any such arrangement as this? Can he get himself seriously to believe that any such arrangement would be *right*? What he means is not, of course, to have these funds all gathered in Baltimore, with no power or authority for their subsequent division in the hands of the Sustentation Committee. What he advocates is no mere mechanical collection of these funds into a central treasury, and then, with no discretion anywhere lodged, their dispersion according to fixed, invariable law. The funds are to be "placed *under the control of the Committee* for the benefit of the whole Church." The Sustentation Committee is to divide out these funds according to its discretion. Does Dr. Wilson soberly consider that this would be wise, or that it would be *right*? If he does, then, indeed, we are ready to join with him in saying, Let us have an end of discussion; it can do no good; we are hopelessly divided in judgment.

We have just read what a zealous and earnest writer in one of

our Presbyterian weeklies says of Dr. Wilson's programme. He holds that this plan is "what Sustentation should have been from the first, or should have had in view as its aim or end from the beginning." This (he says) is "a true sustentation; he has the true idea if he had the power to carry it to its full and legitimate end." He insists that we "must leave our narrow and contracted plan, and adopt the broad working basis the Secretary lays down, and so reach out to a full coöperation." He understands Dr. Wilson to aim at this: "That there should be a fixed *minimum* salary for every minister that is preaching the gospel, no matter what his charge may be, rich or poor; and upward from that *minimum* there should be a constant effort to rise year by year. Let the fixed salary for the first year be, say, \$600, keeping ever in view the lifting this up to a higher figure, \$700, \$800, to \$1,000, or above, if it can be reached. How is this to be done? By a capita tax on our whole Church sufficient to pay every preaching minister, from the \$5,000 salary downward; let each have his \$600 drawn from the general fund, and then let his congregation supplement up to the full amount of salary they see fit. The main work will fall on the Presbyteries—seeing their churches supplied; collecting the funds and forwarding them to the Executive Committee; enforcing the tax or cutting off the supply. Let no church receive the benefit that does not meet the demand, and in this let the Presbytery exert its Presbyterial authority, and there will be fewer churches with 'V.' opposite to their names in the Assembly's Minutes, and fewer ministers with 'W. C.' By this plan the Church will be more securely bound together in one ligature, the rich and poor together all receiving alike out of the common fund. The Secretary has sounded the key note of an alarm which must have been reaching every minister: 'The tendency of the times in which we live, so far as religious matters are concerned, is not so much to centralisation or Prelacy as to Independency. Church authority as such is at a discount.' . . . The great remedy for this, if it could be done, is to put every minister's full salary into the Sustentation Fund, and after the *minimum* has been paid out, *pro rata* the remainder according as the churches have paid in."

Such is the interpretation an intelligent man puts on Dr. Wilson's plan. And if Dr. Wilson says this is not his idea, we say, it might, as well as not, be his idea. For, if coöperation be essential to our Church's unity, and if all our Presbyteries should have but one fund for Domestic Missions, as for Foreign Missions, then why might it not be well for all our churches to have one fund out of which to pay their pastors, and let the Sustentation Committee at Baltimore disburse it all? If "the great principle of unity and brotherhood" demands coöperation in *missions*, why not in *pastorates*? Certainly this was the idea which Dr. Hodge urged on the General Assembly in 1847. He placed the obligation for the minister's support, not on the individual congregation which the minister serves, but upon the Church as one, and the Church as a whole. He wanted the *Board of Missions* to give an adequate support to every minister in its service devoted to his work. Dr. Thornwell, reviewing this discourse, said: "The settled principle of our Church seems to be directly the reverse of that for which Dr. Hodge has contended in his sermon. The change contemplated is radical. . . . When the edition of Chalmers' *Economics* by the Board of Publication made its appearance, we read the preface with regret. . . . Our conviction was, and is, that anything analogous to the Sustentation Committee there contemplated is fraught with danger. . . . We submit to our brethren in candor, whether it is not as much the duty of the Church as one and the Church as a whole to select and appoint ministers, as it is to support them—whether the right of election and the right of patron are not inseparable; and if the people delegate one to a central committee, we would further inquire how long they are likely to retain the other?" (Collected Writings, IV., 485-6.)

But why quote from Dr. Thornwell, when it is so easy to say, with Dr. Wilson, that had he edited his own works, he "would no doubt have made important changes and modifications"—would doubtless have approved of all our churches sending all their Domestic Mission funds to the Committee at Baltimore, and possibly might have approved of having the Church as one supporting all her pastors? Because Dr. Wilson asserts that Dr.

Thornwell assisted in forming the present Constitutions of our Committees,¹ and "approved of the structure of our present schemes," and Dr. Wilson insists that the only "solid foundation on which all Christian coöperation ought to rest" is a "provision for the whole Church to rise and stand together, as one compact, united body." This being *no doubt* what Dr. Thornwell, if now alive, would hold, it would, with *just as little doubt*, be his doctrine that Presbyteries ought to coöperate through the Sustentation Committee in their Home Missions, and churches, through the same Committee, in their pastorates; for is not this the "broad and solid foundation on which all Christian coöperation ought to rest," and does not the permanency and the very life of our Church "depend on the steady maintenance of this great principle"?

JOHN B. ADGER.

ARTICLE VI.²

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1882.

The Assembly and the whole Church are to be congratulated that the complications growing out of the development of small-pox in Atlanta were not allowed to interfere with the attendance of the Commissioners nor with the business of the body. The facts were about as follows: Some weeks before the time appointed for the meeting of the General Assembly this loathsome disease appeared in the city. It was confined chiefly to the colored population, large numbers of whom steadfastly declined vaccination. But this population furnishes domestic servants to such families as were most likely to entertain our brethren,

¹Our Sustentation Committee was not in being during Dr. T.'s lifetime.

²This interesting and able review of the late General Assembly, prepared at our request, may fail on several points to meet the views of many of our readers. No man could expect on some of these topics to satisfy all. Ours to a large extent is, and has ever been, and must always be, a free journal, open to writers of different opinions.—EDITORS OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

and experience had proved that colored domestics could not be hindered from exposing themselves to infection whenever an acquaintance had the disease. And just at the close of the week preceding the meeting developments occurred which justified the the fear that a number of those who had been exposed to infection would, in all probability, show the disease while the meeting was in progress; and as many of the expected guests came from localities where no disease was reported, it was feared that they might be unprotected. Duty to them, therefore, seemed to require that notification be published by telegraph of the real condition in Atlanta, so that every man might govern himself accordingly. Only one instance is known in which a member of the Assembly was disturbed by the development of small-pox in the family to which he had been assigned; and, in order to escape the long confinement of quarantine, he promptly, and wisely, withdrew from Atlanta. The negroes had at last been persuaded to put aside their folly and submit to vaccination, and so the disease was checked.

As it was, the prompt hospitality of the church at Columbus, Ga., placed everybody under obligations to them. The tantalizing uncertainty as to the rendezvous caused some confusion and extra expense. But, so far as known, only one brother (and he from "the far West") actually erred so far as to take up his quarters in the wrong city. After enjoying his bath, his dinner, and his "nap," however, he discovered his mistake, and boarded the first train, reaching Atlanta in ample time to be placed by hearty and unanimous choice in the Moderator's chair!

A large congregation assembled at 11 o'clock a. m. to hear the opening sermon by Dr. Farris. The theme was: "*The Resurrection of Jesus a conclusive demonstration of the truth of Christianity.*" First of all, the boast of infidelity was met by an imposing array of statistics, which showed the steady, uninterrupted march of the gospel toward its predestined triumph. And then the reasons were adduced with point and fulness for the claim that the resurrection of Jesus is the best attested fact in all history. The discourse extended through an hour and a quarter, but it was not too long for the subject and the occasion.

And this opportunity is improved to emphasise the hope, which was generally expressed by his hearers, that Dr. Farris will give us his able and timely discussion in a permanent form.

The Assembly being constituted, the name of Dr. R. K. Smoot was proposed for Moderator, and there being no other nomination, he was unanimously chosen by acclamation; the Rev. Frank Mitchell, of Missouri, being made Reading Clerk in the same way.

The docket soon showed that a great volume of business, some of it of especial difficulty and importance, was to be acted upon; such, for example, as Overtures, more than thirty in number and covering all sorts of questions; three judicial cases; new adjustments in the working of our Executive Committees, and the ever-recurring problem of "Fraternal Relations." It is matter for devout gratitude that such weighty questions were discussed, some of them at great length and with intense earnestness, and yet there was scarcely a word spoken the recollection of which should give pain to the speaker or the hearer. The decisions reached will not, of course, give equal satisfaction to all parties. Some points, it is plain, are to be debated elsewhere. But in the end, the mind of the Church will rest, for the most part, in the decisions of the Assembly.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The twenty-first Report was presented by the venerable Dr. Wilson, of whom it was testified by a brother, who knew whereof he affirmed, that among missionaries in China it is very generally conceded that he is "the best Secretary in Christendom." The Report acknowledges with devout gratitude a growing interest in the work among the pastors and the people, so much so that its claims are generally recognised by all. The gospel is now preached by our representatives in many tongues; 500 children are under tuition; 1,500 hopeful converts have been gathered into the churches; an increase over the past year is reported of \$10,000; the treasury proper is freed from debt, though the claim of Mr. Morton for about \$10,000 continues to be pressed against the mission property at Campinas; our corps

of native laborers now musters fifty strong; a native Presbytery has been organised in Greece. And yet our overtaxed brethren are in some instances compelled to live in unhealthful houses, because the money cannot be had for better. For this purpose at least \$15,000 is needed immediately.

Along with the Report, Dr. Wilson submitted, on his own responsibility, a memorial touching the power of evangelists laboring as foreign missionaries, which was received and referred to a special Committee, their report to be matured *ad interim* and presented to the next Assembly.

HOME MISSIONS.

Dr. McIlwaine's Report shows that tenacious grasp upon the multifarious details of this vast scheme which he may have inherited from ancestors devoted to mercantile life. Mention is made of the twofold calamity, drought and floods, which have disabled many congregations, rendering our beneficiaries more numerous and our helpers fewer. Notwithstanding, all the Committee's pledges have been redeemed, and the treasury is out of debt.

Sustentation reports an increase of contributions aggregating more than \$3,000; ministers are better supported, ninety-two *per centum* of those wholly engaged in ministerial work receiving what may, in some sense, be termed "adequate maintenance;" *manse*s are being provided; 205 are already in use, of which 30 were obtained during the last twelve months. But along with these encouraging features, the Secretary mentions the fact that 133 ministers, many of them able preachers and consecrated men, are compelled, because of inadequate support; to resort wholly or in part, to other employment; 320 congregations are entirely vacant; 110 require help in order to build houses for public worship. Such, in brief, are the facts upon which the call is based for \$50,000, whereas \$150,000 might be profitably employed.

The Evangelistic department shows signs of healthful growth. The past year's income was \$11,628, giving help to 55 evangelists—19 more than at any former period. All doubts as to

finding suitable men for the work have been solved, and God has blessed the means to the salvation of souls. The most noteworthy developments have taken place in Western Texas and in the Synod of Kentucky, where noble things have been devised by individuals of our communion. It is risking nothing to say that if these examples are generally followed, the time is near at hand when the expansive energies of Presbyterianism shall be better known, and (what is yet more to be desired) the dark corners of our land shall be fully illuminated by the Sun of Righteousness.

The evangelistic work among the colored people does not move forward as it should. But testimony is at hand to show that wherever it has been tried, the results have been good.

But one of the most comforting paragraphs in the Report is that which is devoted to the Invalid Fund. The congregational collections are not pushed by the pastors and Sessions as they might be, this deficiency having been made up by individual liberality. Among these the noble bequest by Dr. Stuart Robinson, of course, is preëminent. He devised the sum of \$25,000 to the Trustees of our Assembly, the income of which is to be applied *in perpetuum* to aiding infirm ministers and the families of such as have died. The condition of this bequest was that an effort to raise \$75,000 additional be set on foot by the General Assembly—a work which Dr. Robinson had reserved as the last work of his life—a labor of love for Christ and his afflicted saints. And, then, a letter from Bennett H. Young, Esq., was read, tendering, on behalf of Dr. Robinson's heirs, the bequest unencumbered by the condition. Surely God will raise up some good wise man who will take up the scheme of an endowment of \$100,000. It can be raised—so raised, too, as not to interfere with any other work.

The matter which gave most anxiety to the Assembly, though it was not debated on the floor, was the separation of the two Committees. Reasons for this separation had been urged on former occasions; and, indeed, the Assembly at St. Louis had ordered it to be done. But to the surprise and grief of many in that Assembly, the action was reconsidered at the very end of

the sessions, and under a pressure that, as we ventured then to say, ought never to have been applied, the action was reversed. These reasons were adduced in the committee rooms at the last Assembly, and being reinforced by others which need not be rehearsed now, the two standing Committees concurred in recommending a separation, which was made, *nem. con.* The action was timely. The business is too great for any man. Here place is found for the Lord's saying, "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will hold to the one and despise the other." If only the separation be completed, according to the original plan, by sending Home Missions to Nashville, to Louisville, to St. Louis, or to New Orleans, an objection will be forever removed that has long lain in the minds of many among us, namely, that there has been an undue aggregation of Committees in the northeastern corner of our territory.

EDUCATION.

The Report on Education presented by the Rev. E. M. Richardson showed a gratifying condition in these respects: all appropriations to candidates, the maximum fixed by the Assembly being \$125, have been met, and \$1,000 in addition has been distributed to cases which seemed specially urgent; the treasury is out of debt, and a surplus is, for the first time in many years, on hand.

But what has long troubled thoughtful minds among us is the small number of young men who are seeking the ministry. The Secretary says that anxious scrutiny of the proceedings of our Presbyteries enables him to report that about seventy-five candidates have offered themselves. Of these twenty-five are studying at Union Seminary, Va., five in other Seminaries, and the remainder in colleges and academics. These are not sufficient, as all will see, to replace the annual losses occasioned by death, old age, and other causes. So that in this vital matter our Church is certainly declining. So far from reaching out vigorously to supply the destitutions at home and abroad, she is relaxing her hold upon what she now has. The cry spontaneously

rises to one's lips, "Help, Lord, for the godly man ceaseth; the faithful fail from the children of men!" Now, if ever, must the Church pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth more laborers. The Assembly has commended the solemn subject to the consideration of such as pray for the peace of Jerusalem. True enough, this has been done again and again. And yet no other course is left to Assemblies than to reiterate the exhortation until God shall hear.

The subject was earnestly debated in the Assembly, and among other things, these two causes were suggested as explaining, at least in part, the saddening deficiency: 1. Worldliness in the Church, and especially among parents, moving them to prefer lucrative employments for their sons. Hannahs are no longer bringing their little Samuels to God in prayer. And in the face of such worldliness, it is not to be wondered at that our youth are no longer like Moses, who "esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt." 2. The Church has been negligent of her trust in failing to provide sufficient help for such of her young men as have offered themselves for the work, either before they have been ordained or after it. These are grave and serious matters, which deserve to be carefully considered by the people of God. If our glorified Lord sees us to be careless concerning his "ascension gifts" (Eph. iv. 11), he may take occasion to remind us of it by withdrawing the gifts until such time as experience shall reveal to us the greatness of our sin.

An additional suggestion occurs which we do not remember to have heard in the discussion—the carelessness of Presbyteries in the oversight of their candidates is unquestionably giving rise to scandal and alienating the confidence of men and their gifts from this branch of our work. The writer speaks according to observation, and *knows* whereof he affirms. As a pastor in three widely separated congregations, one of them closely connected with a Theological Seminary, and another with the Executive Committee of Education, he has found the evil present in the minds of men at these points. It merits prayerful attention at the hands of presbyters. A thoughtful pen has recently discussed

this topic in the *Presbyterian Review* (Northern.) Attention is invited to an important change in the relations of candidates to their Presbyteries which has been silently produced by the Theological Seminaries. Formerly the candidate, at least during his theological course, was placed by Presbytery under the special charge of some one or more of its ministers. His life and his studies were thus brought into the closest relations with the body. But this order has passed away, and nothing is being done to compensate for the loss of some of its benefits. The inexperienced and comparatively unknown youth, either before or after his collegiate studies, goes entirely out of the Presbytery, sometimes 500 or 1,000 miles away. He is, indeed, in a certain sense under the care of the Theological Faculty, but their power and responsibilities to God, and, under him, to the Church, are not sufficiently defined. Of all temptations few are more subtle and dangerous than a *divided* responsibility. It works evil in this matter to our certain knowledge. "But," we are told, "the Presbyteries are so jealous of their power. They will not allow you to interfere with their candidates." So much the worse, we reply, for the Presbyteries, for the cause of Christ, and for the inexperienced youth, if, indeed, he is ever to assume the awful responsibilities of a gospel minister. All, however, that we would propose is that some more clearly defined mode of communication be established between the Presbyteries and our Seminaries. Let the Faculty be freely used as the eyes and ears of Presbytery, and when occasion requires, as its voice also to counsel and rebuke. The evil is patent, and a remedy greatly needed. Instances are known of good and true men being set against Beneficiary. Education by the abuses of the system.

PUBLICATION.

It would be impossible to say whether the Assembly was more pleased at the disclosures of Dr. Hazen's Report, or perplexed at the plans of future work to which it gave rise.

It was a source of unalloyed satisfaction to learn that the great debt growing out of the disasters of 1877—\$60,000 in all, principal and interest—had been paid in full. Our excellent Secre-

tary, as modest and kindly in counsel as he is capable in action, has deserved well of the Church. And the Executive Committee is watching the business with intelligence and fidelity. We are assured fully that such a disaster as that of 1877 cannot again occur, under our present Secretary, nor while the present Committee holds the reins. But Publication is not an easy business. No one of the religious publishing concerns seems to be giving satisfaction. The Methodists have had trouble with theirs, incurring thereby very great losses. Our brethren of the Northern Assembly have just been going through the usual amount, they say, of grumbling and complaint about theirs. It is a comfort to have Dr. Hazen's assurances that he will in no case advise the Church or its agents to become responsible for the cost of issuing a book. The writer or his friends must furnish the money for press-work, stereotyping, &c. The Church will then aid in its distribution, if she judges it beneficial to her people. This is all that she should ever do for a new book. The hazards are too great for her to do more.

A corporation—and of all corporations a Church—is liable to peculiar risks, if she becomes a publisher for her corporators. The rules of business are made to bend to friendship and importunity. Having a fine opportunity to speak on this subject with Mr. P., of Philadelphia, the head of the largest book jobbing house in America, and, as it is said, in the world, the writer heard him say: “It is my confident opinion that Churches cannot safely become responsible for the cost of unpublished books. They should all follow our plan, which is to let the book get into print as best it can; then if it proves worthy, use it for your purposes. We have our skilled labor to observe the world's market, and when we discover what we need, we watch it until the publisher has about made out of it what he can. We then come in with our offer in cash. Our stock costs us about fifty per cent. of what religious concerns pay for theirs.” Paying one's money out for an untried book is always a doubtful experiment. Dr. Hazen is moving on the right course when he contracts for Dr. Robinson's Hymnals. Ours has proven a sad failure. It takes something like genius to succeed at such work; and genius cannot be had on demand.

The Sabbath School Publications, issued on contract with Messrs. Whittet and Shepperson, are growing wonderfully in favor with the people, and consequently in profit to the cause. Already the "royalty" on them is yielding \$1,800 toward the Secretary's salary; and ere long, the whole amount being paid in this way, all the funds given by the churches can be used for disseminating good books and our Sunday School literature among the destitute congregations.

But a perplexing question came up in connexion with the Assembly's contract with the Presbyterian Company. Complaints came in from various parts of the Church, and formal overtures, requesting that the Executive Committee engage directly in the work of distribution. In order to do this we *must* have in cash at least \$16,000 to cancel the contract and enter upon the business hopefully. The Executive Committee, so we heard on the floor, did not choose to suggest a plan. But the Standing Committee, through its Chairman, Dr. Smith, of Dallas, indicated three possible modes of obtaining the money—by a special application to churches and to individuals; by waiting until the annual collections should accumulate, say three or four years; by issuing bonds based upon the Publishing House, which, after paying off the lien of \$31,000 so long hanging over that property, would leave a surplus of \$9,000, which, added to the collection of 1883, would furnish the \$16,000 needed. By floating \$40,000 at four per cent., it was urged, we shall actually be saving \$260 per annum in the interest now paid; we shall not be incurring a new debt, but putting an old one in better shape; and we shall have not only the \$9,000 of surplus for capital, but also the enhanced value of our Publishing House, which will, it is believed, be worth the \$45,000 paid for it. These arguments, backed by the approval of men of business who entered heartily into the discussion, and enforced by the opinion of Dr. Hazen, prevailed over the repugnance of most to having bonds, and of some to retaining that house, which has been a costly and annoying experiment from the beginning. The vote was hearty, and along with his other cares the Secretary will have laid on him the work of placing the bonds. If any man can do it, he can. Should the Executive

Committee, after full consideration, adopt the plan, (the discretion being wisely left to them,) Dr. Hazen will no doubt get the money and go forward. He deserves and has the confidence and esteem of all who know him; and if his life is spared ten years, he will pay off the debt too.

THE JUDICIAL CASES.

It was a happy thought that two of the three cases were referred under the law to a Commission of twenty-seven. They were both brought at the instance of Mr. W. S. Turner, a member of the Central Church, Atlanta, who appeared in a similar manner before the Assembly in Staunton. The first of these cases originated judicially in a complaint taken before Presbytery by Mr. T. because the Session had declined to prosecute its Clerk for allowing one of the witnesses in a former case, (the one above mentioned,) to revise the record of his own testimony and correct a clerical blunder made by the assistant clerk. The *manner* of doing this (though precise rules are not given in the law) might by inference be termed an irregularity. But a corrupt motive was entirely out of the question, and the circumstances required prompt action. Session declined to prosecute, and cited Rules of Dis., Ch. V., parag. 8th, to show discretion vested in them. The Presbytery sustained the Session, as also the Synod. And the Commission unanimously sustained the lower courts, but noted the irregularity of the mode of correcting the mistake.

The second case was an appeal from the sentence of Session excommunicating Mr. Turner for alleged offences of the gravest nature. Appeal was taken to Presbytery, and after hearing the case the Session was unanimously sustained, nineteen votes being cast. But when appeal was brought before Synod, the court, upon motion, threw the case out on the ground that appellant had not furnished a sufficient reason, as required by law, for taking his appeal to Synod.

Dissatisfaction was expressed in the Commission at the state of the record. For, *first*, Synod had neglected to state formally its reasons in an explanatory minute; and, *secondly*, an extract

had not been made of what Synod really did *in re*, so as to be attached in proper form, but the Commission were furnished with the printed minutes, the references to this case being marked on the margins of the pages. The appellant had claimed that he was not *de jure* liable to the discipline of said church because he had asked a letter of dismissal to the M. E. Church, South, to which he claimed to be entitled, but it was denied him by Session on the ground that he was under sentence of admonition. The Assembly at Staunton had indeed decided (unwisely, as we think,) that in all cases admonition is *transient*, and expires when delivered; that Mr. T. was therefore at the time in regular standing, and entitled to a letter to any church within our denomination; but that, having asked it to another denomination, the matter was not regulated by law at all, but was a courtesy only. The obvious reply to this was that even if he had *obtained* his letter, yet until he had presented it and been enrolled elsewhere, he was a member of the Central church and subject to its discipline. This principle decided the famous case of the "seven elders" in the First church, Louisville. They had letters which they declined to present, returning them to said church, and claiming the privileges of members and officers. The Assembly held that they were such. But this question, it is said, gave rise to much debate in the Judicial Committee of the Assembly, by some of whom the case was strangely pronounced to be exceedingly complicated. The question of jurisdiction, however, gave no trouble in the Commission; and after grumbling for a while over the fragmentary state of the Synod's records, they came at last to consider very earnestly whether Synod had acted within the law in declining to entertain the appeal. To ascertain this the appeal before Synod was compared with the requirements of the law, (Rules of Dis., Ch. XIII., Sec. III., Par. III.,) and the Commission decided that the appeal was sufficiently definite to warrant a hearing of the case on its own merits by the Synod. The action of Synod was, therefore, reversed, and the record sent back for a trial on its merits, the vote being: to sustain, 24; not to sustain, 1.

THE PARK CASE.

This *cause célèbre* was to determine the status of a colored minister, ordained by the Presbytery of Memphis, as was alleged and admitted by both parties, under the plan proposed by the Assembly in 1869, looking to the organisation of a separate African Presbyterian Church. This man, San Park, it was alleged, though under the friendly care of said Presbytery was not *de jure* a full member of the same; that he had not in fact ever offered to vote on questions of discipline, nor was he fitted for it; that during an exciting discussion concerning the reception by Presbytery of a white minister who was suspected of unsoundness, Park was called on by members to vote; but the Clerk declining to call his name, as he said, because he had never voted and was not entitled to vote (indeed, he had no desire whatever to do so), the Moderator deciding that Park could vote, appeal was taken to the Presbytery, and decision given that he could not. From this complaint was made to the Synod, which, after earnest discussion, decided (48 to 12) to sustain the complaint. From this decision complaint was made to the Assembly.

The discussion was protracted and able. On the one hand, it was contended that Park, being ordained under the action of the Assembly in 1869 looking to a separate African Church, had no authority conferred on him to rule in the white churches; he was to administer sacraments and discipline in the churches of colored people to whom he was sent as an evangelist; that, unforeseen providences having hindered the formation of the African Presbytery, these Presbyterial powers were, in his case, held in abeyance awaiting the opportunity for their employment; that such was Park's understanding at the time of his ordination and since, and such was the mind of the Presbytery. On the other hand, it was urged that ordination is a matter to be regulated by the Constitution, and under it there is but one kind known; that if the Assembly in 1869 meant to suggest a different sort of ordination, it went beyond its legal power, and its action is *ipso facto* null and void; that Park being in point of fact ordained, and in the usual way, the Constitution must decide what powers were conferred by the ordination, Assemblies, Presbyteries, etc., to the

contrary notwithstanding; that the records of the Presbytery show Park to have performed various and sundry acts pertaining to membership—*e. g.*, his name was called, excuses rendered, was counted to make a quorum and to entitle Presbytery to double representation in the Assembly. On the one hand, it was argued that in deciding that Park was a full member of Presbytery, this court would be making a “collateral attack” upon the action taken by the same court in 1869, which would be inadmissible. On the other hand, it was argued that Park being ordained somehow, it is incompetent to bring a “collateral attack” upon the validity and fulness of that ordination. If this be done at all, the Presbytery must be cited for departure from the law in ordaining a man to the ministry who fell, as to qualifications, neither in the usual line, nor yet under the exceptional cases provided for. The effect might be to show that *de jure* Park is not a minister at all, but not that he is one of a peculiar sort—that is, one of limited powers.

When the vote was counted, it stood thus: to sustain the complaint, 42; not to sustain, 81. And thus Park was declared to be a member of Presbytery, and entitled to all privileges pertaining to the same. Subsequently, the following minute was reported by a Committee, of which Dr. Farris was Chairman:

Whereas, perfect ministerial parity is an essential and fundamental principle of the Presbyterian polity; and

Whereas, it is in evidence that Rev. Sam Park was duly ordained in the Presbytery of Memphis, according to the provisions of our Constitution; and

Whereas, said Presbytery did at several times, by their formal act, recognise him as a duly ordained minister under their care; therefore,

It is the judgment of this court that Rev. Sam Park is in full ministerial connexion with said Presbytery, and consequently entitled to vote, and that this court do not sustain the complaint of said Presbytery.

We take occasion to declare our full persuasion that the Presbytery of Memphis, in denying to Rev. Sam Park the exercise of his right as a presbyter, were not at all influenced by race prejudice, but simply desired to carry out strictly the recommendations of the General Assembly of 1869.

Adopted.

Thus ended the "Park Case." It was throughout considered and decided as a question of *law*. It was well known that the party whose name it bears had never desired the test to be made. He had not proposed to vote on the occasion referred to, nor upon any other. A simple-minded man, of very limited information, he has been content to be a *protégé*, as it were, of Presbytery, and as such to be aided by the counsels and the money of the white people in carrying on, as best he can, his labors among the blacks. The question of his vote was raised—unwisely, as it seems, and at a time of great excitement,—by brethren of the other race, by them discussed, and by them decided, he being quiet all the while. The two chief factors in this decision were: 1. That, on the supposition that Presbytery had acted fully upon the plan proposed by the Assembly in 1869, nevertheless that Assembly had no power to make new terms of ordination, that being a matter regulated by the Constitution, which can only be amended in the prescribed way. Consequently, Park being ordained, as Presbytery said he was, he is a presbyter. The additional words, to the effect that he was to be an evangelist to his own race exclusively, count for nothing, because they are extra-constitutional. If ordained at all, he is fully so, simply so, the Assembly of 1869 to the contrary notwithstanding. And if the contention be that Park did not possess the qualifications, whether regular or exceptional, as provided for in the Constitution, then Presbytery must be called before Synod for transgressing the bounds of that discretion which is expressly given to it by law, and the action must be declared null and void, after due inquiry. 2. But it was also conceded that Presbytery had not acted in accord with the plan commended by the Assembly of 1869, and consequently with the theory of this complaint. The record revealed such facts as have been set forth above—his name called and excuses rendered as with regular members; counted to make a quorum and to give double representation in the Assembly; name placed upon a committee, etc. The privilege of voting he seems never to have claimed, openly at least. The first of these positions is far the more important, and, to the writer's mind, no

answer can be framed. The second, though less important, had its weight with many.

But the anxious inquiry raised by the discussion in the Assembly was, What effect is this decision to have upon our prospects of doing good among the colored people? Had the Assembly decided that Park was not a presbyter in the eyes of the law, that decision was sure to be used as a means of agitation among the churches and candidates who remain under the care of our Presbyteries. The slender films of attachment between the races are liable to be snapped by busybodies of either color who thrive upon these jealousies. On the other hand, what is to be the effect of this decision upon the interest felt by the white people in our work—in the Tuscaloosa Institute, for example? Doubtless some among us will be tempted to withhold their gifts. But it is to be hoped that further consideration will relieve their minds. None of the speakers denied that a separate African Church is a necessity. The instincts of both races require it. The colored race feels it, as was said without contradiction over and over again during the debate, even more than we do. Theorists who live far away from us may utter all the nonsense which empty minds can find. But the facts remain. The only question is, How shall we best promote that end without disregarding the fundamental law? To this two replies have been made. Introduce an amendment, say some, to enable the Assembly to carry out some such plan as that proposed in 1869. But this is very questionable; and a better plan, it seems to the writer, would be to *license* suitable candidates, retaining them in that condition until the Synod can, according to the Constitution, set them apart as a Presbytery so soon as they shall have been ordained. This is all regular and valid. True, the emissaries, black and white, of other and kindred Churches, will be almost sure to inveigle all such even then. Let them do it, if they will. Let us only do the best we can, and like Paul we may say that though some preach Christ of envy and strife, nevertheless Christ is preached, and we will glory therein.

"FRATERNAL RELATIONS."

This vexed and vexing subject was brought up by overtures from four of our Presbyteries. The overtures were referred, as usual, to the Assembly's Standing Committee on Correspondence, Dr. Wm. Brown being Chairman. But on the second day, just after devotional exercises, Dr. Pitzer sprang the question in a new shape by introducing the following:

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to bear our cordial Christian greetings to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church now in session at Springfield, Ill., and to express our willingness to co-operate as far as practicable with that body in the work of Home and Foreign Evangelisation.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wiggins, of Texas. But on motion of Dr. Farris, the resolution was also referred to the Committee; and the motion of Mr. Morton, to make this subject the order of the day for 12 o'clock on Saturday, was lost. However, the matter was again brought up on Saturday upon receipt of a telegram bearing the Christian salutations of the Assembly at Springfield; Mr. Morton moving to postpone a reply until our Committee had reported, but upon learning that no report was likely to be made that day, the motion was withdrawn and the usual response sent by telegram. On Monday, (the fourth session of the Assembly,) Dr. Brown, of Virginia, in behalf of the Committee on Correspondence, submitted the following report, which had been approved by all the Committee save the Rev. D. O. Byers, who dissented:

"The Committee on Foreign Correspondence report to the General Assembly that five overtures have been placed in their hands, viz., from the Presbyteries of Abingdon, Atlanta, Holston, South Alabama, and Maryland. Also a resolution offered by Rev. A. W. Pitzer, D. D. The object of all these overtures, with some slight difference in their forms of expression, is the same. They desire and respectfully request this General Assembly to establish fully and formally what are called 'Fraternal Relations' with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, by sending forthwith a delegate or delegates to that body, now in session at Springfield, Ill. The resolution referred to proposes, also, that such delegation shall convey an expression of 'our willingness to co-operate with that body, as far as practicable, in the work of Home and Foreign Evangelisation.'

“After the most careful consideration your Committee have been able to give to the weighty matters involved, they recommend to the Assembly the adoption of the following paper :

“While the General Assembly might restrict its answer to these overtures and the resolution, by a general reference to the action of former Assemblies on the same subject, it may be proper to state it somewhat fully, not only out of regard to the sources from which these papers emanate, but as useful to a right understanding of the matter in hand. It is our deliberate judgment that to accede to the requests aforesaid would not be a measure suitable in itself, nor would it minister to the edification of our Church; and this judgment is sustained by the following reasons :

“1. Because it would be inconsistent with the position taken by our Church—a position thoroughly considered and thoroughly established.

“In 1874 a committee was appointed by our Assembly at the request of the Northern Assembly, to confer fully with a committee of that body ‘concerning the removal of those causes which have heretofore prevented fraternal relations between the two Churches.’ When these two committees met in Baltimore in January, 1875, and the committee of the Northern Assembly was requested to state what measure they proposed for healing our division, they answered: ‘We now propose that your committee join with us in recommending to our respective General Assemblies the interchange of delegates, thus recognising each other as corresponding bodies.’

“This our committee refused to do, and it was precisely upon this point and principle involved in it that the whole design of conference failed to agree. In accordance with the language used by our General Assembly as late as last year, ‘It never has been with our Church a question whether we should not, in some form, acknowledge a Christian brotherhood with the Northern Presbyterians. More catholic and Christian sentiments towards all evangelical Churches, more especially those of the Presbyterian order, are nowhere to be found than in our Minutes of 1861 and 1865. But the question simply is as to the form and extent of the acknowledgment. This statement is established by well known facts :

“1. At the close of the war, when brethren of the Northern Church were present in our Synods and Presbyteries, they were invited to sit as corresponding members.

“2. As soon as a Christian salutation was sent by their Assembly, it was unanimously reciprocated. But.

“3. In 1870, and subsequently, we declined a proposal for an interchange of delegates, which would recognise each other as corresponding bodies, on the distinct ground that this has always been regarded as the most manifest and visible consummation, and the most complete evi-

dence, of such relations. Like the sending of ambassadors between nations, this interchange of delegates carries with it the fullest significance of fellowship, and we declined it unless our grievances should first be removed.

“ This proposition has been confirmed by the action of the Assemblies of 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, and 1881. To accede, then, to the requests now presented would be nothing less than a surrender of this position. Having been most carefully taken, and its rightfulness reaffirmed so deliberately and repeatedly, it should not be yielded now except under most controlling considerations.

“ And this introduces a second reason for not granting the requests here referred to, viz. :

“ 2. Because the position aforesaid was right and proper. If it was wrong, no considerations of consistency are worthy of regard for a moment. The only upright way of dealing with acknowledged wrong is to confess it, and as far as possible to repair it. But as to the righteousness of our position, we may safely refer—

“ (1.) To the fact that we have never, in a single instance, assumed an aggressive attitude towards the Northern Presbyterian Church, but, on the contrary, have explicitly declared that ‘ no grievances experienced by us, however real, would justify us in the acts of aggression or a spirit of malice against any branch of Christ's visible kingdom.’

“ (2.) To the fact that no instance is known to us in modern times in which one part of the denomination of Christians has heaped upon another such extreme and odious accusations, ‘ extending, as they do, to heresy and blasphemy.’

“ (3.) To the fact that any retraction, even the least, has not only remained unoffered, but has been repeatedly refused.

“ The lapse of time changes many things, but can make no change whatever in such a record of aspersions. If true, we are not worthy of their confidence and respect. If untrue, Christian honor, manliness, and truth require them to be withdrawn. So long as they remain upon record they are a perpetual offence, and an impassable barrier to the kind and degree of official intercourse referred to in the papers aforesaid.

“ 3. A third reason for not acceding to this request is because it would inflict a grievous wound upon the bosom of our Church. Even supposing it could be agreed to hold in abeyance the considerations already presented—to waive the whole question of consistency and of right—there is, to say the least, a great multitude in our communion, and among our very best people, who would feel deeply aggrieved by the step proposed. They have intensely sympathised with our beloved Church in all her sorrows and trials, and when our General Assembly has through all these trying times vindicated her Christian honor against

the aspersions of her assailants, they have rejoiced to recognise in it the protection of their own. Will the time ever come when that protection shall fail? Can the sending of delegates to the Northern Assembly furnish any compensation for the infliction of such an injury upon our own body?

"In reference to the co-operation suggested in the work of Foreign and Home Evangelisation, it may be answered:

"1. As to co-operation in the foreign field, our Assembly of last year, in response to our Presbyterian Alliance, has placed that whole subject in the most favorable attitude looking to such co-operation as may be found practicable with all the 'Reformed Churches.'

"2. In reference to the work of home evangelisation, this Assembly does hereby declare its readiness to co-operate, in every way which may be found practicable and judicious, with all of the 'Reformed Churches,' in the undertaking which we are now struggling to advance, but with efforts and means so utterly inadequate to its vastness and importance. We refer to the work of building up a separate Presbyterian Church of the colored people, according to the policy accepted by all evangelical denominations in the Southern States, and in general more earnestly desired by the population of African descent themselves, than by any other.

"Finally, the General Assembly deems the present occasion suitable to counsel all the members of our beloved Church to cherish sentiments of brotherly-kindness and charity towards their brethren of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, (as, indeed, towards their fellow-Christians everywhere,) and to co-operate with them, as far as practicable, in every good work; thus manifesting to the world the great truth that, notwithstanding the imperfections and divisions in the Church of Christ, there is still a unity and a communion of saints which is of priceless value."

A motion to adopt being made, Dr. Pitzer proposed to the Committee that the reasons for declining to do as the overtures requested be omitted. But this was declined, on the ground that it was necessary that the reasons be given. A motion to recommit being lost, Dr. Lefevre took the floor, earnestly protesting the devotion to the Southern Church of those border congregations from whom some of the overtures had come, and urging the Assembly not to omit the last reason if it should see fit to deny the requests. Dr. Pitzer explained that his proposal to the Committee had been made in the interest of peace and to secure unanimity. For himself he had been in favor of fraternal correspondence ever since the Northern Assembly had said that all their past action

touching the Southern Church was "null and void." The report says, "It is only a question of form and extent;" he believes in going further. Dr. Richardson, of Richmond, was ready to abide contented the action of the Church, but believed the interests of religion demand forgiveness and magnanimity. "They," he said, "have hardly used harsher words than our declaration that they had taken the crown from Christ's head and tied it to Cæsar's wheels."

Mr. Tenney, of Texas, opposed Dr. Pitzer's motion to strike out the reasons, because it did not go far enough. He was opposed to the report because he favored fraternal relations. The work in Texas demands this course. We are losing all the while on this account. Brethren speak of losses likely to occur should we establish correspondence. Perhaps a half dozen might go, but we may lose scores, if we don't act now. He therefore proposed the following substitute for the report:

Resolved, That this Assembly, while not receding from its position as heretofore taken in protesting against certain grievances which we claim have been inflicted by the Northern Presbyterian General Assembly upon us, and while we do not think that they have done all that they ought to have done toward removing these grievances, yet does now agree to send a delegate or delegates to bear our fraternal greetings to the Northern Presbyterian Assembly, now in session at Springfield, Ill., and are ready to co-operate with them in the work of Home and Foreign Evangelisation."

Mr. Brown of Lexington Presbytery, Mr. Lumpkin of Georgia, Dr. Bryson of Huntsville, and Mr. Gordon of Virginia, followed in a similar strain, the latter reading the action of our Assembly in 1870, condemning the political enactments of the Northern Assembly. Dr. Farris, of St. Louis, reviewed at some length the steps taken to secure a withdrawal of the offensive aspersions; named several eminent brethren in the Northern Church who hold that it ought to be done; proclaimed his desire for fraternal relations on terms honorable to all alike; repudiated the declaration that that the Reunited Assembly is not responsible for the debts of its constituents, though it carefully claims all the assets.

On Tuesday the debate was resumed by Mr. Tenney, who observed that the advocates of the report was mostly *old* men.

We respect them, but do not need to hear these battles of the past rehearsed. Recalling our wrongs is not the way to promote that peace and friendship which all profess to desire. Mr. Leyburn, of Missouri, feared that there is too much of the old war spirit in those who oppose fraternal relations. He objected to the declaration that correspondence involves the sacrifice of principle. By telegraphing our salutations we have virtually done the thing already; and so by sending delegates to the Pan-Presbyterian Council. We have no right to ask more than they have already done in declaring their former action "null and void."

Mr. Collier proposed to add to Dr. Brown's report the following as a fourth reason:

"Recognising the obligation to do unto others as we would that others do unto us, we hereby express our willingness to disavow any and all acts on our part, past or present, of which rightful complaint may be made, deemed by our Northern brethren derogatory or offensive to them, and so signify our willingness cheerfully to exert our best efforts in clearing the way of all difficulties to full fraternal correspondence. And until such expressions are mutual, fraternal relations are not desirable."

Dr. Brown, Chairman of the Committee, reviewed at length and with signal ability the negotiations between the Assemblies. We must not allow "the world" to force us into measures which disregard principle. They would have us to open our arms to all sects, regardless of creeds. "Nor must we be so anxious for their money as to forget *how* we obtained it."

Mr. Tenney (interrupting)—"That is just what I *am* particular about—asking for money when we cannot show fraternal feelings."

Dr. Brown—"I suggest four questions: 1. Have we been wronged? 2. Have we vindicated ourselves, and how? 3. Has that wrong been rectified? and, 4. What is our duty in the premises?" In answering these questions he read extracts from their Minutes; traced out all the steps taken to procure retraction, and said: "Are these words sufficient? Let me illustrate by a case. You go to a man and say, 'You have put an insult on the name of my mother.' If he replies, 'We have formed a partnership, in which nothing of the past should have any force

unless reënacted by the united firm;’ or, ‘I did not do it this year, but ten years ago; and let the dead past bury its dead;’ or, ‘I have a very great respect for you and your mother, and though I did make imputations, nothing that I have ever said is to be construed as an imputation.’ ”

In reply to Mr. Gordon, he said that there was a great difference between their aspersions of us and what was said by us at Louisville. They had asked us to state our complaints, and this was one of them. He was free to say that he did not defend the wisdom of that utterance as a preliminary to correspondence, whereas it properly belonged to organic union. But the *circumstances* make a world of difference between what we said and what we complain of. As for Mr. Leyburn’s remark touching the Council, he would say, that there were doubtless men for whom we might have great respect, whom we would salute on the street and shake hands with in the bank, but we did not ask them into our families, for good reasons.

Dr. Girardeau felt that after the able speech of the Chairman there was hardly need for a long speech, but he could not be altogether silent. The mere allegation of fallibility in all councils and synods does not warrant a change of action; caution is the legitimate inference. To infer change, one must be prepared to show error in the action complained of. As to what has been said of forgiveness, he would suggest the difference between forgiveness in one’s heart and the act of saying to the wrong-doer, “I forgive you;” the latter step pre-supposes manifest repentance. The wrongs inflicted are against the Bride of Christ, whose character we are bound to defend. They have expressed confidence in our *present* character, but our present is our past. We have not repented. We are still separate. He objected to fraternal correspondence because the arguments by which it is urged would naturally lead on to organic union.

The discussion for the day closed with a speech from Dr. Lane, of Georgia, in favor of fraternal correspondence. But the next morning Dr. Pitzer rose to a question of privilege, moving to postpone unfinished business in order to consider the following paper:

"Resolved, That the following telegram, signed by the Clerks and Moderator, be immediately telegraphed to the General Assembly at Springfield, Ill.: 'Will it please your Assembly for each body to remove aspersions cast upon the Christian character of the other, and exchange delegates?'"

Dr. Brown rejoiced in such a paper from that side, but could not see how it was a question of privilege. After some discussion on the point of order, Dr. Brown read the following resolution, "which," he said, "I was writing just as Dr. Pitzer rose to speak. I believe good results will follow, if this paper of mine, Dr. Pitzer's, and Mr. Collier's, be all referred to the Committee on Correspondence, with the addition of other brethren holding different views. My paper is this:

"In answer to overtures from Presbyteries and others, asking this Assembly to send delegates to the Northern General Assembly, this Assembly does hereby declare that if there be any utterances of the Southern General Assembly which can be interpreted as containing imputations upon the Christian honor and character of the Northern General Assembly, they are to be regretted, and are hereby withdrawn; and whenever the Northern Assembly shall take similar action, this Assembly will rejoice in an interchange of delegates."

The papers were referred, together with the following from Dr. E. P. Palmer:

"Resolved, That this Assembly send a telegram, signed by the Moderator and Clerk, to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, expressing our desire to co-operate with that body, as far as practicable, in the work of Home and Foreign Evangelisation, and our readiness to correspond by an exchange of delegates for the promotion of that end."

Also the following from Mr. Kerr, of Savannah:

"We suggest the following minute for the action of your Assembly: While receding from no principles, we hereby disown all expressions which may be regarded as reflecting upon, or offensive to, the Northern General Assembly. Will you adopt this minute *mutatis mutandis*?"

About noon the Committee entered the room, Dr. Brown expressing great pleasure that they had agreed upon a report which would harmonise the Assembly and the Church, he was sure.

"The Committee on Foreign Correspondence report to the General Assembly that five overtures have been placed in their hands, viz.,

from the Presbytery of Abingdon, Atlanta, Holston, South Alabama, and Maryland. Also, a resolution offered by Rev. A. W. Pitzer, D. D. The object of all these overtures, with some slight differences in their forms of expression, is the same. They desire and respectfully request this General Assembly to establish fully and formally what are called 'fraternal relations' with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, by sending forthwith a delegate or delegates to that body, now in session at Springfield, Ill. The resolution referred to proposes also that such delegation shall convey an expression of 'our willingness to co-operate with that body, as far as may be practicable, in the work of Home and Foreign Evangelisation.' After the most careful consideration your Committee have been able to give to the weighty matter involved, they recommend to the Assembly the adoption of the following paper :

"In order to remove all difficulties in the way of that full and formal fraternal correspondence for which, on our part, we are so earnestly desirous, we adopt the following minute :

"That while receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for and withdrawal of all expressions of our Assembly which may be regarded as reflecting upon, or offensive to, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

"Resolved, That a copy of this paper be sent by telegraph to the General Assembly, now in session at Springfield, Ill., for their prayerful consideration, and, *mutatis mutandis*, for their reciprocal concurrence, as affording a basis for the exchange of delegates forthwith."

Dr. Arbuthnot moved its adoption by a rising vote.

Dr. Brown—We say, *first*, if we have said anything harsh, we regret and withdraw it; then we ask them to do the same.

Mr. Hopkins—I want to know what we withdraw. It seems to me a confession which I do not wish to make.

Dr. Brown—We make no specification; we leave that to the individual conscience. Let each party decide in his own mind how much it means.

Mr. Hopkins—I want to know what we have said that was offensive.

Dr. Brown—The report neither affirms nor denies. It leaves us non-committal as to whether we have said anything that is offensive.

Rev. H. C. Alexander, D. D.—I am satisfied that we have never said anything *intended* to be offensive; there may be something which has been understood in that way.

Dr. McIlwaine moved the previous question. The resolution was adopted by an almost unanimous vote, there being but three dissenting votes—Rev. Roger Martin of North Carolina, Rev. Donald McQueen, and Mr. W. G. Vardell, of South Carolina. Thereupon Dr. Henry C. Alexander was called upon to lead the Assembly in prayer.

After an interval of several days a reply came from Springfield, stating that the paper forwarded by our Assembly known as the "Concurrent Resolution," had been adopted with enthusiasm and by a vote almost unanimous. However, before action could be taken, another telegram was received, headed "Personal," which excepted from the action taken in the "Concurrent Resolution" all the deliverances of former Assemblies touching "loyalty" and "the rebellion." These telegrams will be here inserted in their order:

"That while receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for and withdrawal of all expressions of our Assembly which may be regarded as reflecting upon or offensive to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

"Resolved, That a copy of this paper be sent by telegraph to the General Assembly now in session at Springfield, Ill., for their prayerful consideration, and, *mutatis mutandis*, for their reciprocal concurrence, as affording a basis for the exchange of delegates forthwith."

"SPRINGFIELD, ILL., May 26.

"To the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in session at Atlanta, Georgia—from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America:

"The following report from the Committee on Correspondence was adopted this morning. The Moderator is instructed to telegraph to the Moderator of the General Assembly in session at Atlanta, Ga., that his telegram is received with warm enthusiasm by this Assembly, and in order to remove all difficulties in the way of that full and formal fraternal correspondence between the two Assemblies which we are on our part prepared to accept, we adopt the following, to wit: While receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for and withdrawal of all expressions of our Assembly which may be regarded as reflecting upon or offensive to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and we renew the expression of our warm fraternal regard for all who compose its communion, and our readiness to exchange delegates forthwith.

HERRICK JOHNSON, Moderator.

WM. H. ROBERTS, Permanent Clerk."

“SPRINGFIELD, May 26.

“*To R. K. Smoot—“Personal”—Moderator Assembly, Atlanta, Ga. :*

“As a matter of information, and in justice to all parties, I would say that our Assembly’s action on your basis for fraternal relations was taken. *mutatis mutandis*, with great heartiness, only two or three dissenting. Pending our action the following resolution was passed:

“*Resolved*, That in the action now to be taken we disclaim any reference to the acts of previous Assemblies concerning loyalty and rebellion, but only to those concerning schism, heresy, and blasphemy.’ We were led in prayer after final action, and sang the doxology amidst grateful and profound feeling. We shall welcome words from your Assembly concerning delegates.
HERRICK JOHNSON.”

“*To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in session in Springfield, Ill.—from the General Assembly in session at Atlanta, Ga. :*

“If the action of your Assembly telegraphed by your Moderator to our Moderator does not modify the Concurrent Resolution adopted by your Assembly and ours, we are prepared to send delegates forthwith.

“R. K. SMOOT, Moderator.”

“SPRINGFIELD, May 27.

“*To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States at Atlanta, Ga. :*

“The action referred to does not modify, but it explains the Concurrent Resolution, and the explanation is on the face of the action. There is nothing behind it or between the lines. The dissolution of our Assembly is near at hand. We may be ready for final adjournment this evening. The exchange of delegates is impossible before Tuesday. Shall we not each appoint delegates this day to visit the respective Assemblies next year? We await your answer with deep and prayerful interest.

“HERRICK JOHNSON, Moderator.

“WILLIAM H. ROBERTS, Clerk.”

“ATLANTA, May 27.

“*Resolved*, 1st. That this Assembly does hereby declare its entire satisfaction with the full and explicit terms in which the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has expressed its reciprocal concurrence in the paper transmitted to said Assembly on fraternal correspondence.

“2. That we do unfeignedly rejoice, and render thanksgiving to God, in an event suited to take away the reproach of alienation between bodies holding the same standards of faith and tending to bring peace to our borders.

“3. That inasmuch as it is impracticable at this date to have an in-

terchange of delegates, the Assembly does hereby appoint Rev. William Brown, D. D., Rev. T. A. Hoyt, D. D., and Hon. B. M. Estes, principals, and Rev. R. P. Farris, D. D., Rev. H. C. Alexander, D. D., and Hon. Patrick Joyes, alternates, to bear to the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America our cordial Christian salutation."

We had confidently expected to receive ere this time a review of "Fraternal Relations" by Dr. Brown, the Chairman of the Committee on Correspondence, but his recent indisposition has so delayed its preparation that we are forced to go to press without it. This, however, is less to be regretted because Dr. Brown's discussion will be given to the Church through the Presbyterian newspapers, so that it will have met the reader's eye before the more slowly moving REVIEW can have reached him.

Now, upon the important topic which has been impartially outlined as it was developed in the Assembly, we shall submit a few comments.

1. And first, it seems clear to the writer that, so far as the action contained in the "Concurrent Resolution" is concerned, the mind of the Church will surely come into full accord with the Assembly.

The charge of *inconsistency* will not lie against the Committee or those members of the Assembly who sustained the first report because they finally voted for the Concurrent Resolution. The above outline will show that the first report was recommended as the Assembly's answer to the proposal that we should ignore the basis of correspondence propounded by our Commissioners in the Baltimore Conference and send our delegates to the Northern Assembly without any withdrawal of their aspersions. To this proposition the Committee recommended that an emphatic reply in the negative be given; and had the vote been taken, it is our candid opinion that the Assembly would have carried out the Committee's recommendation. It would have stood by the Baltimore platform, though there would have been a large minority vote against the report. But by adopting the Concurrent Resolution the Committee and the Assembly determined so far to gratify those who had sent up the overtures as to approach our

brethren in a Christian manner, asking them whether they would now withdraw their offensive imputations. There was no inconsistency whatever in proposing or voting for such action.

Moreover, the action had much to commend it. It unified the Assembly, as it promised to unite the Church. For it is a palpable fact that many of our most devoted adherents have been troubled by the air of mere passivity which our Church seemed to wear through these long years of negotiation. It is always a dangerous posture in war or diplomacy. It is oftentimes harder to hold a line than to assault one, to stand a charge than to make one. But when alienation has been effected, no matter how, there is always a presumption in favor of the disciple who is active in making demonstrations toward peace. He always *seems* to be most desirous of removing the "offence," even when it can be demonstrated that not one of his proposals ought to be accepted. It is natural, too, that such difficulties should press more heavily upon our brethren who live along the border than upon those in the interior. This does not argue less attachment to the principles which we hold in common. In many cases the intimation would be a cruel injustice. If one may speak as a pastor, the writer can say from observation that he knows many devoted children of our Church, who, holding firmly to the conviction of the injustice of our brethren, have yet longed to see her move forward and show that she loved peace by actions as well as by suffering. The action of our Assembly in forwarding the Concurrent Resolution was a measure eminently fitted to give relief to these tender consciences.

But it has been said that the means adopted were questionable. "We had never said hard and offensive things about them. Why, therefore, should we seem to imply that we *had*, by expressing regret for and withdrawal of any such expressions?" The same assumption was made, we observe, in the Northern Assembly, Dr. Humphrey observing during their discussions that it might be said to the credit of the Southern Church that we had never said such things. But a reference to the outline of the debate in our Assembly will show that members on both sides of the question *did* recal words spoken on one occasion by our Assem-

bly which had a severe and harsh sound. The writer, had he been allowed a vote, could have adopted that clause most heartily; for, happening to be a member of the Assembly of 1870, he objected to the words then, in the Committee on Correspondence and on the floor, not only for the reason intimated by Dr. Brown in his reply to Mr. Gordon, but also because of the sharp, biting rhetoric, as it seemed to him, in which the thought had been clothed. Doubtless the majority felt as those who commented on the words did—Dr. Brown and the others—that they could wish they had not been uttered by us; and they were glad that the only severe, or seemingly severe, words which had passed our lips could be honorably withdrawn.

Nor can the writer now see anything impolitic in our Church seeking to establish fraternal relations on this honorable basis, because it may lead to organic union. This is evidently the idea entertained by many at the North. The astute editor of the *New York Observer* hastens to say:

“With such important demonstrations before our eyes, all made within one short week, it requires no spirit of prophecy to predict that a formal reunion of the Churches cannot long be delayed. The wedge that has kept them apart has been the view which each Assembly has taken of the other's acts during and consequent upon the war. That wedge has now been removed by the spontaneous action of the Southern Assembly, and the concordant action of the Northern. What more is there to be said or done?”

Other journals in that region have followed Dr. Prime's lead, the *Philadelphia Presbyterian* bringing up the rear. But do not our brethren know that we have been for years in close and affectionate intercourse with the Reformed (Dutch) Church? In their conservative adhesion to the standards, they are far nearer to our type of thought and feeling than are our former associates of the Reunited Assembly. Let them be assured that we will not give up our peace and freedom for the bitter contests in store for us should we enter their great but somewhat miscellaneous Church. We cannot abide their *penchant* for politics, as shown by resolutions touching the civil rights of the Indians, and the Federal legislation about Chinese immigration, and the Mormons. Their recent behavior should settle that question with us; for to us it

seems as though, when put to the test, our brethren clung to their political deliverances as the Ephesians to that blessed image which fell down from Jupiter. We cannot approve of their allowing women, contrary, as we hold, to the word of God, to preach, as they do, in their pulpits, and even in presence of Presbyteries, on resolution of the body. We fear their departures from the faith, as foreshadowed in the illy-disguised advocacy among teachers in their Theological Seminaries of the theories of Weiss and Wellhausen. Let the able men whom God has given to be, in a fair and honorable sense, the leaders of our Church do their duty in teaching the truth to our people. They shall see that we will not barter our liberty to become a helpless minority in an Assembly that is already overgrown.¹

2. But this brings us to consider that part of the Assembly's action which followed the adoption of the "Concurrent Resolution."

There was no occasion whatever, so far as we can see, for the Committee on Correspondence to have assumed, as they did, to solve the riddle of the sphinx. For their so-called explanation in response to the inquiry of our Assembly touching the meaning of their action relative to loyalty and rebellion is a riddle, the interpretation of which awaits a Daniel who is not yet born. But when our Committee went on to say that this explanation was "perfectly satisfactory," they rashly led the Assembly into saying what is far enough from the fact. How the sagacious Chairman, who has served his Church so ably during the whole controversy,

¹ It is with a feeling of surprise and mortification that, on looking over the speeches made on "Fraternal Relations" in the Northern Assembly, we discover allusions to hints dropped by Southern brethren, members of our Assembly, as it would seem, which encouraged the inference that we of the South are ready for a reunion. What was said or telegraphed, we know not; and who may have said it, we do not wish to know. But that the inference is an error we feel fully assured. The people in this region prefer their own independent organisation. Among other intimations of it, one might cite the vote on Mr. Martin's resolution. Some of the most resolute advocates of separation declined to vote because they did not consider the motion to be called for. But the vote was about ten to one in favor of our separate existence.

came to be "taken in" after this fashion, we can only explain by the old formula, "*quandogue bonus dormitat Homerus.*" We suspect that he was misled by the words, "The explanation is on the face of the action; there is nothing between the lines," applying them to their adoption of the Concurrent Resolution. We know that such an impression was widely prevalent in the Assembly. We have been tempted to surmise that the counsel of the young men also proved as disastrous in this instance as it did to Rehoboth.

When that enigmatical answer came, the Committee should have recommended that we wait for further light from them as to their meaning. It would not have been long delayed, if we may judge the feeling of the body from their official reports. Or, if action must be taken immediately, the Committee might have reported something to this effect: "*Resolved*, That accepting the explicit declaration of the Assembly at Springfield that they did not intend to modify the Concurrent Resolution as proposed by us, withdrawing all imputations cast upon either body by the other, we do now, upon that understanding, appoint delegates, and ask them, if they accept our interpretation, to do the same." This would have brought on the issue and completely wiped out the Johnson resolution with its exceptions. The blunder is, in this case, all the harder to bear because we happen to know that a resolution to this effect was prepared by a member of the Assembly after conference with a number of gentlemen, and it was handed to the Committee. The error would have been exposed on the floor, but, unfortunately for all concerned, "the question" was called, and the Assembly being fagged out by long-continued sessions, the call was sustained. This error and its consequences none will regret more than our honored brother, Dr. Brown. And we know him too well to doubt for a moment that he will be the first to apply whatever remedy the occasion may demand; for he will see that truly fraternal relations cannot be established while the matter stands as it is. It will be easy for him to report the painful doubt in the minds of his brethren to our next Assembly, and the delegation of which he is Chairman may call upon the Assembly at Lexington to instruct them as to

their duty in the circumstances. Or the delegation may go on to the other Assembly and say: Our people are in doubt as to your exact intentions in speaking of loyalty and the so-called rebellion as you did. If you only meant to save yourselves from the appearance even of repudiating your principles, while we consider the resolution unnecessary, because the Concurrent Resolution had already done this for you as for us also, yet we have no purpose to object to your excess of caution. But if, as some among us apprehend, you meant us to know that you neither regretted nor withdrew the severe denunciations of us which were mingled with those opinions of yours, please to speak out plainly. We wish not merely the semblance, but the reality of a Christian reconciliation—one that will be alike honorable to you and to us." This will bring out the truth and open our way clearly. The gentlemen associated with Dr. Brown (Dr. Hoyt and Mr. Estes) are also thoroughly well known. They would not consent to remain as our ambassadors in any foreign court which would be understood as reaffirming the fearful aspersions of us intermingled with their expressions about that government to which the loyalty of citizens in these States is, or was, primarily due. Our brethren of the North, be it remembered, went so far in their excitement as to affirm solemnly that our Church was organized in the interests of rebellion, and to aid in perpetuating negro slavery. Worse they could not say, and yet this is part of their deliverances about loyalty and rebellion. The mistake into which our Assembly fell was painful, but it admits of remedy.

And, moreover, we believe that good men at the North will be glad to accord such an explanation. We have spoken with distinguished brethren of their Assembly, who have frankly regretted the resolution which was passed chiefly by the agency of Dr. Johnson, who doubtless meant no harm. The Northern journals, we observe, touch the matter very gingerly. They all feel shy of it, if we do not mistake them, and will be quite as glad to get rid of it, we imagine, as our Church will be. The fact is apparent, that so great was the excitement in their Assembly, as indicated by uproarious applause (of which we had none) and by the confusion in the house, that many of the members had but a very

obscure conception of what they were doing. Upon referring to the "Assembly Edition" of the *Illinois Journal*, which was sent by a member of that Assembly to a friend in the South as containing ample and trustworthy reports of all they did, we find in the reports of May 26th, but published on the 27th, the following colloquy as taking place immediately upon the offering of Dr. Johnson's resolution touching loyalty and rebellion :

"Rev. Mr. Tully inquired if the resolution was to accompany the reply to the South.

"Dr. Johnson : 'It is no part of our action in reference to the Church, South.'

"The rules were suspended, and the resolution adopted.

"A member : 'This is not to be embodied in the returned answer?'

"Dr. Johnson : 'No, sir.'"

Again, in the same paper, under date of May 29th :

"The Moderator : 'I will now seek to make plain, if I may have the ear of every member of the body, the exact status of the case, in order that we may take appropriate action.

"It was thought by the Moderator and other members of the Assembly, upon consultation, that it would be only justice to the body at the South to apprise them of our action taken prior to the action upon the Concurrent Resolution. . [Applause.]

"You will remember that in anticipation of that action, we passed a resolution, simply explanatory, which the Moderator communicated to the Moderator of the Assembly, South, in connexion with the official telegram, in the following telegram sent to him personally.'"

Then follows the telegram as above given, with the word "Personal" affixed to it. The report continues : "To the official telegram to that body, we have received the following reply."

Then follows the telegram of our Assembly, dated "Atlanta, May 26th," as above given, suggesting that charitable construction of Dr. Johnson's resolution, according to which it had not modified the Concurrent Resolution, and inviting an interpretation of it by the other Assembly. Dr. Johnson then proceeded to say that having telegraphed to Atlanta that their Assembly was not then in session, he had in the meanwhile taken the liberty of preparing an answer to the inquiry touching the force of his resolution, which he would now read, with a view to its being adopted and sent to Atlanta as the Assembly's reply to our

telegram. Then follows the reply in which occurs the enigmatical phrase, "does not modify, but it explains," etc.

A motion to adopt having been made and seconded, then followed some promiscuous talk about the practicability of an exchange of delegates during the present session of the Assemblies. This was cut short by impatient cries of "Question! Question!" Whereupon "Judge Moore, of Chicago, moved to amend by striking out the words 'in explanation.'¹ If these words were stricken out there would be an end of the controversy, which all so much desired. [Applause.]"

Drs. Phraner and Niccolls opposed the amendment—the former on the ground that, if Dr. Johnson's motion touching "loyalty and the rebellion" had not been passed previously, the Assembly's vote on the Concurrent Resolution would have been different; the latter because the Southern brethren had never asked an apology for deliverances about loyalty and the war. The Moderator then put the question on the adoption of the paper as prepared by himself, when Judge Moore reminded him of the amendment. Dr. Briggs, amid some confusion in the house, called attention to the complications brought in by Judge Moore's amendment, "which operated, he said, as a virtual reconsideration of the former action. The words 'but it explains' mean something." "If," he inquired, "it neither modifies nor explains, what does it do?" [A conundrum, we respectfully suggest, only second to the one raised by the Moderator, *i. e.*, How can it explain without modifying?]

The stenographic report shows more of desultory talk, amidst which the Moderator called upon the Assembly not to become excited over a minor point. At length Judge Moore is reported as saying: "I find a great many of my friends prefer that I should withdraw the amendment, and I am willing and do withdraw it." [Great applause.]

Now from this it is clear: (1.) That the Moderator's paper touching "loyalty and the rebellion" was adopted as a sort of compromise among themselves, and with the full understanding

¹An evident error for "but it explains."

that it did not affect us and was *not* to be sent to us. Dr. Johnson's words are: "*It is no part of our action in reference to the Church, South.*" Again, in reply to an inquiry as to whether it was to be sent to us, he said distinctly, "*No, sir.*" (2.) It is also clear that the mind of the Northern Assembly was in a state of *obfuscation*, hardly equalled by that even of the Atlanta Assembly, or of its Committee. (3.) The telegram marked "Personal" was sent by Dr. Johnson to Dr. Smoot, on his own *responsibility* (which we imagine he meant to vindicate by the word "Personal"), and without the action of his Assembly, or even its knowledge.

These things being so, we for our part are heartily glad that Dr. Johnson changed his mind about his ill-advised paper, and notified us of it. He has managed, no doubt with the best intentions, to create about as much trouble and confusion as any good man is likely to have the chance of doing between this date and the end of the nineteenth century; but the mischief done is of small consequence to what might have happened had our Assembly been allowed to act in ignorance of that paper. A moderate show of manliness and good temper will set this all right; the other might have been serious indeed, by bringing reproach upon Christian honesty and candor. As it is, we are sure that our brethren tried to do right, though they failed egregiously. Indeed, neither Assembly did what it intended to do. One adopted a paper which it imagined did not concern its sister, and was not to be made known to her at all. But it *was* made known to her all the same, and it proves to be of the deepest concern to her good name. The other, in her haste, takes action upon it that, if left to stand, will forever prove a barrier in the way of cordiality between many of the children of the two families.

Further explanation is needed, and of a very different sort, if we may say so without offence, than the riddle sent back to us by the Northern Assembly, at the instance of its Moderator. That paper on "loyalty and the rebellion" "*means something.*" Dr. Briggs, in his wisdom, said so, and the bewildered Assembly seems to have agreed with him by failing to adopt Judge Moore's

amendment to strike out the words "but it explains." Had the amendment prevailed, the enigma would have been solved most happily, for their reply to us would then have read: "The action referred to does not modify the Concurrent Resolution;" that is, our brethren would then have said in effect: "We stand by all our principles, but withdraw all abusive imputations against your character." The purpose of the resolution on "loyalty and the rebellion" would under that explanation be only to let their own people see more explicitly what the Concurrent Resolution guarantees to both parties. But it so happens that the worst things (if there can be degrees in such sweeping condemnations) that they have said of us are precisely under the head of "loyalty and the rebellion." We find a sample in one of our religious journals which is in point. In 1865 they said: "A large number of Presbyteries and Synods in the Southern States whose names are on the roll of the General Assembly as constituent parts of this body, have organised an Assembly denominated 'the General Assembly of the Confederate States of America,' in order to render their aid in the attempt to establish, by means of the rebellion, a separate national existence to conserve and perpetuate the system of slavery." But such deliverances as these—the most horrible of all—our brethren have seemingly exempted from consideration when they adopted the Concurrent Resolution. They stand, not only as testimonies of their opinion upon the *political* question which divided the country—the question whose solution depends entirely upon the *nature* of that government which our fathers established by means of that instrument known as the Constitution of the United States—but also as their solemn declaration of the purposes for which our General Assembly was organised. With their political opinions we have no concern whatever in this connexion. The Concurrent Resolution exempts them. But the ascription of a political end to our Church's very being is a matter that demands attention. There can be no fraternal relations which deserve the name while they refuse to consider that offensive aspersion with a view to its withdrawal. Progress has been made, but errors require to be corrected. In this work our

brethren are as much interested as we are. They can no more afford to encumber their records with such enigmas as, in their perplexity, they allowed Drs. Johnson, Niccolls, and Briggs to persuade them to adopt, than we can afford to remain in doubt as to the imputations which cluster about their enactments as to "loyalty and the rebellion." Christian candor and self-respect require a full understanding between friends.

WM. E. BOGGS.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

These random shots at the literature just passing into view are sometimes taken at very long range, and are always taken on the wing. It is by no means the design of this periodical mention of certain new books to give an adequate critical estimate of them. This would often be impossible without further information. The idea is frequently no more than to notice them, or else merely to hold them long enough before the mind's eye, and in a sufficiently bright light, to secure them the reader's attention. The names of authors are often all the guarantee one would care to have of the excellence of the work. This is true of the Sunday-school Lectures on the New Testament.¹ We, however, know *aliunde* in this and some other instances, that too many cooks have not spoiled the broth. Hitzig is now outheroed by younger and still more radical students of the Old Testament.² The coryphæus of the post-exilic theory is Reuss, who has devoted a large part of his life to it; and it is worth while to dip into his *Old Testament History*,³ if only to be convinced that Robertson Smith had the best part of his work done for him in Germany.

The fourth volume⁴ of the Bible Commentary is thought to

¹Lectures on the New Testament: delivered before the New York Sunday-school Association. By the Reverend Doctors Weston, Bevan, Lloyd, Storrs, Hall, Taylor, Vincent, Elder, Fowler, Tiffany, and Johnson. 12mo, pp. 355. New York: American Tract Society.

²Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Erste Lieferung. Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, von Dr. F. Hitzig. Vierte Auflage, besorgt von Dr. H. Steiner, ordentlichem Professor der Theologie in Zürich. Leipzig: Hirzel. 1881. Westermann & Co., New York.

³Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments entworfen von Edward Reuss. 8vo, pp. xvi., 744. Braunschweig, C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn. New York: B. Westermann & Co., New York. 1881.

⁴The Bible Commentary: New Testament, Vol. IV., Hebrews, by William Kay, D. D.; The Epistle of James, by Dean Scott; The Epistles of Peter, by Canon Cook and Professor Lumby; The Epistles of John, by the Bishop of Derry; Jude, by Professor Lumby; Revelation, by Archdeacon Lee. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

resemble its predecessors in character and merit. It is (as we have said before) orthodox according to the *doxy* of the Church of England. We now add that the *doxy* of the Church of England is not exactly the *doxy* of the Church of Switzerland and Scotland. Several of the principal contributors leave nothing to be desired on this score. Here and there in the book there are nevertheless loose statements, to say the least of them, and statements which cannot easily be reconciled with the strictest view of inspiration. This is the case undoubtedly in the commentary on the earlier Gospels. In general the theology of the work seems to be entirely sound, and its scholarship and popular adaptation have become widely admitted. Dr. Watts's rejoinder to Professor Smith¹ is a timely answer and a crushing blow. Professor Watts (Antæus like) is strongest when he touches the hard ground of ordinary common-sense and familiar Biblical exposition. The inquiry made by ex-President Stebbins into the age of the Mosaic writings accomplishes the same grand object in a different way.² In the masterly array of the more technical critical arguments, this study of the Pentateuch may be compared with the comprehensive and cogent refutation just furnished by Dr. Wm. Henry Green in his "Moses and the Prophets."³ These two replies also agree in this, that they are both answers to Kuenen's "Religion of Israel." Dr. Watts confines his examination almost

¹The Newer Criticism and the Analogy of the Faith. A reply to Lectures by W. Robertson Smith, M. A., on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church. By Robert Watts, D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the General Assembly's College, Belfast. Second Edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882. 12mo, pp. 320. New York: Scribner & Welford.

²A Study of the Pentateuch for Popular Reading, being an inquiry into the age of the so-called books of Moses, with an introductory examination of recent Dutch theories, as represented by Dr. Kuenen's "Religion of Israel." By Rufus P. Stebbins, D. D., formerly President, Lecturer on Hebrew Literature, and Professor of Theology in the Meadville Theological School, Boston. 1881. 12mo, pp. 233.

³Moses and the Prophets. Being a review of "the Old Testament in the Jewish Church," by Prof. W. Robertson Smith, and of "The Prophets and Prophecy of Israel," by A. Kuenen. By William Henry Green, D. D., of Princeton Theological Seminary. 12mo, cloth, 300 pp., \$1.25. Robt-Carter & Bros., New York.

wholly to the Aberdeen Professor. Dr. Green embraces in the scope of his volume a review both of the Scotch and also of the German neologist. Till very recently the great representative of the Tübingen school was Dr. Keim, who, sceptic as he was, notwithstanding blazed a path before his followers by which, if they took the advice of their old teacher, they would return to a more conservative way of thinking on many points. Keim's *Life of Christ*¹ suffers from the fatal vice which besets every rationalistic treatment of this subject, but is better than Strauss, Baur, or even Renan. Dr. H. B. Smith's little *vade mecum* on the *Evidences*² is exceedingly able and valuable, but too much condensed for the purposes of the general reader. Bishop Martensen is an erudite and useful writer. His work on *Ethics*,³ though lacking somewhat in freshness, seems to be a good one. Among the noted preachers at the Philadelphia Council was the pastor of the barony Church⁴ of Glasgow. His book on the Last Supper and final discourses of our Lord is spoken of favorably. The Dr. S. M. Merrill, who writes on *Christian Experience*,⁵ appears to be a different man from Selah Merrill, the geographer of Gilead and Bashan. Outlines of other people's sermons⁶ are of very little advantage to anybody. Of far more value are suggestive

¹The History of Jesus of Nazara. By Dr. Theodor Keim. Translated by Arthur Ransom. Vol. V. Williams & Norgate, London. 1881. 8vo, pp. 343. (The next to the last volume.)

²Apologetics: A Course of Lectures by Henry B. Smith, D. D., LL.D. Edited by William S. Karr, D. D., Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1882.

³Christian Ethics. Special Part. First Division—Individual Ethics. By Dr. H. Martensen, Bishop of Seeland. Translated from the author's German edition by William Afeck, D. D. Pp. vi., 423. New York: Scribner & Welford.

⁴The Last Supper of our Lord, and his Words of Consolation to his Disciples. By J. Marshall Lang, D. D., Minister of the Barony Parish, Glasgow. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1881. 12mo, \$1.25.

⁵Aspects of Christian Experience. By S. M. Merrill, D. D. 16mo, cloth, 298 pp., \$1. Walden & Stowe, Cincinnati.

⁶Three Hundred Outlines of Sermons on the New Testament, by eminent English and American Clergymen. 12mo, 282 pp., cloth, \$1.50 A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

hints and collections of extracts. Twenty-five or thirty years ago Dr. Wadsworth had a brilliant reputation as a popular preacher in the city of Philadelphia.¹ He read closely, but his fervid and imaginative rhetoric and the wailing pathos of his musical voice held packed houses in breathless silence. He had the art of making much in the way of sermonizing out of little in the way of a text. One of his most famous efforts was on the theme, "Faint, yet pursuing."

The questions that trouble beginners² are often the very same that trouble those who have nearly finished their course. It would be a good thing to have these questions wisely and tenderly handled. Whether they have been so handled by Mr. Shinn is more than we are at present able to affirm. Paxton Hood is capable of giving an admirable account of the Great Revival;³ but this is not the first account of it. Dr. Aspinwall Hodge has made the whole Presbyterian Church⁴ his debtor by his sensible and thoroughgoing exposition of the Constitution and the Digest; and his book (though of a somewhat different and higher order) must hereafter stand on the same shelf with those of Baird and Moore. Heine's name is now for the first time associated (in English) with anything of a religious nature. Philosophy and religion, though wedded on so many title pages, are too often in Germany divorced from one another in the world of practical manifestation.⁵ As the host of philologists have considered the lingual, and Counsellor Main the jural, phenomena of the Indo-

¹Sermons by the Rev. Charles Wadsworth, D. D. 16mo, cloth, 240 pp., 1.25. Presbyterian Publishing Company, Philadelphia.

²Questions that Trouble Beginners in Religion. By the Rev. George W. Shinn, Newton, Mass. 115 pp., boards, 25c. Thomas Whitaker, New York.

³The Great Revival of the Eighteenth Century. By the Rev. Edwin Paxton Hood. 12mo, cloth, 329 pp., illustrated, \$1.25. American Sunday School Union.

⁴What is Presbyterian Law, as Defined by Church Courts? By the Rev. J. Aspinwall Hodge. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

⁵Philosophy and Religion in Germany. By Heinrich Heine. Translated by John Snodgrass, Jr. 8vo, cloth, \$3. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

European tribes, so Max Müller, Baring-Gould, and a multitude of contemporary writers (including Dr. Tiele of Holland and Mr. Keary of the British Museum) have similarly busied themselves with the phenomena afforded by the Indo-European religions.¹² The so-styled science of Comparative Theology, when conducted on this principle, and when made to embrace Christianity and to treat it as only the best and highest of a number of fictitious systems, is about as sensible and useful a thing as a science of comparative note-engraving would be which should embrace United States treasury notes and the basest counterfeits under a common description. The Koran has long demanded, but hardly deserves, a systematic interpreter.³ One of the most curious of the apocryphal volumes is the book of Enoch.⁴ Its resemblance is marked to the book of Jude and the second book of Peter. Noble's appeal for the New Church even falls into the error of deriving these two canonical books from that spurious and corrupt one. The origin of Quietism in the bosom of the Roman Church, and during that ferment in the world that succeeded the downfall of the Stuarts, is as remarkable as the system itself is interesting. The relation of Quietism to Quakerism, as well as to the general subject of Mysticism, is as important as it is obvious or (as Sir William Hamilton would say), *obtrusive*. The character and story of Molinos⁵ himself are very attractive. Dean Stanley's sermons display the qualities of the man, to which we have several times adverted in previous numbers. It may be well to say again that he was specially gifted as a rhetorician and (in the estimation

¹Comparative History of the Egyptian and Mesopotamian Religions, Egypt, Babel—Assur, Yemen, etc. By Dr. C. P. Tiele. Translated from the Dutch by James Ballingal. 8vo, cloth, xx., 230 pp., \$3. *Ibid.*

²Outlines of Primitive Belief among the Indo-European Races. By Charles Francis Keary, M. A., of the British Museum. Cr., 8vo, cloth, 550 pp., \$2.50. Charles Scribner's Sons.

³A Comprehensive Commentary on the Quran. By the Rev. E. M. Wherry, M. A. 2 Vols. 8vo, cloth. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

⁴The Book of Enoch. Translated from the Ethiopic, with Introduction and Notes, by George H. Schodde, Ph. D. 12mo, viii., 278 pp., \$1.75. W. F. Draper, Andover, Mass.

⁵Molinos the Quietist. By the Hon. John Bigelow. 16mo, unique binding, \$1.25. Chas. Scribner's Sons.

of the English, and particularly of the Broad-Church,) as a preacher. He wore his cap while speaking, and never raised his arms, and seldom took his eyes off the paper.¹

The new and elaborate work² on the influence of Germany and its schools on the religion of the Cross is said to be a very learned and able one. We as yet decline expressing our own judgment as to the permanent worth of the book. To the labors of Flourens, Brown-Séguard, Ferrier, Dalton, and others, we are now to add those of Dr. J. Luys, in that wide and mysterious department of investigation which concerns the functions of the nervous system and the brain.³ We are very tired of hearing about "culchaw," especially in the Boston sense.⁴ As often used, the term denotes no more than a smattering of graceful surface knowledge of various branches and notably of literature. The term "science" is also painfully narrowed in its application by many who employ it. In the good sense of the expression, "Science and Culture" is a phrase that covers a vast and noble field for the exercise of our highest powers. Handy-books are always welcome. A handy-book on the heathen stories about the gods and heroes is doubly so.⁵ There is much in the so-called "science" of the day that is purely mythical, and much that in the Scriptures is spoken of as "myth" is in reality the highest "science."⁶ The Greeks were right in their views as to value of bodily training.⁷

¹Westminster Sermons. Sermons on Special Occasions, preached in Westminster Abbey, by Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D. D. Cr., 8vo, cloth, 438 pp., \$2.50. *Ibid.*

²German Culture and Christianity: their Controversy in the Time 1770-1880. By Joseph Gostwick. 8vo, cloth, \$6. Scribner & Welford, New York.

³The Brain and its Functions. By J. Luys. (International Scientific Series.) 12mo, cloth, illustrated, 328 pp., \$1.50. D. Appleton & Co., N. Y.

⁴Science and Culture, and Other Essays. By T. H. Huxley, LL. D., F. R. S. 12mo, cloth, 358 pp., \$1.50. *Ibid.*

⁵Mythology for Every-day Readers. Limp cloth, 50c. J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

⁶Myth and Science. By Tito Vignoli. (International Scientific Series.) 12mo, cloth, \$1.50. D. Appleton & Co., N. Y.

⁷Physical Education. By Felix L. Oswald, M. D. 12mo, cloth, 258 pp., \$1.00. *Ibid.*

The lawyers all tell us that circumstantial evidence¹ is in general as safe as any other. Certainly it is so when it is sufficiently complete. The doctrine of chances comes in, and there is only an application of the same principle that is constantly referred to in the argument from prophecy. There are, however, on record some staggering exceptions to the rule, or what would have been exceptions had not the investigation been pushed (as in the Tichborne case) much further than is usual. In the midst of the multifarious literature of the Bar, consisting so largely as it does of reports and special treatises, it is refreshing now and then to stumble upon a new, and at the same time general, discussion within brief compass.² Professor Plumptre, if we mistake not, is connected with the University of London, and is unquestionably one of the true scholars of England. His commentaries and learned disquisitions on Scripture books possess a high value, and his translations of Sophocles³ and Æschylus⁴ are pronounced to be finer than any others that cover the whole ground. Sir Thos. Grantham's work not only opens out a new chapter in Virginia history but sheds light on one of the most interesting periods in the annals of England. The old knight's style, moreover, has a curious and unexpected attraction for the student of philology, and the paper and printing and editing do honor to the Old Dominion and her Historical Society.⁵

¹Circumstantial Evidence. By Alice Irving Abbott. 12mo, cloth, pp. 358, \$1.25. W. B. Smith & Co., New York.

²Elements of the Laws: or, Outlines of the System of Civil and Criminal Laws in Force in the United States and in the several States of the Union. By T. L. Smith. New and revised edition. 12mo, extra cloth, \$1.50. J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

³The Tragedies of Sophocles: a New Translation, with a Biographical Essay, and an Appendix of Rhymed Choral Odes and Lyrical Dialogues. By E. H. Plumptre, D. D. 12mo, pp. xcv., 502. New York: Geo. Routledge & Sons. 1882.

⁴The Tragedies of Æschylus: a New Translation, etc. By E. H. Plumptre, D. D. 12mo, pp. lxxviii., 378. *Ibid.*

⁵An Historical Account of Some Memorable Actions, particularly in Virginia; also against the Admiral of Algiers, and in the East Indies, performed for the service of his Prince and country by Sir Thomas Grantham, Knight. With an Introduction by R. A. Brock, Esq., Secretary of

The continuation of Bancroft's series of historical volumes¹ is not inferior to what has preceded. Amongst other sources of knowledge, the venerable author had free access to the records and memory of the late Hugh Blair Grigsby, whose acquaintance with the Colonial history was perhaps not second to that of any man in the Union. We have always thought that Burke (in his "Reflections on the French Revolution") overpraises Montesquieu. Yet Montesquieu stands in the first rank amongst publicists and writers upon government; and largely on account of his penetration, his originality, his boldness, and his conservatism.² Two more volumes of Mr. Lecky's striking (but not very orthodox) book on the eighteenth century³ will be accepted with satisfaction by a large majority of intelligent readers. George Borrow nearly exhausted the subject of "The Gypsies in Spain." Mr. Chas. G. Leland (the author of "Hans Breitman") here discourses of the Romany tribes in other parts of Europe.⁴

The political growth of the United States has been so marked and so abnormal that their Revolutionary garments will no longer fit them.⁵ Equally remarkable, and even more discouraging has

the Virginia Historical Society. Reprinted in *fac simile* of the London edition 1716. 8vo, pp. iv., 171, paper uncut, \$2. Carlton, McCarthy & Co., Richmond.

¹History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States. By George Bancroft. Uniform with and a continuation of the author's "History of the United States." 2 Vols. 8vo, \$2.50 a volume. D. Appleton & Co., New York.

²Montesquieu's Considerations of the Causes of the Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans. New Translation, with Introduction, Critical and Illustrative Notes, and an Analytical Index. By Jehu Baker. 12mo, cloth, \$2. *Ibid.*

³The History of England in the Eighteenth Century. Vols. III. and IV. By W. E. H. Lecky. Large 12mo, uniform with Vols. I. and II., \$2.25 a volume. *Ibid.*

⁴The Gypsies. With Sketches of the English, Welsh, Russian, and Austrian Romany. By Charles G. Leland. Cloth. Houghton & Mifflin & Co., Boston.

⁵Constitutional History and Political Development of the United States. By Simon Sterne, of the New York Bar. 12mo, cloth, 300 pp., \$1.25. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., New York.

been the development of Russia.¹ Mr. Conway Robinson's great work on the High Court of Chancery is more than worthy of the fame of the author of Robinson's Practice.² Mr. Henry Giles once discoursed in a fruitful and stimulating way concerning "Joy in Writing." With such a theme as the humanity glassed in Shakespeare, this veteran *littérateur* could not fail to be interesting.³ These hints from a proof-reader are likely to be of much practical service.⁴ The autobiographical and other personal matter about Carlyle⁵ that has been so largely accumulated recently, and mainly by Mr. Froude, is at once instructive and entertaining, but much of it is very startling and not a little of it very depressing. Conversation is an art that cannot be taught in books, but some of its charms and foibles may be pointed out by a judicious and skilful pen.⁷ Half the mystery is in a fertile brain, a nimble tongue, and a good heart.

¹The Russian Empire: Its Origin and Development. By S. B. Boulton. With complete Index, Map, and Chronological Table. (Vol. XV., Cassell's Popular Library.) 16mo, 194 pp., cloth 50c.; paper 25c. *Ibid.*

²History of the High Court of Chancery, and Other Institutions of England, from the time of Caius Julius Cæsar until the accession of William and Mary (in 1688-9). Vol. I., to the death of Henry VIII. (1546-7.) By Conway Robinson. Sheep, \$7.50; in two parts, sheep, \$8.50; two parts, cloth, cut or uncut edges, \$7.50. J. W. Randolph & English, Richmond.

³Human Life in Shakespeare. By Henry Giles. New edition, with introduction by J. Boyle O'Reilly. 16mo, cloth, 288 pp., \$1.50. Lee & Shepard, Boston.

⁴Hints and Helps to those who Write, Read, and Print. By Benjamin Drew, Proof-reader. *Ibid.*

⁵Thomas Carlyle. By James Anthony Froude. 12mo, cloth, 576 pp., 56c.; paper, 40c. Harper & Bros., New York.

⁶Thomas Carlyle. A History of the First Forty Years of his Life, 1795 to 1835. By James Anthony Froude, M. A. 2 Vols., crown, 8vo, with illustrations, \$5. Charles Scribner & Co., New York.

⁷Conversation; its Faults and its Graces. Compiled by Andrew P. Peabody, D. D., LL. D. 16mo, cloth, 150 pp., 50c. *Ibid.*

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

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

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

☞ All business communications should be addressed to the Proprietor, JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued until a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or after the first number of a volume is published.

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

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

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

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

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

THE
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

Vol. XXXIII.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXXII.

No. 4.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. AN APOSTOLIC MISSIONARY IN CHINA. By AGNES M. MACHAR. From the <i>Catholic Presbyterian</i> ,	601
II. THE LORD'S DAY, AND NOT THE JEWISH SABBATH. By the late Rev. JOHN BEVERIDGE,	614
III. AN INQUIRY INTO THE AGGRESSIVENESS OF PRESBYTERIAN- ISM,	647
IV. THE POWER OF WOMAN. By the Rev. FRANCIS P. MULLALLY, D. D., Walhalla, S. C.,	689
V. WHAT WERE THE CHERUBIM? By the Rev. R. K. MOSELEY, Seguin, Texas,	702
VI. A CALL TO THE MINISTRY. By the Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Pendleton, S. C.,	725
VII. DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE ASSEMBLY OF 1837. By the late Rev. Dr. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,	747
VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	781

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1882.

With the address of each subscriber, we now print the date of the last number for which he has paid. For example, those who have paid in full for the current volume—Vol. XXXIII.—will find after their names, “Oct. '82,” which means that they have paid for the October number of 1882, and of course for all preceding it. If any one has paid for all past volumes, and one dollar on XXXIII., he will find “Jan.” or “Jny, '82 and 25c.,” which means that he has paid for the January number of 1882, and 25 cents on the April number. And so in other cases.

Those who have not paid for the current volume will confer a favor by forwarding the amount due to JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C.

In compliance with the wishes of many friends, it is announced that hereafter, as a *general rule*, the names of writers for this REVIEW will be attached to their articles, and the initials of each to the critical notices.

The REVIEW will continue to be, as it has always been, an open journal, favoring free discussion within limits. More than ever it is desired to make it a representative of our whole Church, as its name imports, and a faithful exponent of the Calvinistic Theology and the Presbyterian Polity.

Communications for its pages may be addressed to JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C., or to ROBERT L. DABNEY, Hampden Sidney, Virginia, or to JOHN B. ADGER, Pendleton, South Carolina.

A more generous support by Southern Presbyterians would enable the proprietor to make the work more worthy of its name.

[Entered at the Post-Office at Columbia, S. C., as second-class postal matter.]

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXXII.

ARTICLE I.

AN APOSTOLIC MISSIONARY IN CHINA.

About ten years ago, a young man was quietly ordained to the foreign mission work in a small church in Montreal, Canada. He had been from boyhood an enthusiast as to missions, and having now finished his preparatory studies, was ready to go forth as an ordained medical missionary to China. No public attention was aroused by his ordination, and there were but few to bid the young missionary God-speed, though there were some, even then, who were deeply impressed by the quiet *intensity* with which he spoke at meetings which he addressed before leaving the country, and who long after remembered him as one especially characterised by apostolic faith and fervor. He was the first missionary whom the then "Canada Presbyterian Church" sent forth to the heathen in the regions beyond Canada, which, of course, is a wide mission-field in itself.

The Rev. Principal Grant, of Queen's University, Kingston—then of Halifax—happened to be in Montreal, and to be present at the dedication service, and he thus describes the impression produced on him at the time: "The committee had not selected one of the large churches for the service, probably because it estimated rightly the amount of public interest in foreign missions. The small church was not filled. The missionary-elect, a small, dark young man, seemed to make little impression on the con-

gregation, though there was a simple earnestness in his manner, and an occasional pathos or Highland wail in his tones, that touched a brother Highlander. But, to judge from remarks made by some near me, there was not much faith in the mission or the missionary. Others believed that the young man was walking *by faith*, and that wherever faith was, even miracles were possible."

In 1880 Dr. Mackay returned to his native land to give an account of his stewardship. The hearts of thousands in Canada have been deeply stirred and impressed by the simple unadorned recital of his experiences in Formosa, which reads more like a chapter from the Acts of the Apostles, than from the history of an age which, we are so often told, is one "of little faith."

Being left free to choose his own field of labor by the committee which sent him to China, Dr. Mackay left Canada in October, 1871, and landed at Hong-kong early in 1872. There he met an old friend who strongly recommended him to go to Formosa. He accordingly went thither, and first visited the interesting mission of the English Presbyterian Church in southern Formosa, which has its headquarters at Tai-wan-foo, the capital of Formosa. Here, a medical mission and hospital had been established under Dr. J. L. Maxwell, who also translated the Bible into the "Roman Colloquial," a work largely helpful to Dr. Mackay, as well as to the southern mission. Tai-wan-foo is a large fortified city of 70,000 inhabitants, inclosing a circuit of five miles. Here and at Takao, another city, the English Presbyterian missionaries had been laboring since 1865. Dr. Mackay took counsel with Dr. Maxwell and Mr. and Mrs. Ritchie, and decided that they should divide the land, and that his mission-field should be northern Formosa. As the island is about 250 miles long and 90 in width, with three millions of a Chinese population, exclusive of 60,000 or 80,000 aborigines, there was abundance of room for two missions to work without the slightest interference. He accordingly proceeded northward to Tam-sui, or Hobe, a town of about 8,000 inhabitants, a treaty-port at the mouth of a river of the same name, which has ever since been his headquarters. It is beautifully situated on the slope of high hills rising directly from the river, and divided, about 200 feet above

it, by a table land, on which now stand the houses of two missionaries, near four others belonging to the few foreign residents. On the low land by the river lies the Chinese town, "like all Chinese towns, full of filth and horrible smells."

Of the beauty of the island of Formosa, Dr. Mackay, who has travelled through the continents of Europe and America, and a large part of Asia, speaks in the most glowing terms, as of a land of glorious mountains, lovely valleys, grandly picturesque passes, placid lakes, in a word, "the most beautiful island in all God's earth." Its great natural beauty, indeed, led the early Portuguese explorers to give it the name of *Isla Formosa*, which it has ever since retained. The eastern portion consists of a ridge of lofty mountains, called by the natives "Ta-shan," or Great Mountains, reaching at some points an elevation of 12,000 feet.

This rugged mountain tract is the abode of the still untamed aborigines of the island, who have been gradually driven back by the Chinese to this natural fastness, from which they have repelled all attempts to dislodge them; a fierce warlike race of Malay origin, at deadly feud with the Chinese, who live among their sugar and rice fields and their tea and indigo plantations on the western side, divided by ninety miles of sea from the main land of China. The island was known to the Chinese from 1430, though it was only in 1652, on the expulsion of the native Ming dynasty by the Tartar one, which has ruled China ever since, that they began to colonise it. The Spaniards had previously made some attempts to plant settlements and missions, and the Dutch had, in 1624, founded a settlement protected by two bastioned forts at Tam-sui and Kelung. Their missionaries, George Candidius and Robert Junius, seem to have been very successful in converting the natives to Christianity. The latter is said to have baptized about 6,000 converts on profession of faith, and to have planted twenty-three churches, besides schools in which about 600 children received a Christian education. The arrival of many thousand loyalist Chinese emigrants eventually proved fatal to the Dutch colony, as Koxinga, a dreaded pirate, disaffected to the Tartar dynasty, was attracted to the island in the hope of driving out the Dutch, and usurping the sovereignty over the

Chinese population. After an heroic resistance, the brave little Dutch garrison was overpowered, and many prisoners massacred, including three ministers; the remnant of the garrison, after holding out for nine months, was forced to retire to Batavia.

A century later, a Jesuit traveller found still existing among the natives some traces of the Dutch language and of some Christian doctrines, relics of this first successful mission to Formosa. But at the period of Dr. Mackay's arrival, though there was an interesting English Presbyterian mission in southern Formosa, the population of northern Formosa, whether Chinese or aboriginal, presented a dense mass of unbroken heathenism.

He had been preceded by three Spanish priests, who had labored for three years without success, and had left the island a few months before his arrival. The people boasted that they had driven away these "foreign devils," and that they would soon drive away this new "foreign devil" too. When Dr. Mackay landed at Tam-sui, he had difficulty in obtaining any kind of shelter. There was no inn, good, bad, or indifferent, and it seemed that there was literally no room for him in the placé. His first quarters were a small damp bath-room, which he soon exchanged for a hut or cabin that had been used for the temporary stabling of horses by an Englishman who had been engaged in the tea trade, horses not being ordinarily used in Formosa.

His first work, of course, was to learn the Chinese language. The people avoided him in general; but he went out to the hills, and learned many words from the boys herding cattle there. At first they, too, fled from him, calling him "foreign devil," and casting stones at him; but he gradually won their friendship, and found them useful teachers, while he in turn tried to teach them. As the rainy season approached, his hut proved anything but a comfortable abode. The rain, pouring down continuously, found its way through the roof in such quantities as to lay the floor under water, frequently to the depth of two feet, so that he was obliged to place several layers of boards under his mattress in order to secure a dry bed. In this miserable damp lodging he found his home for many months. Without, the hostility of the people remained unabated, or rather, grew more bitter. His

worst enemies were the *literati*, or educated portion of the people, a class answering to the Pharisees of Jerusalem in the time of our Lord. He had posted the Ten Commandments, in Chinese, on his door. The last six met with the approbation of the *literati*, but the first four they indignantly rejected. They spared no means of exciting the poor ignorant people to hatred, and even to violence. They issued vile placards, containing slanders, and used to attach these to the door of his hut. They circulated the most absurd stories concerning him, which the populace believed. They represented him as a political agent, sent to beguile the people into friendliness preparatory to a hostile descent, and as a poisoner; exciting so great a prejudice against him that he often had to walk miles inland in order to procure rice and leeks for his subsistence. The ignorant people were even made to believe that he had a long knife for cutting out their hearts, and an iron hook for pulling out their eyes, and that he spent his nights in packing them up in boxes for exportation to England for the manufacture of opium! Soldiers, sailors, and the lowest of the people, came to his hut to revile him, spit upon him, and heap upon him all kinds of insults, and two mandarins even threatened with imprisonment any who should show kindness to the "foreign dog."

Still, the solitary missionary worked on, undaunted and undiscouraged, making use of his medical skill to win by degrees the confidence of the people. As they began to understand what he could do to relieve sickness and suffering, they came to him in crowds for advice and medicine. During one summer he gave medicine to 3,000 people, and sent home appeals for another medical missionary to take charge of a hospital at Tam-sui. In 1873, he rented a house to serve as a hospital, being encouraged by the arrival of an English physician, Dr. Ringer, who gave his services gratuitously to this useful work. Another ordained medical missionary, Dr. Fraser, was sent out from Canada in 1874; and during the following year upwards of one thousand patients received medical treatment.

In the meantime, Dr. Mackay had at last the joy of finding that his persevering labors had awakened some interest in the truth which he proclaimed. A tall, stalwart, fine-looking young

man, named Giam-chheng-hoa, began to come to him, like Nicodemus, by night, to ask questions and discuss Christian doctrines, bringing his objections written out. After many such conversations, Dr. Mackay was cheered by hearing him declare that he was ready, despite the threat of death pronounced against any who should embrace the "new doctrine," to receive and follow Christ as his Saviour and Lord. The two knelt down together in Dr. Mackay's hut, and the young man prayed, with the simple and intense earnestness of a perishing man beseeching help, "O Thou, the *true* God, that I did not know a few months before, help me to know more of Thee, for I now know that these idols which our people worship cannot save. From the bottom of my heart I thank Thee for bringing Pastor Mackay to Formosa. Help him, by the Holy Spirit, to bring many to Jesus." Dr. Mackay had waited long and patiently for his first convert, but he gladly owned that the salvation of even this one soul was worth all he had endured—"worth more than the world round and round." And A-hoa has ever since proved an invaluable helper in leading his countrymen to Christ. A recent letter from Dr. Mackay's present colleague, Mr. Junor, thus refers to him: "Especially A-hoa's power in preaching, and his tact and decision of action and character are something remarkable. Any church in Canada would listen to his preaching with pleasure and profit. His advice is invaluable." With the assistance of A-hoa, after nine months of patient teaching, Dr. Mackay was enabled to put in execution his long-cherished plan of an evangelistic tour through northern Formosa. It was the rainy season, and the two men set out on their mission tour, braving the violence of the rain, for the fierce winds make it impossible to carry an umbrella, and with trousers rolled up to the knees, bare-footed often, at other times wearing basket-work sandals, of which two or three pairs are sometimes worn out in a day, as nothing else will do for the clammy sticky mud of the paths over the hills. Here, certainly, the kingdom of God came not with outward observation. And as they went on their toilsome way, from village to village and from town to town, they did not find a population waiting with outstretched arms to receive the gospel. They still

met with the same bitter hostility. The people, instigated by the *literati*, pursued them with insulting cries, pelted them with mud, and set dogs upon them, while little bands of soldiers followed them at a distance. The authorities, too, were against them. One place to which they came they found in a wild commotion, excited by noisy heathen rites then going on. Scarcely had he obtained temporary quarters, when he received a peremptory notice, in substance as follows: "You foreign devil, with your disciple, must either leave here to-morrow morning by daybreak, or stay in the house for three days; for we are going to sacrifice to our ancestors" (the principal feature of Chinese worship). Dr. Mackay promptly replied, in the spirit of the apostles in similar circumstances: "We, the worshippers of the Lord Jesus, will not leave this place by daybreak, nor will we remain in the house for three days, but, by his grace and power, will preach his everlasting gospel in your streets for several days." A-hoa readily promised to stand by him, faithful, if need were, unto death, and they held their ground, although the excited mob surrounded his house, even climbing on the roof and shouting for his destruction. Next day he preached as he had said, after dispensing medicine to those who would receive it. One of his first converts was a man who had stoned him; another of these had headed the opposition against him. The first is one of his native preachers; the second is the best elder in the place to-day.

They usually began their preaching to the people by singing a hymn in Chinese—"A Day's March nearer Home" being one of their favorites. At other times they sang the well-known paraphrase, "I'm not ashamed to own my Lord," in circumstances which gave it a special significance. As Dr. Mackay began to attract crowds to hear "the new doctrine," the *literati* were aroused to more open opposition, and challenged him to public discussion. He studied, night after night, the sacred books of the Buddhists and Confucians, and then met them in public argument. On one occasion he held a discussion before an audience of 3,000; afterwards he sang a hymn, and preached salvation, full and free in Christ. One of the leading arguers on the side of Buddhism became a convert to Christ, and has proved a most

useful preacher, carrying the gospel into the very temples of the Buddhists. Another, who had been a Confucian, was, in like manner, led to the true Saviour. He had a mother so bigoted that he feared she would kill him when she knew of his change of belief, but, through prayer and divine grace, she also was, in two months and a half, brought to confess her faith in Christ. An ambitious young man, who was studying to be a mandarin, was attended by him in sickness, and also became a convert to the Christian faith. He confessed his faith to his father, who sent him back to his studies, but he had no heart to continue them. Dr. Mackay joined with him in prayer that his father's heart might be turned from his opposition. The prayer was answered, and the father is now one of the best elders of the church in northern Formosa, while the son is a native preacher.

The missionary's medical skill was an invaluable aid to his preaching. On one occasion, in a place where they met with fierce opposition, Dr. Mackay relieved a soldier from severe toothache by extracting a tooth with a primitive instrument extemporised by him out of two sticks, when the attitude of the people immediately changed to one of friendliness. At another time, a plot was formed to throw himself and his helpers over an aqueduct; but his successful treatment of a child, whose head had been cut by a stone thrown by a performing conjuror, completely overcame their opposition, and he was soon able to preach to 9,000 people. That place is now one of his most promising mission stations, its membership increasing so fast that it must soon become self-supporting.

After visiting many villages and towns of the Chinese, Dr. Mackay, with A-hoa, daringly resolved to penetrate to the haunts of the fierce barbarian tribes in the mountains. One portion of the aborigines, the Sek-hoau, have submitted to Chinese rule, and dwell in villages over which Chinese mandarins preside. They are partially civilised, and shave their heads in token of submission, but practise no art save agriculture in its simplest form. They are, however, like the North American Indians in similar circumstances, a dying race. But the Chi-hoau, or aborigines of the mountains, are still fierce and untamed, wearing long hair,

tattooing their slender olive bodies, and blackening their teeth with betel. They are described as good-natured, frank, and faithful to each other, but hating the Chinese with a deadly hatred; occasionally rushing down upon a Chinese village to destroy, and rating the valor of their warriors by the number of *heads* they could bring home from a raid. Such religion as is to be found among them is a rude paganism, presided over by priestesses. They dwell in habitations simple, but neat and clean, built on posts of observation, for the petty tribes into which they are divided are for ever waging war among themselves.

When Dr. Mackay and his faithful A-hoa set out on their adventurous journey, the soldiers who followed them at a distance rejoiced in the expectation of their destruction. Following the mountain path that led up among the mountains, some of them 11,000 feet high, they came at last upon a party of mountaineers, who advanced threateningly towards them and covered them with their guns. Dr. Mackay thought they were about to fire upon him, when suddenly the chief dropped his weapon and drew near with his hand upon his heart. The reason for this sudden change was—they afterwards found out—that the chief had discovered, from his want of a cue, that he was not a Chinese, and therefore he claimed and protected him as a kinsman. His companion they spared for his sake. Dr. Mackay and his helper sang hymns to the savages, and then preached the gospel. Not a few converts were made among this "barbarous people," and several martyrs sealed their testimony with their blood. Four other converts belonging to a little church he had built in the woods of Mount Sylvia, were waylaid by heathen savages and beheaded. Dr. Mackay, coming up soon after, saw their headless bodies and buried them there, marking their last resting-place with a blue stone, on which was inscribed, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord."

Time would fail to tell all the interesting incidents of this apostolic mission. In training his converts to become native preachers, as in other things, Dr. Mackay followed very close in the footsteps of his Divine Example. He took them with him on his pedestrian mission-tours, in parties of from five to fifteen, teach-

ing them by the way, and expounding to them the Scriptures. Other things besides scriptural knowledge were taught in this peripatetic college. The little band would sit down together, sometimes under a shady bamboo by the way, sometimes on the rocks by the sea-shore, sometimes on the lonely mountain-side, while Dr. Mackay would give them practical instruction in the botany of the plants around them, or in the geology of the rocks, or in natural history or geography or anatomy. They were drilled, also, in systematic theology, studied Horne's "Introduction," and Boston's "Fourfold State," and became very thoroughly acquainted with the history of missions and such missionary biographies as those of Dr. Duff and W. C. Burns, whom, by the way, Dr. Mackay, in some respects, much resembles, especially in his determination to identify himself thoroughly with the people among whom he labors. Dr. Mackay has now, in all, twenty trained helpers or catechists, officiating as native pastors in as many chapels, which have been built by degrees at the various stations where the nucleus of a Christian congregation has been formed. Dr. Mackay expects that, ere long, these will all be self-supporting native congregations, leaving the resources of the mission free for the evangelisation of the still heathen portion of the island. This training of a native ministry is in every way the best for the people, as well as the most economical method of meeting their spiritual needs, since six native pastors can live on what would be necessary for the support of one foreign missionary. A few of the principal mission-stations, after Tam-sui, the headquarters, are Yokokah, Sin-kang, Chiranik, Santing-po, Toa-lung-pang, Kelung, Teck-cham, and Bang-kah.

At Tam-sui, besides the chapel, a hospital has also been built, the gift of a lady in Canada. At Kelung, near coal-mines worked by English miners, a hospital was opened in 1879, under the kind care of Dr. James Mann. Of the blessed work done by such hospitals in the cure of disease and the relief of pain, in a country where medical aid is almost unknown, it would take many pages to tell. One traveller says that the scenes he witnessed in a single day at Dr. Maxwell's hospital in Tai-wan-foo made him feel perfectly appalled, when he "reflected on the

groans of unalleviated pain which must constantly rise from the poverty-stricken millions who swarm over the plains of China."

The Rev. Dr. Fraser, Dr. Mackay's first colleague, was obliged, by the death of his wife and his own impaired health, to return to Canada, after three years' service. The Rev. Kenneth Junor went out in 1878 to assist Dr. Mackay, and, as soon as he had made sufficient progress in the language, undertook the visitation of the chapels. During the summer following his arrival, malarial fever visited the little mission band severely, cutting off the only child of Mr. and Mrs. Junor, a lovely boy of four. Dr. Mackay's own strength has been much undermined by frequent attacks of the fever, and by his constant exposure in all kinds of weather; but this is no matter for surprise, when the amount of labor undergone by him is taken into consideration. Some idea of it may be formed from the following summary, given by himself at one of his meetings. He has travelled 45,000 miles, for the most part barefooted, over hills and dales; he has ministered relief to 30,000 patients; he has extracted 10,000 teeth;—besides his more purely spiritual labors, in training native pastors, forming the nuclei of congregations, and admitting 323 persons into the Church by baptism, after long and careful instruction. Add to this the labor of learning to speak freely in such a language as the Chinese, and the whole presents a record of one man's work in eight years which is simply marvellous.

It is pleasant to be able to state that, while Dr. Mackay, in common with all missionaries, has found in the conduct of careless Englishmen abroad one of his greatest obstacles in commending Christianity to the heathen, he has also been refreshed by finding not a few examples of a very different class. Of the British consuls at Formosa he says: "Every one of them in turn was very kind to me, and they did all they could for myself and the work. I will ever feel grateful to Messrs. Frater, Baber, Allén, and Scott, all of them British consuls, for their kindness and help; also to my dear friend, Dr. Ringer, who did so much for the mission; and, indeed, to the entire foreign community for their kindness to myself during the early stages of

the mission, when any help was of value. They also showed great kindness to my students and converts. Once, when I was ill in the country, two Englishmen came to bring me food, a Chinaman carrying it in a basket." Mr. Frater's testimony concerning Dr. Mackay is thus given in his official report, dated February, 1877 :

"As I am about to leave this port, I take this opportunity to say a few words regarding the only Protestant, and, in fact, the only, mission in the north of Formosa. It was established in 1872, by the Presbyterian Church of Canada, which then sent the Rev. G. L. Mackay to this port. He has proved himself to be one of the most zealous missionaries I have ever met, and his prudence in dealing with the Chinese I cannot too highly extol. Even the Chinese officials of the district regard him as a singularly upright man, and he is adored by his converts, who are prepared to suffer much for his sake. His system of operations is unique. He has, I may almost say, no fixed place of abode, but wanders from place to place, taking with him on all such occasions a band of students, whom he instructs in science, geography, history, etc., as well as religion, and he has more than once walked with them all the way to Tai-wan-foo, in the south of the island, and back. Constant exposure to all kinds of weather has filled his system with ague, and I fear he will soon have to rest from his labors. Candidates are not admitted by him until after a probation of several years, and all such are frequently reminded by him that, though they have become members of a foreign religion, they have not ceased to be Chinese subjects. Dr. Mackay is never molested in his travels, but always finds the people friendly wherever he goes."

Soon after the arrival of the Rev. K. Junor in Formosa, he performed the pleasant duty of uniting Dr. Mackay in marriage to a Chinese lady, Kai-chhang-mia, who, of course, had been led by him to embrace Christianity. They have now two little girls, one of them born in Canada, Mrs. Mackay having accompanied her husband on his visit to his native land. Dr. Mackay has, therefore, in all respects, identified himself with the people among whom he has chosen his life-work. Mrs. Mackay, whose manner is pleasing and engaging, has already given much assistance to her husband among her own sex in Formosa, many of whom are already earnest Christians, some of them most zealous and devoted in winning others to Christ.

The contrast between North Formosa in 1872 and North Formosa in 1880 may be briefly glanced at. When Dr. Mackay

landed, it was one unbroken mass of dark heathenism and degrading superstition. *Now*, besides the 323 members of the twenty churches, there are some twenty thousand people at least partially enlightened and shaken in their allegiance to heathenism, most of whom will, doubtless, ere long, be Christians. *Then*, he was hated and scorned as a "foreign devil." *Now*, he is respected everywhere, and besides being ardently beloved by his converts, he meets with almost as much kindness from the Chinese generally as he does in Christian Canada. He expects that there will soon be in Formosa a native Church on the Presbyterian model of church government. He is collecting funds for a native college, which will train a native ministry. He rejoices in the hopeful future of Formosa, the land of his adoption, and very close to his heart. To it, hundreds of new Chinese colonists come every year, attracted by the great capabilities of the island for the growth of tea, the export of which grows immensely from year to year. Dr. Mackay speaks most warmly of the good qualities of the Chinese, their native intelligence, industry, docility, family affection, reverence for parents, which, under Christian influences, will make them a great people. He has studied the ancient writings of China, and has a profound respect for Confucius as an earnest reformer, who devoted his life to reviving among the people the moral maxims contained in the "old classics," dating back to remote antiquity, possibly to the time before the influence of the primeval revelation had been wholly lost. He eloquently denounces the cruel injustice done to the Chinese by England and America, at home and abroad, while the success of his labors alone is sufficient to scatter to the winds the infamous figment of unbelieving minds that the Chinese cannot be Christianised. Dr. Mackay is determined, by God's grace, to show its falsity still further, by winning Formosa, *as a whole*, for Christ. He walks by faith, finding him faithful who hath promised. Why should not greater wonders be done in his name?

AGNES M. MACHAR.

ARTICLE II.

THE LORD'S DAY, AND NOT THE JEWISH SABBATH.

BY THE LATE REV. JOHN BEVERIDGE.

No. I.

INTRODUCTION.

It has long been a disputed point among Christians, whether the Lord's day, commonly called the Christian Sabbath, is, or is not, a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath into the Christian or New Covenant system, merely changing the day of the week and suppressing the death penalty attached to it under the Old Covenant. At the present time, a large majority of evangelical Christians firmly believe that the Jewish Sabbath has been transferred to the Christian system, while a very small minority believe the Lord's day to be an institution peculiar to the New Covenant, and an outgrowth of the New Testament system, similar to the gospel ministry, and in intimate connexion with it, and yet no more of a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath than the gospel ministry is a transfer of the Levitical priesthood; both of these being but a shadow or prophecy of the corresponding institutions of the New Covenant.

The author of the following articles, after a careful examination of the claims of both parties, has decided in favor of the minority, finding himself fully convinced that they are in possession of the truth. He cordially invites fair and honest criticism, either to confirm him in the truth, or clearly indicate where his line of argument departs from the solid basis of the inspired oracles. From all those critics who condemn without examination, merely because his views are not those of the majority of professing Christians, or not in accordance with the opinions of illustrious teachers who are as liable to error as himself, he asks no sympathy, and expects none from that Judaising class who are ever ready to exclaim: "Except ye be circumcised after the

manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." To the cause of truth the condemnation of such men is far preferable to their praise.

On referring to the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, it will be observed that the Westminster divines left the question undecided. It says: "The fourth commandment requireth of all men the sanctifying or keeping holy to God such set times as he hath appointed in his word, expressly one whole day in seven; which was the seventh from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, and the first day of the week ever since, and so to continue to the end of the world; which is the Christian Sabbath, and in the New Testament called the Lord's day." The designation "Christian Sabbath" here, would indicate a distinction between this and the Jewish Sabbath.

In accepting the position that the Lord's day is not a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, the author has the satisfaction of knowing that he has at least one illustrious Presbyterian in his favor—John Calvin.

Calvin says: "If superstition is dreaded, there was more danger in keeping the Jewish Sabbath than the Lord's day, as Christians now do. It being expedient to overthrow superstition, the Jewish holy day was abolished; and as a thing necessary to retain decency, order, and peace in the Church, *another day* was appointed for that purpose."—*Calvin's Institutes*, Book 2, Chap. 8, Sec. 33. Calvinists of the present day appear to have departed from the views of Calvin, probably owing to the loose manner in which the Lord's day is observed in those portions of Continental Europe where the Reformation was first established by Calvin and Luther. It is usually supposed that these views lead to a disrespect of the Lord's day, and consequently should be deprecated. This is not right. We should not depart from the truth of God's word because ignorant or wicked men abuse it. The author of these articles would not detract one particle from the proper observance of the Lord's day, as required by the Sacred Scriptures, and would rejoice to see the day observed and respected far more than it is, by the great majority of evangelical Christians of the present day: his only object in presenting his

views to the world being a desire to know and teach the truth as revealed by God's word, and not erroneous views based upon human prejudice or tradition. But was Calvin right? Were his views of the Lord's day in accordance with Scripture? Was he not in error on this point? Have not his disciples become wiser than their teacher? It is hoped that these questions may be answered satisfactorily in this investigation.

The author has chosen as a clear exposition of the views he combats, a prize essay entitled "The Holy Sabbath," and published by the "Presbyterian Committee of Publication," from which he has taken the liberty of making frequent extracts. In doing this, he wishes to say that he has no desire to depreciate his brethren in the ministry, but, by pointing out their errors, he would desire that we may all grow in knowledge as well as in grace, till we arrive "in the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," and by "speaking the truth in love, we may grow up into him in all things."

THERE IS NO COMMAND GIVEN TO MEN TO OBSERVE THE JEWISH SABBATH BEFORE THE EXODUS FROM EGYPT.

The first record we have of the Seventh day is in connexion with the creation of the world. "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. ii. 2, 3. There is certainly no command here to men to keep the day holy. This is merely an historical record, telling us that God rested after completing the work of creation. Nor are we told how long he rested. Did he rest one day of twenty-four hours and then resume the work of creation? No one will answer this in the affirmative. Did he on the eighth day resume the work of supporting and sustaining the creation which he had made? If so, what became of the creation on the seventh day? It is universally admitted that, were God to withdraw his sustaining power from the universe but for a single moment, it

would be utterly annihilated. This power, then, was exercised on the seventh day, according to our Saviour's words: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

We find ourselves, then, compelled to accept the conclusion that the seventh day, or day following the six days of creation, was not a literal day of twenty-four hours, but a period—a day in creation's history, reaching from the end of the six days in which creation was brought into existence, down to the morning of redemption, when a still more holy day was ushered in.

Now, as geologists have proved as clearly that the world was not created in six literal days, as geographers have that the world is a globe and not an extended plain, and the Church universal has accepted this view, (except a few, who would have us believe that God created the world with its great mountain ranges largely composed of countless millions of sea-shells, which would be as absurd as to suppose that he created the pyramids of Egypt in the same way, only to try men's faith), we can have no doubt but the seventh day is a period reaching from the time when he created man, and that then looking upon everything that he had made, he pronounced it good; down to that hour when the work of redemption was completed, and the Second Adam exclaimed from the cross, "It is finished."

We are told that at the commencement of this period, "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made," and then, towards its close, prophecy points forward to its termination and says: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy." Dan. ix. 24.

"God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." He blessed and sanctified it in an especial manner. The six periods in which God created all things, were but preliminary to that period in which man should dwell upon earth. He blessed it by walking with man in the beginning, and sanctified it by coming himself clothed in human flesh to redeem man from the curse of the

fall. God blessed and sanctified the seventh day of the world's creation ; but does this prove that he commanded man to observe the seventh day of the week ?

There is absolutely no command given to men in the Bible to observe the seventh day of the week before the exodus from Egypt, nor is there any passage of Scripture from which such an inference can be derived ; and any assertion to the contrary is pure assumption. If any such command had been given, Moses would certainly have recorded it ; or are we to assume that he did record it, and that the Jews lost it out of the Bible ? Give us proofs, and we will believe them ; but mere assertions without proof are of no value. To assert that "the great Creator should in some way demand of his creatures a formal acknowledgment of their fealty to his throne ; that he should seek to bind them to himself by levying a tribute upon their love and affection ; that he should appoint a place and designate a time when he would condescend to meet them, and graciously admit them to communion with himself ; that he should select for this purpose the day of his resting from his creative work ; and that he should hallow the day thus selected, by separating it from all the rest, and making it holy as he is holy, that it might thus ever stand as a perpetual witness for him," would be all well and good, if we had any proof to that effect. To assert that God would not abandon his creatures without giving them the Sabbath day from the beginning, merely because our finite views thus deal with his character, would also assert that a holy God would not abandon his creatures to sin. The latter we know is not true, and the former is equally deficient of proof. It has no basis in Scripture, and to our own finite reasoning we have no right to appeal.

We know that God walked with the patriarchs, and no doubt taught them to obey his will by verbal communications ; and we also know that he had his servants who, like Noah, were preachers of righteousness, or, in other words, teachers of the Moral Law ; and thus have good reason to infer that he required of his children a proper portion of their time in consecration to himself, a first fruits, as it were, of that day which he had blessed and

sanctified, and which the patriarchs doubtlessly gave him; but this is vastly different from a direct command to keep holy the Jewish typical Sabbath day. The former we admit from inference; the latter we deny.

INSTITUTION OF THE JEWISH SABBATH.

That the Jewish Sabbath was given to the Jewish nation, or rather nation of Israel, and not to the world, is plainly evident to any one who will carefully read the history of its institution as recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. On the evening of the fifteenth day of the second month of the Jewish sacred year, the Israelites arrived in the wilderness of Sin, weary with the day's march through the desert, and having exhausted the unleavened bread which they carried out of Egypt, and which had now lasted them thirty days, counting from the morning of the day in which the Passover lamb was killed, and fearing that they would all perish there in the desert, they murmured against Moses and Aaron. Then we are told that the Lord said unto Moses, "Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." Then according to this promise quails were given them in the evening and manna in the morning, until the sixth day. "And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man: and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning." Our English version here would rather indicate, that what Moses tells them that the Lord said, had been said sometime before; but such is not the case. The true rendering is, "This is *what* the Lord said," now revealed to the people for the first time. Then when the seventh day had arrived, "Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a

sabbath [not THE sabbath] unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the sabbath, in it there shall be none."

Here we have the institution of the Jewish Sabbath, which in its institution is denominated "*a sabbath,*" and henceforth called "the sabbath." Then we read, that in direct violation of this commandment *some* of the people went out on the seventh day to gather manna, and found none. Then the Lord said unto Moses, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" (Other versions say, "Till when do you not wish to keep my commandments and my laws?") "See, for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day."

Here, then, we have a record of the institution of the Jewish Sabbath, instituted among and for the Jews; a commandment given to the Jewish nation, and not to the world. Those who maintain that the Christian Lord's day is the Jewish Sabbath transferred into the Christian system, contend that it was given to the whole world from the beginning, and that this is but an historical record enforcing its observance. The writer of the prize essay, "*The Holy Sabbath,*" quotes the first half of the twenty-third verse of this chapter: "To-morrow is the sabbath of the Lord;" and then adds: "This is not the language of a legislator, but of an historian, and the whole context shows that it was not a new, but simply the revival of an old statute that had fallen into disuse."—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 29. The writer is undoubtedly in error here. The whole context clearly indicates that it was the giving of a new law, and not the revival of an old one. The command: "Eat to-day; for to-day is a sabbath unto the Lord;" like the whole of the context, contains not only a law regulating the gathering of the manna, *but also an authoritative appointment of a day of rest.* Moses tells the people: "The Lord hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you the bread of two days;" which proves clearly that the Jewish Sabbath was a new institution given with the bread, and that the manna, or its equivalent, and

the day of rest are so intimately united that they cannot be divorced. "So the people rested on the seventh day:" that is, because the bread of two days had been given them. This is the first record of any people resting on the seventh day, and we are not left in doubt as to the reason why they did this and why God commanded them to do so. The Sabbath day was given to the Jews because God gave them food from heaven for six days, doubling the supply on the sixth. The confirmations of this day with other and more important reasons for observing it, will be examined in their proper place. If the observance of the Jewish Sabbath is an old statute, we should be pleased to see more potent proof of it than can be derived from the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. Until such proof is forthcoming, we shall believe as we now do, that it was first given and only given to the Jews and not to the world.

THE PROPHETIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE JEWISH SABBATH IN THE DESERT.

The author of the prize essay, after referring to the manner in which the Sabbath is interlaced in all the symbolisms of Scripture, says: "This recurrence is just as noticeable in the *typical development of Scripture*. That development is in septenary cycles. Seven is the archetypal number, and seven periods the archetypal cycle, in typical cosmogony. Thus the seventh seal contains the seven trumpets, and the seventh trumpet contains the seven vials. Seven days bring on the Sabbath, seven weeks the pentecost, seven months the atonement, seven years the sabbatic year, seven sabbatic years the jubilee, seven thousand years the millenary period, as is generally believed, and for aught we know the seventh millenary period will be the dawn of heaven, the final everlasting jubilee."—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 10. Excepting perhaps the latter part of this quotation, that referring to the millennium, it contains a very important truth. Let us see how well it applies to the institution of the Jewish Sabbath in the desert.

The Jewish nation may be considered to be a type of the whole world from the death of Christ to the end of time. The exodus

from Egypt may, then, well represent God's calling a people to himself through Christ, either by the preaching of the word to adults, or as in the case of infants by being born under gospel influences. The cold, hard unleavened bread which they brought with them from Egypt, is that innocence of childhood (the innocence of ignorance) which Paul knew before the commandment came.—Rom. vii. 9–11. This can but barely sustain life, and that but for a short time. It gradually grows harder and more mouldy until it finally disappears altogether, and we are brought face to face with Moses and Aaron, the representatives of the Law and the Sacrifice; where we are found murmuring at our sad condition. The promise is then given us and immediately fulfilled of bread from heaven. Christ himself is the true bread from heaven, but he was not given to the Israelites in the form of the Holy Comforter at the same time that the law was given. The sacrifices were first instituted, and then the prophecies given; a temporary bread, which could afford life only for the time being, but which would disappear before the coming of the true bread. A double supply of these, however, was given, in the teachings of John the Baptist and the disciples of Christ, and of Christ himself in the flesh, before the rest of the Holy Comforter was instituted. And so it is with us through the journey of life; as the hard unleavened bread of the world passes away, we find ever increasing consolation in God's word, till we are about to leave the world, and then comes a double supply, and we enter into rest. These six days are prophetic days, and if multiplied by seven, give us forty-two. Counting from the tenth day of the first month, when the Passover lamb was chosen (Ex. xii. 3), to the twenty-second day of the second month, that on which the Jewish Sabbath was first instituted, including both the first and last of these two days, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, we have just forty-two days; or omitting these two days, we have forty. In like manner after journeying forty years in the desert, stopping at just forty-two stations, the whole nation arrives at the land of Canaan, and *rests* from the toils and weary wanderings in the desert. Here the manna, which had furnished them with food through these long years, suddenly ceases, and they partake of the fresh fruits of the land.

But the Jewish Sabbath is not discontinued when the Jews enter Canaan. A law had already been given which confirms its continuance till the true manna and the true rest should come. On the contrary, in connexion with this, another Sabbath was now to be established, a yearly Sabbath, which was not given to the world, nor to Israel in the desert, but was confined alone to Canaan. "And the Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep a sabbath unto the Lord. Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard and gather in the fruit thereof: but in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the Lord: thou shalt neither sow thy field nor prune thy vineyard." And in connexion with this was also established the Jubilee, which, like the former, belonged alone to the land of Canaan, and not to the world.—Lev. xxv. These Canaanitish Sabbaths were an outgrowth of the condition of the Jews in their own land, and ceased to exist when Canaan ceased to be a type of God's kingdom, just as the Jewish Sabbath ceased to exist when the family of Jacob ceased to be the typical kingdom of God, in the coming of the Saviour, not of Israel, but of the world.

Now just as the Jewish Sabbath was instituted forty-two days after the Passover lamb was chosen and the nation entered into the rest of Canaan after forty-two journeys in the desert; so the Son of man came after forty-two generations had passed away from Abraham according to Matthew's genealogy; and forty from David according to Luke. That true bread from heaven of which the manna was an imperfect type, if type at all, gives, not life to the body, but life to the soul, sent not to the typical Jew, but to the Christian world; not to give a rest after the labor of gathering it, but to give a rest from sin. The Shadow has passed away now; the Body, Christ, has come.

Some critics have supposed that Luke, writing for the Gentile church, speaking of the ascension of our Lord as occurring forty days after his resurrection (Acts i. 3), did not use the Jewish mode of reckoning, which would give forty-two days, counting

the day he arose and the day he ascended. If this is true, the forty-second day would fall upon a Jewish Sabbath, a most appropriate day for the completion of our Lord's entire work upon earth. That our Lord ascended from earth to heaven on the Jewish Sabbath, and not on Thursday according to the old almanacs, can hardly be doubted; otherwise Luke would not have been so careful to tell us that the place where he ascended was a Sabbath day's journey from Jerusalem.—(See *Alford on Acts*, i. 12.)

The words of the prophet Hosea: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt," being a prophecy of future events, are not as applicable to ancient Israel as to the present Israel of God, or those who are called by his word, as it is revealed to us in the Old and New Testaments. Those who are born of religious parents are called out of Egypt in infancy, when the manna, the "milk of the word," is fed to them by their parents in childhood. The manna does not appear to be so much a type of Christ in the Holy Comforter, promised before and sent down after his ascension, that "strong meat" which Paul speaks of (Heb. v. 12);—but a type of the word as taught before regeneration; something coming from heaven, yet through a human instrumentality, and not directly from the Father as were the teachings of the Holy Spirit; something that if abused might become corrupted (Ex. xvi. 20), yet of which a double supply was to be secured in preparation for that rest when the Holy Spirit by regeneration becomes our teacher.

"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Then said they [the Jews] unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."—John vi. 32–35.

Now we well know that what Moses gave was the *law*, and that which frees us from the law is the gospel. The law condemns to death; the gospel gives life. We now see the full meaning of Christ's words: "I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which

cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die."—John vi. 48–50. The Jewish Sabbath, then, is typical of that rest under the gospel which frees us from the fear of death.

It is usually supposed that the manna was a type of Christ. This can hardly be true. If it were, it would not become filled with worms, nor would the gathering of it be prohibited on the Sabbath day. Again, the manna ceased when the Israelites entered Canaan. Does Christ's presence leave us when we enter into the rest of his kingdom? Paul refers to a spiritual food of which the Israelites partook on the night in which they passed through the Red Sea (1 Cor. x. 3, 4), but then Paul tells us that that spiritual food was Christ himself, and not the material manna which fell in the desert. It would rather appear, then, that as Moses gave the law, and the manna was not given by Moses, but rained from heaven, it was a type of something that would give life for the time being, but would disappear when the true bread came which giveth life to the world. Now, if the gospel is the true bread *rained from heaven* (Deut. xxxii. 2), then the spiritual manna which precedes the gospel must be the ceremonial law and the prophecies, occupying an intermediate position between the moral law and the gospel, and yet being in reality but an introduction to the gospel. The ceremonial law is fulfilled, and the prophecies cease to be given, after the true bread of Canaan, the gospel, comes. Yet on the last day, that period when our Saviour walked the earth clothed in human flesh, there was a double supply given in the parables which he spake and the miracles which he performed.

CONFIRMATION OF THE JEWISH SABBATH IN THE GIVING OF
THE LAW.

"Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore

the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." Here we have the Jewish Sabbath confirmed to the Jewish people, and a second reason given why they should observe it. That reason is, that in six days God rested from his work and rested on the seventh and blessed it. The cause as stated here, is the glory and magnificence of the day of rest after the labor of creation, prophetic of Christ's rest after the labor of redeeming a world, and of our rest through him after having toiled through the Old Covenant and resting in the New.

No one can doubt for a moment that this commandment was given to the Jews. But it is maintained that it was not given to them alone. They tell us, "It was set at the beginning, and was clearly intended for Adam and his posterity. Hence the 'stranger within the gates,' the representative of the whole outside world, was also required to keep the law."—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 27. It is rather difficult to understand how the stranger within the gate can be a representative of the outside world before the gate is opened to the Gentiles. When Christ comes, who himself is the *gate*, and by the sacrifice of the cross opens the door to the Gentile world, then the Gentiles will be admitted into his kingdom. We find no proof here that God gave the Jewish Sabbath to the world.

Now, if we turn to the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, we will learn the reason why this day was given especially to the Israelites. We have already learned when it was given, and why it was to be observed as a holy day, and here we have God's own word as to why it was given to typical Israel. After repeating the Fourth Commandment, he adds: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; THEREFORE *the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day.*" As God rested after the work of creation, so he commanded the children of Israel to observe a day of rest from the toil and affliction of Egypt. Exodus xx. 11, tells us why the day was blessed and hallowed, and Deut. v. 15, tells us why it was given to the Israelites.

But an argument in favor of the transfer of the Jewish Sab-

bath is deduced from the fact that "*it was formally incorporated in the moral law.*" We quote again: "The Ten Commandments were spoken in an audible voice, by the Lord himself, from the summit of Mount Sinai, in the audience of the people. They were then written with his own fingers upon enduring tables of stone. They were then by his express command deposited in the ark of the covenant, directly under the overshadowing mercy seat, the symbolic throne of the Most High, indicative of the fact that they constituted the foundation of that throne; 'and heaven and earth shall pass away before one jot or tittle of that law shall in any wise fail.'"—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 32. Can it be possible? We read this sentence again and again, but there can be no doubt about its meaning. It certainly means just what the words express. We find it upon the page of a prize essay for which the sum of two hundred dollars was awarded by a committee appointed for the purpose, and it was chosen from one hundred and eight manuscripts, at least so the prefatory notice informs us. It is written by a prominent minister of the Presbyterian Church, and published by a Presbyterian Committee of Publication. There can be no doubt about it, and yet how much error it contains. The quotation "and heaven and earth shall pass away before one jot or tittle of that law shall in any wise fail," is nowhere to be found in the New Testament. Christ says, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." (Matt. xxiv. 35; Mark xiii. 31; Luke xxi. 33.) But then he means by "my words," his own gospel, in contradistinction to the passing away of the whole Jewish economy which he has just described under the symbolic language of sun, moon, and stars, and which did pass away when the veil of the temple was rent at the hour of his death on the cross. Again he says: "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, *till all be fulfilled.*" Matt. v. 18. This is simply a declaration that the law is binding until fulfilled, and no longer. When fulfilled, it ceases to exist. The passage from which these words were probably intended to be a quotation are to be found in Luke xvi. 16–18. The whole passage reads: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the

kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. *And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail.* Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." The declaration here is, that it is *easier* for heaven and earth to pass, not that they *shall pass away before* the law is fulfilled. The very point of the law which Christ is here talking about, *adultery*, is one that must be fulfilled, and consequently pass away, before the heavens and the earth. When the author of *The Holy Sabbath* penned these words, he never dreamed that he was misquoting the Scriptures in order to prove an error. It is the natural result of an entire misconception of the relations sustained by the Old and New Covenants. The author's heart is right, but he has failed to obtain a distinct perception of the line of demarcation between the Old and New Covenants, and stumbling over the word *mercy-seat* in our version, which is a mis-translation of the *propitiatory* of the ark or symbolical covering of sin (Psalms xxxii. 1) in the bosom of Christ Jesus, he at once supposed that it was a symbol of God's throne. Are the Ten Commandments the foundation of God's eternal throne? Throughout the whole Mosaic ritual, the whole symbolism of the Mosaic law is accompanied by blood; blood poured out, blood sprinkled, blood mingled with running water, blood everywhere, indicative that the moral law invariably condemns to death. The universal language of Scripture, whether in symbol, prophecy, or epistle, is that there is no life in the moral law. "Salvation is of the Jews" only, as the ceremonial law and prophecy adumbrate the gospel. We may well inquire, then, whether a law whose empire is universal death can be the throne of him in whose presence death shall never come. Why, even here upon earth, we are told that "the sting of death is the law," but death is disarmed of its sting by the gospel. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." We read in the New Covenant of a "*throne of grace*," but not of a throne based on the moral law. Will any one tell us that the command, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife," is one of the pillars of the eter-

nal throne in a kingdom where they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels? We read of the *everlasting gospel*, but nowhere do we read of the *everlasting law*. The members of the New Covenant Church are spoken of as "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone," but they are nowhere represented as being built upon Moses. Moses' disciples belong to the covenant of works, not that of grace. Not the name of Moses, but "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb," appear upon the foundation stones of the wall of jasper.

Are we still to be under the Mosaic law written upon tablets of stone when we arrive at home in heaven? Is that throne, which shall shelter us then, to be based on the Ten Commandments? Does not our state of probation end when we pass from earth to heaven? Of what use are the Ten Commandments in a world where there can be no sin? Do the Scriptures teach that God's throne is based on the Ten Commandments, or is it but a *baseless* tradition?

We do not deny but there is a moral law given to the universe, written, "not in tablets of stone," but in "fleshly tablets of the heart," which is eternal; but the Jewish Sabbath forms no part of it, any more than a piece of canvas on which is painted a portrait of Martin Luther forms a part of Luther's body and soul. The Ten Commandments spoken in an audible voice from the summit of a typical mountain, in the ears of a typical people, and engraven upon tablets of material stone, and then laid away in a typical ark—which, with all its contents and appurtenances, except the Shekinah, was afterwards doubtless destroyed (tradition to the contrary) by the enemies of Israel and of Israel's God—are vastly different from the moral law given by God to the universe. A Jewish Sabbath given to a typical nation in remembrance of a rest from carnal bondage, and a type of a rest from sin, is immeasurably different from its own antitype. In Christ we enjoy the antitype, and will for ever. To keep one day in seven holy, in memory of a rest from sin through the resurrection of Christ from the dead, is part of the moral law; but even this must pass away when we enter that holy Jerusalem where

there is no priesthood, no altar, no temple, and no gospel ministry, and where all eternity (not time) is equally holy. To observe one day in seven, in memory of a nation's escape from carnal slavery, let that nation be Jew or pagan, is not an everlasting law.

The ark of the covenant was a type of Christ's human nature. In his bosom was hid the law. He alone of the woman's seed has kept the law in all its purity. Christ was "made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law;" and when redeemed, they are dead to the law even here in this life. To be redeemed from under the law is to be redeemed from the penalty of the law, and that penalty is death; and shall those who are heirs of eternal life be for ever beneath the shade of a throne whose very foundation stones speak of nothing but universal death? Impossible! The Shekinah dwelling between the cherubim was a type of the Holy Spirit dwelling in Christ, and which descended in visible form upon him at his birth, in the form of the star which the wise men followed from the East, and in the form of a dove on the day of his baptism at the hands of John the Baptist. Christ kept the law for man through life, and annihilated it for him through eternity.

IF THE JEWISH SABBATH IS TRANSFERRED TO THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, WE ARE MORALLY BOUND TO KEEP IT AS THE JEWS WERE REQUIRED TO DO.

If our Lord's day is but a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, then we should observe it with the same care and attention that the Jews were required to do by the Mosaic law. In the history of creation we read: "The evening and the morning were the first day." We well know that the Jewish Sabbath commenced at sunset Friday evening, and ended at sunset Saturday evening. Now if this were a part of the moral law, and in memory of the "evening and morning" of the seventh day of creation, we should be strict in its observance, and not commence the day at twelve o'clock Saturday night, and end at twelve o'clock Sunday night, as we now do.

Again, we should observe Saturday and not Sunday, as we

now do. To this it is answered that the apostles changed the day. They did! Where is the *proof* of it? The *apostles* changed the day? And who were the apostles? If the apostles changed the day, then they are superior to Moses. If the apostles changed the day, then they had a right to demolish the day and substitute another day. Changing seven to eight by the apostles is a failing of a pretty big "jot" long *before* the heavens and the earth have passed away. If the apostles made this change, then there must have been something in the law that has been fulfilled. But did the apostles change the day? Let us examine the proof they give us. They present passages of Scripture which speak of the apostles as meeting on the first day of the week; breaking bread, etc., on the first day of the week. We may accept these passages merely for the inference that may be derived from them in favor of the observance of the Lord's day instead of the Jewish Sabbath; but in the absence of something more positive, they prove nothing. We say they prove nothing, from the very fact that inferences may be derived from other passages of Scripture, equally as valid, that the apostles observed the Jewish Sabbath. Just as Christ had been in the habit of "standing up to read" in the Jewish synagogue on the Sabbath day, so the apostles went into the synagogues and preached on the Sabbath day. Paul "reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Acts xviii. 4. His historian says of him, that at Philippi, "on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." Acts xvi. 13. At Antioch, he and his companions "went into the synagogue on the sabbath day" and preached to the people, and at the close of his discourse the people invited them to come the next Sabbath. Then we are told: "And the next sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." Acts xiii. 14-44. At Thessalonia, "Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures." Acts xvii. 2. Now, if in any of these meetings they had continued their preaching until sundown, and had then partaken of bread, as it would be natural they should do after the

toils of the day; or celebrated their communion or breaking of bread, as Christ did with his disciples after partaking of the pass-over, and as the apostles probably often did, it would have been recorded by the sacred historian as having been done on the first day of the week, as sundown Saturday evening closed the Jewish Sabbath. Now, the proof in favor of the Jewish Sabbath being transferred to the New Covenant, and then changed by the apostles to the first day of the week, is so extremely slender that we feel that we are guilty of no heresy if we abandon that view altogether.

The Lord's day we believe to be established by a higher authority than either the apostles or Moses, even by him who is Lord of the Sabbath day.

If the Jewish Sabbath has been transferred to Christianity, we are morally bound to observe it as the Jews did, and the man who does not do so should be put to death. The writer says: "The only part that strictly belonged to the state was the death penalty, which was afterwards added, and which has been repealed, being no part of the original law."—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 30. By whom was it repealed? Did the apostles do it? If so, when? Where is the record? The *death penalty* for murder is no part of the original law written upon the tablets of stone. Was that repealed at the same time? By whom?

Again, no beast was permitted to perform any labor on the Jewish Sabbath. No manservant nor maidservant, and no Gentile who was temporarily stopping at the house of a Jew, for so the phrase "stranger that is within thy gates" is to be understood, were permitted to do any work whatever. "In it thou shalt not do any work." No fire was allowed to be kindled, no food was allowed to be purchased or even prepared on that day. The command was very strict. "On the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death."—Ex. xxxv. 2. Even a man found gathering sticks on that day was commanded to be stoned. "And" they "stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses." Num. xv. 32-36. Nor was this all. We read in the New Testament, as the kingdom of God (not the Jewish nation)

was verging on toward the New Covenant, of a Sabbath day's journey, but the ancient law says, "Let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." Now, will you tell us that that was a law given to the world and not to a nation? Will you tell us that the Esquimaux in his snow hut must not kindle a fire on the seventh day to prepare his food; but that he must take it frozen as hard as a rock or perish with hunger? No. The very demands of the New Covenant that we should not forget the assembling of ourselves together, prove that not only the death penalty, but the Jewish law itself, in the ceremonial and national part of it, is fulfilled by the establishment of the New Covenant.

But you plead works of necessity. Necessity? We would rather hear you plead a God of reason and of justice, whose laws can be obeyed without inconvenience by all classes and conditions of men, than to see you resort to such miserable subterfuges as this. If the Jewish law is binding now, why do you not obey it? If the Jewish Sabbath, as given and observed in the desert, is binding on Christians to-day, then our evangelical Churches are a band of Sabbath breakers. You ride to church on your horses and in your carriages, and you return to a warm dinner, prepared by the "stranger within your gate," (if your cook happens to be a foreigner,) and you complacently tell us that the only thing about this law that is repealed is the death penalty. Will you tell us that you feel yourself free to break God's holy law with impunity, merely because the Jewish nation does not possess the power to enforce the death penalty? Or, do these infringements on the law written on *tablets of stone*, come under the category of works of mercy and necessity? Look the stubborn fact squarely in the face, and then tell us whether these are works of mercy and necessity any more than the gathering of manna by the Israelites in the desert, or the gathering of sticks to cook it with? Works of mercy and necessity, indeed! If it is your law, obey it. Will you charge us with heresy because we deny that the Jewish Sabbath is binding on Christians? Then you will permit us to charge you with being a band of Sabbath-breakers, and according to *your own law* you should be stoned till you are dead.

THE SABBATH MADE FOR MAN, AND NOT MAN FOR THE SABBATH.

“We have the emphatic declaration of the Master himself that ‘the sabbath was made for man,’ not for the Jew only, or for the Hottentot or Arabian or any other one nation or people, but for man universally.”—*The Holy Sabbath*, page 28. Will any candid unprejudiced mind read the second chapter of Mark, and the fifth chapter of Luke from the thirty-sixth verse to the twelfth verse of the sixth chapter, and then tell us that the idea Christ wished to convey to the minds of his hearers when he pronounced the above words was, that the Jewish Sabbath was made for *all men*, and not alone for the Jew, when he himself, before their very eyes, broke the Jewish Sabbath, and was here defending his disciples for having done so? The passage, in connexion with its context, proves just the reverse of what is intended in the above quotation. Christ had again and again broken the Jewish ceremonial law: when he sat at the table with lepers, put his hands on a corpse, allowed ceremonially impure women to fondle and caress his feet, and his disciples to prepare food on the Sabbath day. The scribes and Pharisees could not believe him to be the Messiah unless he observed the law of Moses. But he gives them to understand that the kingdom of God was coming—a new creation, and not a patch sewed upon an old garment; that the Jewish law, like an old leather bottle, was now worthless when the old wine was exhausted; but new bottles must be prepared for the wine of the New Covenant; and then he tells them that “The sabbath was made for man and not man for the sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.” Can anything be plainer than this? The Sabbath being made for man, and he being the Lord of the Sabbath, as well as of the whole Mosaic law, has a right to dispose of the Sabbath as he thinks best. If he chooses to set the Jewish Sabbath aside by the establishment of the kingdom of heaven, he has a perfect right to do so. The very fact that he breaks the Jewish ceremonial law, is proof that he is Lord of that law; and establishes his Messiahship, although the short-sighted Pharisees could not see it. It is a sad misquotation of Scripture that would force this passage to do service in defence of the universality of the Jewish Sabbath. “The sabbath was made for

man," and when man's representative shall come in the power and glory of his kingdom, then he will give that true rest, of which the Jewish Sabbath is but an imperfect shadow.

THE NEW COVENANT IS NOT A PATCH ON AN OLD GARMENT.

"Let it first be asserted that if the day was intended for the Jews," says the author of *The Holy Sabbath*, page 25, "then for that very reason it must still exist, for they are still the people of the Lord, cast off for a time, it is true, but not for ever; for they are yet to be brought back into the fold of their covenant-keeping God (Rom. xi. 25). The covenant with Israel is an everlasting covenant. If the Sabbath is the sign of that covenant, it, too, must be a perpetual sign. Besides, 'he is not a Jew who is one outwardly.' If the covenant be transferred to believers, and now confirmed unto them as the spiritual children of Israel, it must still remain the same everlasting covenant, and as such must retain the same perpetual sign." That we may know how well the above corresponds with the language of Scripture, let us turn to Jeremiah xxxi. 31, and read, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord; but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people." This prophecy is now being continually fulfilled in the regeneration of the Christian Gentiles, and has no reference to the people called Jews, of the present day. Paul, after quoting these words, adds: "In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."—Heb. viii. And yet the writer tells us that "the covenant made with Israel is an everlasting covenant." If he had told us that the new covenant made with the regenerated Israel of God, and which is now being gathered into the spiritual Canaan from among all nations, is an "everlasting covenant, even

the sure mercies of David," (Isa. lv. 3,) he would then have told us what is perfectly true. Prophecies to the same effect may be found throughout the fifty-fourth and fifty-fifth chapters of Isaiah, in Ezek. xxxvi. 25-38, and many other portions of the Old Testament, referring to the New Covenant, not established with the old typical Israel, but with the antitype, the true Israel of God; not born of the flesh, but born of God's Holy Spirit—proving that "the everlasting covenant" in Christ's blood is the covenant made with God's true Israel redeemed from sin, and not the covenant made with the typical Israel relieved from Egyptian bondage.

The author of *The Holy Sabbath*, like many other well meaning but misinformed theologians, is lost in the fog of old Judaism. He thinks that because there is a people in the world claiming to be the carnal seed of Abraham, and that although Christ told them that they were of their own father the devil, yet in some way "they are still the people of the Lord," and then he misquotes Rom. xi. 25 in support of his erroneous views. He might as well have quoted the next verse, "And so all Israel shall be saved," to prove that no Jew could be lost, as to quote this to prove that the Jews are still the people of the Lord. In Paul's time the temple was still standing with all the sacrifices and ordinances connected with it. The gospel, according to our Lord's command, was first to be preached to the Jews, and every possible effort was made by the apostles to win them to Christ. The "remnant" which was to be saved, spoken of by the prophets, did embrace Christianity; some of them, as did the Ebionite Jews, continuing to observe the ceremonies of the Old Covenant in connexion with faith in Christ. But when the temple was destroyed and the sacrifice taken away, Old Israel ceased to be the typical people of God. Rejecting the Prophet like unto Moses, (Deut. xviii. 15: Acts iii. 22,) as presented to them in the gospel by the preaching of the apostles, they were spiritually destroyed, and as God's people were completely annihilated, (Acts iii. 22, 23,) and henceforward were no more heirs of God's kingdom, any more than any other Gentile nation. Virtually they became Gentiles, and in the eyes of God occupy the same position to-day that the Laplanders and Japanese do. They are not heirs of the New

Covenant, for they have never entered into it; and they are not heirs of the Old, for they have broken it. There is not a promise in the Bible that is not an heritage of the converted Gentile as much as of the converted Jew, and without conversion to Christ there are no promises to either. To the Jew out of Christ, there are no other promises than those to all other members of Satan's kingdom, that they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." The assumption that the Jews are to return to the literal Jerusalem, and that the Old Covenant is to be established with them, is a most dangerous error, and contrary to all the teachings of God's word. The only door to Canaan to-day is Christ, and the Jew who enters Christ is as much in Canaan in the pork-killing city of Cincinnati as he would be in Jerusalem; and should he go to Jerusalem with the superstitious idea that by doing so he would enter the kingdom of Israel, it would be a most positive proof that he was going to Satan in search of the kingdom of God. All prophecies concerning the restoration of the kingdom of Israel and the gathering of the dispersed among all nations, must have their fulfilment in the antitype and not in the type.

Paul, in the third chapter of Galatians, compares the Jewish nation to a school and the law to a schoolmaster. Now a schoolmaster may write on his blackboard laws for the use of his pupils while they are in his school, but when they pass out of his school they are no longer under *his laws*, and yet the system of morality which the schoolmaster's laws were designed to teach them, is of infinitely more importance. This is the reality, of which the schoolmaster's laws are only the shadow. The schoolmaster prepares his pupils for a higher destiny than that of occupying his benches and submitting to his laws; laws which are only intended to prepare them for a higher code of morals than any ever written upon his blackboard or engraved upon Moses' tables of stone.

The Jewish Sabbath, then, is a shadow fulfilled when the body comes, and that body is Christ. When he comes, the shadow, like the schoolmaster's blackboard laws, is of no further use and passes away. And the apostle says that "The righteousness of

the law is fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." "For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." Those, then, who have Christ's spirit are not bound by the law of the schoolmaster. Christ says: "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath," and in the same way we say: The school was made for the pupil, and not the pupil for the school. The schoolmaster's law is intended for the preparation of his pupil for a higher destiny than that of occupying a seat in his school, and when he has entered upon that destiny, the morality taught by his law, and not the law itself, is binding upon his soul. Hence we say that the Lord's day is a rest of the soul, and not a rest of the body alone. It is a Sabbath of the soul. The Jewish Sabbath was a rest of the body in memory of a rest from Egyptian bondage, the liberator being Moses, who led the people out into the desert, but was unable to provide them with food to keep them from perishing of hunger. The Christian Lord's day is a rest of the soul from sin, our leader being Christ Jesus, who himself gives that true bread from heaven which giveth life unto the world. At the earnest request of Moses, God gave the Israelites manna, and with it the Jewish Sabbath; but the true bread and the true rest are given, not to typical Israel, but to the world; and whosoever eateth this bread shall enter into rest; that is, have everlasting life.

Again, we ask, can a Jewish carnal ordinance, typical of a spiritual blessing, be transferred from a carnal typical kingdom over into a spiritual kingdom? Are not the words of our Lord Jesus Christ most decisive upon this point? "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." What a host of disciples Nicodemus has, who cannot distinguish between a Jewish Sabbath and the rest of God's spiritual kingdom! Can the carnal be transferred to the spiritual when the Scriptures emphatically declare that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God"? But supposing the Jewish Sabbath to be transferred, why not transfer a thousand other things? The only evidence we have that the temple service was done away with, is that the shadow is fulfilled in the body—

Christ. If not, why not transfer the sacrifices of sheep and oxen? Why not transfer circumcision? Some will tell us that we do in baptism, which we most emphatically deny; the whole argument in favor of it being based upon an erroneous foundation. Why not transfer the golden altar, with the burning of incense, just as the Roman Catholic Church has done? There is certainly as much authority for it as there is for transferring the Jewish Sabbath.

About the only thing that may be said to be transferred from the Old Testament system to the New, is the Jewish synagogue, which now appears under the form of the Christian church; but even this had no foundation in Moses. It undoubtedly owes its origin to the prophets, and was probably in some way connected with the schools of the prophets, and being an outgrowth of the prophetic system, which was nothing more or less than an outline of the gospel ministry, it has come down to us with very little modification. We do not deny that there was a shade of the gospel extending back into the Old Covenant. There was, and so there is, a shade of the Old Covenant extending down into the New, but it is only a shade. The reality of both ceases at the dividing line. The moral law runs through both, just as the life blood of the New Testament, flowing from Christ's heart, runs through the whole ceremonial law; but is as different from the law written upon tables of stone as the true bread from heaven, which giveth life to the world, is different from the manna which fell in the desert, giving but temporary relief, and disappearing when the bread of Canaan supplies its place.

Now we take the ground that the Jewish Sabbath, like any other strictly Mosaic law, was fulfilled in Christ. Christ says: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." If the Jewish Sabbath was a type of Christ, then it most certainly must have been fulfilled in him.

But we are told that "the Fourth Commandment is enjoined on Israel as one of 'the ten words;' and if you strike out this one, why not strike out any other, or in fact all the rest?"

We answer, that we do not propose to strike out the Fourth Commandment from the Decalogue. We consider the Fourth Commandment fully as binding as any one of the Ten. Those who hold the views which we are endeavoring to sustain, do not base the divine authority for the observance of the Lord's day upon the Fourth Commandment, but upon the practice of the apostles. We must here beg leave to differ from them, for we consider the practice of the apostles alone as too vague and uncertain; whereas, we find a divine command for the observance of the Lord's day in the Fourth Commandment. Prof. Schaff says: "The former was only a type and prophecy of the latter. For as this *new* creation, the resurrection of Christ and the founding of his Church, is greater than the first creation of the heavens and the earth, and brings it to its perfection, so does the Christian *Sunday* transcend the Jewish Sabbath. This direct derivation of the Church festival of Sunday from the living centre of the gospel of Jesus Christ, is certainly the primitive view of it, and the one which best answers to Paul's system of doctrine; whereas, the exclusively legal view which bases the institution primarily and directly on the Fourth Commandment, in the first place affords no sufficient explanation of the transfer of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week; and secondly, is utterly irreconcilable with clear declarations of the New Testament."—*History of Apostolic Church*, p. 554.

Prof. Schaff we believe to be right in basing the divine authority for the Lord's day "*primarily or directly*" upon "*the living centre of the gospel of Jesus Christ;*" yet we consider the Fourth Commandment, when eliminated from its typical and prophetic character, of equally binding authority. What is stricken out by the coming of Christ is this *typical and prophetic character*, leaving the *moral* part of it as binding as any other of the ten.

But a careful examination of the Decalogue will give us a better understanding of this matter. The preface to the Ten Commandments is included with the Commandments, and was written upon the tables of stone; and yet, applying it individually, it is *literally* true of but one generation of Hebrews; and collectively,

of but one nation of all the tribes and races of men that have ever lived, or ever will live, on our globe; and if applied either individually or collectively to the Christian Church to-day, would be absolutely false. But in its metaphysical and moral sense—or, in other words, in the fulfilment of its typical and prophetic character—it is as true to-day of every man, woman, and child brought under gospel influences, as it was literally of each individual Hebrew the day that God pronounced these words from the top of Sinai. Every professing Christian teaches it to his child, and the beginning of all missionary labor is to teach it to the pagan; yet no one ever dreams that this preface is to be understood to-day in its literal sense. The passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites is not a type of regeneration, but a type of any influence that brings any son or daughter of Adam under the reign of the law. Were it a type of regeneration, it would annihilate that great fundamental doctrine so firmly taught in the New Testament, the perseverance of the saints; for a large proportion of the Israelites that came out of Egypt, perished in the desert *on account of their unbelief* (Heb. iii. 16–19); and God will allow no truly regenerated soul to perish. But the teaching of God's word brings the soul out of pagan darkness and sends it on its way towards regeneration, which is accomplished in the reception of Christ, and not Moses, as a complete and sufficient Saviour.

Now, if we eliminate the typical from the Fourth Commandment, as we do from the preface, we shall have a Commandment as binding as any in the Decalogue, to sanctify and keep holy the Lord's day, and not the Jewish type. How far the change may affect the *mode* of observing the day, may be more difficult to determine. The death penalty is certainly abolished. Preparing a warm dinner, riding to church in a carriage or on a horse, when these do not infringe upon the duties or conscience of others, are considered permissible by the majority of professing Christians. Perhaps, if we consider that the day is one to be fully dedicated to God's service, we will not go far astray if we observe the day according to the rules we observe in exacting duties from those in our employ during the days of the week,

and the obligations we feel bound to comply with in rendering service to those who employ us. This subject will, however, be more fully examined when we come to discuss the duties and obligations of the Lord's day.

AN INCONTROVERTIBLE ARGUMENT.

When the Jewish Sabbath was instituted, the Lord commanded the Israelites not to travel or do any work on the seventh day. The command is very explicit: "Abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." (Ex. xvi. 29.) And then we are told, "So the people rested on the seventh day." Now the day they went out of Egypt, the fifteenth day of the month Nisan, would have been a Sabbath day, had the Jewish Sabbath been instituted before that time. On this day we find them packing up in hot haste and hurrying out of Egypt; and then the Scriptures tell us that in memory of that day, the Jewish Sabbath was instituted (Deut. v. 15), but it was not instituted for five weeks after this event. On the fourth week after this, on the same day of the week, and on the same day of the month, we find them travelling in the desert. (Ex. xv. 27, and Ex. xvi. 1.) Now, they either broke the Sabbath on this day, or the Jewish Sabbath was not then instituted.

But it will be answered, that the fifteenth day of the second month was not a Sabbath day, as some of the commentators give the month Nisan thirty-one days. According to this, the fifteenth day of the second month would fall on Tuesday, and not on Saturday. But we answer that we can prove beyond a shade of a doubt, that the fifteenth day fell on a Saturday, and consequently the month Nisan must have contained but twenty-eight days.

1st. The commentaries do not agree as to the number of days Nisan contained; some giving twenty-nine days, others thirty, and others thirty-one. But little confidence can be placed where there is so much difference of opinion.

2d. "The Talmudists are generally of the opinion that the fifteenth day of the second month was the seventh day of the week."—*Patrick, Lowth, etc., Commentaries on Ex. xvi. 1.*

3d. Any person whose mind was not already prepossessed, on

reading the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, would decide that the fifteenth day of the second month was the seventh day of the week. On that day the Israelites arrive at the wilderness of Sin, and murmur because they have no food. Then follow six days in which they are fed on manna, and the seventh day is the first Jewish Sabbath.

4th. Those Israelites who, from any ceremonial defilement, could not keep the passover on the appointed day of the first month, were commanded to keep it on the same day of the second month. (Num. ix. 10, 11.) This law was observed by the nation in later years. (2d Chron. xxx. 2-15.) This proves that the days of the second month corresponded with the days of the first month, otherwise the Sabbath would not be preceded by the passover on the occasions which fell on the fourteenth day of the month.

5th. The whole Jewish chronology was calculated from the passover eve, or the full moon on that eve, when the passover lamb was slain. Counting two weeks back from this time, brought the first day of the month, or new moon, on a Sabbath day. This new moon was the first day of the Jewish new year, for it was necessary that the year should begin with the new and not the full moon; otherwise the analogy of development and decay, between type and antitype, would be completely destroyed. Now, counting forward from the Exodus, brought the first day of the second month on a new moon, and consequently a Sabbath; and the fifteenth day on another full moon, and also a Sabbath day.

So far we have given inferences. Now we will give positive proof.

6th. Josephus says that the Israelites, on leaving Egypt, ate of the unleavened bread that they brought out of Egypt, thirty days; and in the same section he calls the feast of unleavened bread "a feast of eight days," showing that he includes the day of the passover as the first day of the feast. Now, if we count thirty days from the first day of the passover, and including the first day, the last of the thirty will be the day that they arrived in the wilderness of Sin. This gives twenty-eight days for the

month Nisan; the unleavened bread is exhausted on a seventh day, and they ate manna for the first time on the first day of the week and sixteenth day of the second month.—*Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*, Book 2, Chap. 15, Sec. 1.

7th. Now there can be no doubt but the fifteenth day of the first month was ever observed as a Sabbath day. Josephus says, "On the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth day of the month, they first partake of the fruits of the earth, for before that day they do not touch them."—*Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*, Book 3, Chap. 10, Sec. 5. And from Num. xxiii. 15, we learn that this sixteenth day was the morrow after the Sabbath.

Now, from Leviticus xxiii. 39, we learn that the fifteenth of the seventh month was a Sabbath day and that the twenty-second was also a Sabbath day, although not one of the seven days of the feast of tabernacles; and consequently not called a Sabbath because it was a holy day, or great feast day, but because it was the regular seventh day Sabbath. This is also confirmed by the feast kept by Solomon at the dedication of the Temple (2 Chron. vii. 8–11). The people were sent away on the twenty-third day of the month, or first day of the week, being the first day after the conclusion of the feast. Now this brings the first Sabbath of the seventh month on the first day of the month, or a new moon. Now, having established the full moon of the first month on a Sabbath day and the new moon of the seventh month on a sabbath day, we have but to count five moons between the two in such a way that the Sabbath will fall on the new moon or first day of the seventh month. Now, there is only one way in which this can be done; that is, by giving twenty-eight days to the first month and alternately twenty-nine and thirty to the others. Thus we have undoubted proof that the Sabbath falls on the fifteenth day of the month. It may be objected that the fifth full moon does not invariably fall on the same day of the week. We do not claim that it does, nor is it necessary that it should to prove our ground. The full moon may have occurred any time during the day of the passover, yet sunset of that day would be the time from which the Jews would begin to count. If we

turn to the calendar of the year, 1880, we will find that five times out of seven, four in succession, the full moon of the fifth month falls on the same day of the week :

BEGINNING.

Tuesday, January 27.
 Wednesday, February 25.
 Friday, March 26.
 Saturday, April 24.
 Tuesday, June 22.

ENDING.

Tuesday, June 22.
 Wednesday, July 21.
 Friday, August 20.
 Saturday, September 18.
 Tuesday, November 16.

We acknowledge that this is not always the case, and this want of uniformity may account for the discrepancies existing between the record of John and the other Evangelists in regard to the time when our Lord partook of the last passover with his disciples. When a discrepancy of this kind did occur, as it might occasionally, we do not know what arrangement the Jews had to overcome it. It is well known that in making up their years of twelve moons, they intercalated a thirteenth month every three years; and we presume they made a similar arrangement when the fifth moon, after the completion of the first two, did not fall on a Sabbath day, although I have at present no evidence that they did so. If they did, it would prove that the Jewish Sabbath was not the seventh day counting from the creation. We suspect, however, that these intercalary days, if there were such occasionally in making up the Jewish half year, falling as they necessarily must do, on the Feast of New Moons, the two days were considered as a sort of double Sabbath. Again, we notice that on the first Sabbath of the first, second, and seventh months, the two sacred days were combined in one, thus bringing them into most intimate relation with each other. (Amos viii. 5.)

Having now proved beyond all doubt that the fifteenth day of the second month, when the Israelites came into the wilderness of Sin, was the seventh day of the week, we ask, can any honest mind believe that the Jewish Sabbath was "an old statute, that had fallen into disuse"? Is it possible that the Creator himself could possibly trample upon his own statutes and lead a whole nation, by cloudy pillar and column of fire, to break his laws and then immediately command them to obey them under penalty of

death? No! never! The fact is, that on that fifteenth day of the second month, no such law had as yet been given. The Israelites travelled on that day and broke no law. God's laws, after given, are immutable.

It is easy to understand why the Israelites, fleeing from the wrath of a nation enraged by the death of all its first-born, and cast out of Egypt by a powerful enemy, should spend the Sabbath in travelling; and if true, as some suppose, they passed through the Red Sea on the night forming the fore part of a seventh day, they should again travel in order to escape from an enemy burning with revenge, determined to destroy or enslave them; but that the Holy Spirit in the guiding cloud on that quiet day in the wilderness, while the corpses of their enemies lay dead upon the sea shore, should lead them to break the holy Sabbath, and then under penalty of death forbid them to imitate his example, is perfectly incomprehensible except upon the ground that the Jewish Sabbath was not yet instituted. We therefore submit to the consideration of the defenders of the Jewish Sabbath as an institution from the beginning of the world, whether the attribution of such a fickle inconsistent character to a God of immutable justice is not a greater heresy than the denial of the Jewish Sabbath being a law given to man from the beginning.

ARTICLE III.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE AGGRESSIVENESS OF
PRESBYTERIANISM.

A CONCIO AD CLERUM.

It seems strange that a Church established in a widely extended, sparsely settled, but rapidly growing territory, should, at the end of a hundred years, be found discussing elaborate theses on the nature, functions, and warrant of the office of evangelist. But while we deplore the occasion for such papers as evidence of serious dereliction, yet we hail them as indication of awakening to vital duty. The Church of Christ, by its charter, is an aggressive institution; propagandism is an essential element in its life; failing in this, it needs apology for its very existence as an organised body. If this be true, and we think demonstration would be easy, it follows that aggressiveness is not on a work, but *the* work, of the Church. "Go, disciple all nations," is the last recorded command of her great Captain: a command, in time and territory, limited only by the needs of the world. Such being the case, any inquiry into aggressiveness becomes of paramount importance, inasmuch as it touches upon the essential vitality of the Church; therefore, to Presbyterians no inquiry could be more practical than that which heads this paper. The importance of the subject should prepare us for difference of opinion upon it; unanimity cannot reasonably be expected upon matters of such moment. Possibly the general drift of this "inquiry" will run so far counter to cherished opinions as to cause sincere, perhaps indignant, doubt as to both the matter and spirit of the paper. As to the latter, the writer claims as loyal a love for the Presbyterian Church, and as heartfelt a pride in the heritage of her history, as those of any reader. As to the former, the facts were reluctantly recognised, and are more reluctantly published, merely as the ground for some tentative suggestions, in the hope that they may awake to investigation, and lead to substantial results. If the writer is mistaken as to these facts, none

will be gladder than he to have it so shown. Refutation will be easy. These things were not done in a corner.

Speaking of the individual Christian life, the apostle says (2 Cor. x. 12): "Those measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise." Doubtless this principle holds true in denominational life likewise, and hence we will not settle the question by reference to the conflicts and conquests of Presbyterianism, doctrinal, territorial, historical, etc., etc., etc. Let us take all this for granted, and for once fling free of denominational provincialism and take a wider range, a comparative view in which all the terms of the comparison are not Presbyterian. Let us compare our growth with that of other denominations working side by side with us; if less pleasing than the usual comparison, it may be not less profitable.

We will, then, compare the Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, consoling ourselves, however, for this new departure, by selecting the ground most favorable to us in the comparison, viz., that of the four oldest and strongest Synods, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

In the outset, it may be well to consider some of the advantages Presbyterianism has upon its side, in several acknowledged items.

1. *In the culture of its ministry.* It is an indisputable fact, that as a body, the Presbyterian ministry, in point of literary culture, is very far in advance of either of the denominations mentioned. Presbyterianism is far better supplied with "skilled labor." In this statement it is not denied that each of these denominations has in the ranks of its ministry many who are the peers of any to be found elsewhere; reference is had to the ministry as a body. That the general average of Presbyterians is superior to that of either of the other two, few will deny. That this superiority, if rightly used, is an advantage, perhaps none will dispute.

2. *In the liberality of its membership.* Presbyterians appear to be much more thoroughly indoctrinated in the duty of contributing of their substance for the advance of the Redeemer's kingdom. Statistics, to be given hereafter, will prove that they give

five times as much *per capita* as either of these two denominations. This difference is not mentioned in anything like a boastful spirit; but merely as an important element in the comparison.

3. There is nothing in externals, or accidents of worship, or polity, etc., which gives these denominations the advantage over Presbyterianism. Their service is as straitly bald as ours, and their discipline is even more rigid. It cannot be alleged here that sensuous worship and worldly compromise fill their ranks, as is sometimes said of other departments of ecclesiastical competition. Of course we cannot admit any advantage in scripturalness of doctrine, nor yet in unscripturalness; for while the fact that the natural man is essentially Arminian in theology, may be considered a factor in the popularity of the Methodist doctrine, this cannot apply to the Baptists; for so far as the doctrinal status of an independent congregational body without a published creed can be fixed, we, perhaps, may be warranted in classing the Baptists as Calvinistic.

4. Moreover, in the four Synods mentioned, these denominations have had no advantage in the matter of priority of occupation. In the four States under consideration, we are under the impression that Presbyterianism antedates both the others. Whether this impression be correct or not, we can at least venture to assert that it has had ample time to develop, mature, and execute plans for aggressive work.

Now, then, under the foregoing circumstances, let us examine the comparative strength of these three denominations in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia. In this comparison we take the *official* figures of each denomination, as published in its statistical reports of work during the years 1878 and 1879. The statistics we have been specially careful to secure from responsible sources, and our calculations have been verified again and again, so that we claim that they are as accurate as our faithful efforts could make them. Only the *white* membership of the Methodists and Baptists is included.

STATES.	BAPTISTS.		METHODISTS.			PRESBYTERIANS.	
	Ministers.	Communi- cants.	Ministers.	Local Ministers.	Communi- cants.	Ministers.	Communi- cants.
Virginia,	465	68,727	377	372	81,233	225	24,656
North Carolina,	463	75,500	215	313	81,998	114	18,358
South Carolina,	262	66,311	170	151	44,564	98	11,546
Georgia,	612	80,790	341	655	92,063	89	9,805
Total, ¹	1,802	291,328	1,103	1,491	299,858	526	64,360

¹ "The summary of Baptist statistics, published in advance of the *Baptist Year Book*, show an increase of about 40,000 members in 1881—less than one-fourth of the reported increase for 1880. The total of members is 2,336,022, which embraces Southern as well as Northern Baptists. Of the ten States which report upward of 100,000 members, only one is Northern. Georgia leads, with 238,975, and Virginia follows, with 203,050. We give figures for these ten States for 1880 and 1881 :

	1880.	1881.
Georgia,	235,381	238,975
Virginia,	207,559	203,050
North Carolina,	172,951	192,658
Alabama,	164,784	167,650
Kentucky,	163,690	162,423
South Carolina,	140,442	150,792
Mississippi,	122,369	126,984
New York,	114,094	119,862
Tennessee,	110,847	110,877
Texas,	107,578	108,340
Total,	1,539,702	1,575,611

[*Central Presbyterian.*"]

Dorchester's "Problem of Religious Progress" gives the following figures :

Baptist, regular, South,	ministers,	5,280 ;	communicants,	1,026,413
" " " colored,	"	3,089 ;	"	661,358
Methodist Episcopal, South,	"	3,887 ;	"	832,189
" " " col.,	"	638 ;	"	112,938
Presbyterian, South,	"	1,060 ;	"	120,028

[*Tables for 1880, see pp. 543-4.*]

As the result of this examination of figures, we discover that the Methodist and Baptist white communicants outnumber the Presbyterians in the old States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, nearly *five to one*.

In this comparison, so far as two States are concerned, we are compelled to be unjust to these denominations. The Synod of Virginia includes *three* States, and that of Georgia *two*, while in our comparison the Methodists and Baptists have been limited strictly by State lines. So that here is a Church with at least no disadvantage in doctrine, polity, or worship; with admitted superiority of ministry; backed by a much greater liberality on the part of the people; having a fair start with the other two; and yet outnumbered by them five to one, after a competition of one hundred years.

This presents a question for consideration, a problem for solution, second to none in importance; indeed, it is *first*, and there is no second. How is this disparity to be accounted for?

The readiest solution is found in the denial of the existence of the problem. This is an exceedingly short cut, far *too* short. It requires considerable boldness utterly to discredit the *official* figures of these denominations; moreover, if this scaling of values be impartially applied, what becomes of Presbyterian figures? Can Presbyterian pastors claim that the General Assembly reports represent the actual *bona fide* resident membership of their churches? But suppose these Methodist and Baptist reports are discounted 50 *per cent.* (*i. e., half*), and the most sceptical could hardly claim more, they are still very far in advance of Presbyterians with no discount at all on their figures. But suppose these figures are scouted entirely, what becomes of what, for want of a better name, we shall call the geographical argument? There are vast sections¹ of these long settled States to which Presbyteri-

¹“Our field stretches from Maryland to Texas, from Missouri to Florida, and covers fifteen States, which contain twelve Synods and sixty-five Presbyteries. Not one of these Presbyteries has occupied the ground it covers, and in every one of them there is room for much aggressive work, while in most of them the unoccupied territory far exceeds what has been taken possession of.”—*Official Paper*.

“The Synod of Virginia, in 1876, declared that forty-two Counties of

anism is a stranger, and where a Presbyterian preacher would be a curiosity. Is this true of these other denominations? By no means; wherever you find any old established town, village, or settlement, there you find one or both of these denominations represented, if not by a church, at least by stated services. This is patent to the observation of any man who travels through the country. This argument cannot be scouted.

Perhaps it may be said that this numerical superiority is counterbalanced on the Presbyterian side by superior consistency, worth, influence, etc. This superior consistency is at least doubtful; for while these denominations are less careful than Presbyterians in receiving members, they are, on the other hand, less scrupulous in getting rid of them. They are not hampered by the terrible tyranny of technicality which besets every case of discipline in Presbyterian government, and gives the cunning or contumacious offender boundless opportunity for difficulty and deliverance, making it about as much as any preacher's ecclesiastical head is worth to resist such a one, should he stand upon his rights; as witness several recent cases where the unfortunate pastor has had to seek another field, with the brand of the fanatic upon him. If a member of one of these other denominations is notoriously inconsistent, he is just summarily "turned out of the church" with little formality and less friction. As to superior worth and influence in any sense other than that of Christian character, we would say that any such claim (or boast, for it amounts to this) preferred by any Christian denomination, when viewed in the light of 1 Cor. i. 26-29, is a sarcasm on the religion established by Jesus of Nazareth.

Some are constrained to admit a numerical superiority and decline all competition with the apologetic plea that such numerical increase is "contrary to the genius of Presbyterianism." If the genius of Presbyterianism is inconsistent with the very highest that State, with a population of two hundred and twenty-six thousand, have no Presbyterian preaching. Another authority declared that Presbyterianism is unknown in fifty Counties of Kentucky."

According to a statistical volume recently published by the State Government of North Carolina, it appears that there are thirty-four Counties in that State without a Presbyterian church, and sixteen Counties in which there is only one!

degree of aggressiveness, then the genius of Presbyterianism needs doctoring, it stands condemned by its own experience. Those who hold such views of "the genius" of our denomination, think that the peculiar province of Presbyterianism is that of teaching; that its ministry is called to be educators, commentators, theologians, etc. All this is very good of its kind, but at the same time all this is but secondary or incidental. The peculiar province of any and of all Christian Churches is to preach the gospel for the conversion of sinners, and by this we mean what we think Christ meant when he said, Go, preach my gospel, *i. e.*, the proclamation of the gospel with the living voice, not from the professor's desk or the author's study, but from the pulpit before the congregation. Moreover it may be interjected here that while there may have been some plausibility in this plea heretofore, the time is coming and now is when this can no longer be claimed to be the peculiar province of Presbyterianism.

So much for the state of the question. Let us now consider some of the causes assigned and cures suggested by thoughtful persons deeply interested in the matter, but who are not quite equal to pooh-poohing it away as merely imaginary, visionary, or at least useless and unsettling—a discussion out of place, calculated to do more harm than good, discouraging, depressing, without remedy, etc., etc.

1. Neglect of the evangelistic office owing to the fact that our forefathers came from a country in which the office of pastor was considered sufficient to meet all the demands of Church work.

2. Need of a wise directory for congregational work.

3. Our Presbyteries have exercised but little control over either churches or ministers.

4. Need of reserve force to assist pastors in extra services: such as is furnished by the presiding elders of the Methodist Church; the regular "visitation" of the Episcopal bishops; and the vast number of foot-loose Baptist preachers.

5. Distrust of protracted meetings, or revivals, as they are commonly called.

6. Defective education; in that our ministry is "educated away" from the people, so that there is little in common between people and preacher, so that our ministers are exclusively "book men."

7. Failure to preach the distinctive doctrines of our Church.
8. Controversy among ourselves.
9. Lack of consecration.
10. Failure to reap what we have sown; other denominations gather in the fruits of our labors because we fail to educate people into love for, and appreciation of, the Presbyterian Church over other Churches.
11. Need of more preaching; *i. e.*, more frequent services in settled charges, extra services during the week.
12. Failure to expect results.
13. Extreme liberality or catholicity of view in recognising the claims of other Churches.
14. Greater caution in admitting members and in the use of the means of grace.
15. Paucity of ministers owing to high standard of qualification and opposition to a secularised ministry.
16. Culture and refinement of our people.
17. System of pastorates too confining to allow ministers to do outside work.
18. Need of a common sustentation fund like that of the Scotch.
19. Pastorates are too long; ministers too often outlive their usefulness in their fields.
20. Inefficacy of eldership; too many broken spokes in the wheel.

Such are some of the reasons assigned for the comparative weakness of Presbyterianism. In most of them there is force, and therefore the list is given as preface to our own views; our part will be not so much to add that which is original as to amplify to some extent certain points already given, to press others to a legitimate conclusion from the premises therein contained, and to suggest some *practical* remedy, wherever such occurs to us, for defects merely singled out in them.

We lay little stress on 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 17, and 20.

The directory for congregational work (2) might be of some assistance, but the circumstances of congregations are so varied as to render one fitted for general application an impossibility. The wise organiser can invent his own directory, and one who is

not would ordinarily make very poor use of a general directory, unless it happened just exactly to suit his particular field. There is plausibility in (6), but far more depends upon the *man* than on the training; let it be borne in mind that the objection here made to the training is not that it incapacitates the man for "shifting for himself" so much as that it unfits him for mingling in easy, interested, and interesting intercourse with practical men, that the young Presbyterian minister has nothing in common as a topic of conversation, and that all intercourse is constrained, awkward, and embarrassing to both parties. While "it goes without saying" that a man who has spent his whole life preparing for a learned profession must be unfitted for making a living at something else, yet we never could appreciate this alleged difficulty of embarrassment in social intercourse. The writer's whole life has been spent in town and in schools, (he never even knew how to "hitch up" a horse until he was put in charge of a very scattered bishopric when necessity soon taught him,) and yet he has never experienced any difficulty in finding abundant entertainment and instruction in the conversation of the farmer, the housewife, the mechanic, and the laborer; such conversation is not only a relief from habitual application to books, but is also very helpful. Moreover, so far as his observation extends, this almost unanimous representation of the Presbyterian preacher as a typical dry-as-dust book-worm, is a very great mistake; in the majority of instances a little more *book-worminess* would be a positive advantage. The charge implied in (7) is unjust; there may be some failure to preach our doctrines controversially, but the incidental enforcement and illustration according to the analogy of the faith, brought out in history, biography, parable, miracle, etc., is done, and done more effectively, we verily believe, than could be done by set sermons of polemic cast. In proof of which we venture the assertion that the members of no denomination on earth hold their doctrines more intelligently or are better prepared to give a reason for the faith that is in them. They may not obtrude their distinctive differences as fussily and offensively as some others, but it is not always the brook that babbles the loudest which runs the deepest. We do not think (8)

contains much force, at least in *comparative* discussion; doubtless had the energy, intellect, and zeal which have been expended in controversy been devoted to work, it would have been better invested; at the same time controversy cannot count for much here, when we reflect that the Methodists have split into several sects and the Baptist divisions are legion, and yet both have outstripped us; while the Episcopalians, the very beau-ideal of the peace policy among themselves, cannot be charged with being very aggressive in *any* direction and are nearly as far behind us as we are behind the others. The value of (9) as a stand-by is admitted; it is always safe and may be relied upon in an emergency when other reasons prove unsatisfactory. The reason assigned in (13) would be more satisfactory if the terms of comparison happened to be Episcopal or Romish; but the fact is, the least liberal are the least progressive, and the smallest of the four denominations is the hide-bound apostolic-succession party that wraps itself in the mantle of a *toploftical* Churchism and imitates the pride of the religionist of old who "stood and prayed with himself."

We cannot pass (16) unnoticed. It is well known that Presbyterians usually occupy middle ground, not invariably but generally. The Episcopalians are the "highflyers," the leaders of the gay and fashionable world; then come the Presbyterians, not less intelligent but less "loud," not less substantial but less showy, while the third class is generally Methodist and Baptist. We are thus between the upper and nether mill-stones. The independent sturdy yeomanry, the mechanics, artisans, and laborers of our towns are not, as a class, found in the Presbyterian Church, but in the Methodist and Baptist. We know this is vehemently denied in some quarters, but it is too notoriously true to admit of argument here, as any city or town pastor can testify. The seven-principled poor (*i. e.*, five loaves and two fishes) who hanker after the wood in winter and the charity dinner in summer, are always accessible, but the self-sustaining poor we cannot win; but more of this hereafter. Little stress is allowed to (17); any pastorate is confining, if the preacher does his duty; where the pastor is not confined, the presumption is that he is leaving undone the things which he ought to do.

We cannot but consider (18) as too mild a medicine for so severe a disease; though we would bid hearty *Godspeed* to any measure looking towards some regulation of salaries by the merits and necessities of the pastor rather than simply and solely by the wealth or liberality of the congregation. So far as (19) is concerned, we think an examination would prove that there is some illusion with reference to the length of Presbyterian pastorates, *i. e.*, the average length. We answer (20) by a decided aversion to shifting the responsibility to the shoulders of the eldership. Doubtless many are very trifling, but as a body they are a noble class of men; moreover, we believe these "spokes" are generally made of the best timber the congregation affords, and of course you must cut your garment according to the cloth.

The points not touched upon in this running comment will be embodied in our own discussion, now to follow. And at this point may be mentioned a difficulty that Presbyterianism contends with, which, while totally inadequate to the solution of the problem, and scarcely of sufficient importance to be made a principal point, is yet worthy of notice, and that is, the need of some simple *authoritative* digest of doctrine. This is especially felt in evangelistic fields where our Church is little known. The Confession of Faith answers very well where the individual has been *raised* on the Shorter Catechism; but the Confession is a very mysterious and difficult treatise to an inquirer supposed to be ignorant of, and consequently not partial to, Presbyterianism; and while the Shorter Catechism is *shorter*, that is about all the difference; it is certainly anything but easy. In admiration of this Catechism we yield to no one. We think it, without exception, the greatest uninspired volume ever penned. For a *multum in parvo*, laconic terseness, and epigrammatic condensation, combined with exhaustiveness, it stands unrivalled, unapproached, and unapproachable. We not unfrequently see extracts from it incorporated into other catechisms; and when such is the case, it unfailingly suggests a quotation from Lord Bacon in a school-boy's composition. But this very *strength*, the absence of every superfluous word, makes it unavailable as a *guide-book* to the Presbyterian highway; the very guide-book itself needs a com-

mentary. Those who have been familiar with its phraseology from early childhood, fail to appreciate its difficulty. A minister in our Church, who became a Presbyterian in adult life, remarked that he had labored long and conscientiously to commit it to memory, that it was the hardest book he ever saw, and that he did not believe it could ever perfectly be learned by one who began the study of it after reaching manhood. To hand a novice the Confession of Faith, or even the Catechism, is like handing him Dabney's Syllabus or Calvin's Institutes. We need something more on the order of milk, and less on that of strong meat; containing a summary of what is essential to constitute a Presbyterian communicant, rather than all that we require in an office-bearer. The Methodist Discipline in simplicity furnishes a strong contrast to the Confession, and in addition to this, they have, in an appendix to their Church hymn-book, a brief summary, covering only two or three pages. But when a Baptist is asked for *his* summary, he waves his hand with an inimitable air of orthodoxy towards the Bible as his creed, and his only one; and this, while having a very serviceable indefiniteness—for every one believes, and subscribes to, the Bible, of course—has also a wonderful effect upon those who are too unreflecting to see through the transparency of it, and who lack acumen sufficient to ask him wherein he differs from the rest of the Bible-subscribing world. Of course, this Baptist net spans every religious stream, by being stretched across the acknowledged source of all; but when one is pleased with the worship and polity of our Church, and inquires somewhat more closely into its internal structure, we must hand him a volume which it requires a theologian to understand, a commentator to explain, and a polemic to defend. However, leaving this confessedly minor difficulty, we approach graver troubles. And at this point we desire to say with emphasis, that we think there is no defect inhering in Presbyterianism as a theory. Observation, however, compels the reluctant conclusion that in the practical working of this theory, so eminently scriptural in all its essentials, so wonderful in its adaptability to every possible exigency of country or age, there must be very grave defect indeed, else its representatives could hardly

be outnumbered *five to one* by their competitors in a territory so long occupied. An attentive study of the matter leads us to throw the difficulties under three heads, for convenience of consideration :

I. The theory of the ministry, as affecting the regulation of supply and demand.

II. The working of church courts in the exercise of the powers of review and control.

III. Aggressiveness in the limited department of congregational work.

I. THE MINISTRY.

There can be little doubt as to the inadequacy of the supply of ministerial labor, notwithstanding the number of "W. C.'s" If the Presbyterian waste places are to be builded, there must be a decided increase in the force of builders. We have already alluded to the numerical excess of the Methodists and Baptists over the Presbyterians, in communicants. Consult the table already given on page 650, and see also the difference in ministerial force. Our settled charges are barely supplied, and the graduating classes of the Seminaries are absorbed to fill existing vacancies in settled churches.¹ And too often the evangelistic

¹ "One-fifth of our churches are vacant, and the fields around them uncultivated. For lack of ministers, they are unable to occupy for the Master.

"But while the grace and providence of God, our own wants, and the needs of the world, all emphasise the demand for an increase of ministers, we are met by alarming facts as to the actual supply of men for the great work. These facts should pierce the heart of every member of our Church with grief, and should humble us in the dust before God.

"The following statement, covering ten years, is from official sources :

<i>Year.</i>	<i>Ordinations.</i>	<i>Deaths.</i>	<i>Candidates.</i>
1871	20	9	184
1872	30	21	205
1873	31	17	209
1874	45	18	199
1875	41	17	187
1876	47	26	189
1877	41	11	176
1878	55	24	145
1879	34	40	165
1880	38	19	145
	382	202	

work is endowed (?) by bequeathing to it "the remainder, after payment of foregoing bequests, legacies, etc." In other words, those men whom no church seems to desire, are ordained *sine titulo* (called evangelists, by courtesy), because they are on the hands of the Presbytery, and there is no other disposition to be made of them. The allegation, mark it, is not that all evangel-

"Let us examine these facts.

"1. During ten years, the number of ministers ordained exceeded the number deceased, by only 180.

"2. The number of ordinations during the second five years exceeded those of the first five years by only 48.

"3. The number of candidates for the first five years was 884; for the second, 820, a decrease of 64. The average of the first five years was 176; for the second five, 164, an average decrease of 12.

"4. The number of candidates in 1880 was 145; that is, 31 below the average of the first five years, and 19 below the average of the second five.

"From the same official sources we find that our ministers and licentiates in 1871 numbered 912; in 1880 they numbered 1,079, an increase of only 167.

"During the same time, our churches increased from 1,548 to 1,928, a gain of 380; and our communicants increased from 87,529 to 120,028, a gain of 32,499. In ten years the per cent. of increase was, ministers, 18; churches, 25; communicants, 37.

"These facts are of great weight and solemnity. In the number of our churches, they show not a large but a solid and gratifying advance. But they show extreme danger of failure at a vital point. The number of candidates for the ministry, at no time adequate to the wants of the Church, has been for some years steadily declining. When we consider that some of our ministers are laid aside by age or infirmity each year, that some fall at their posts, and that so few are coming to take their places, the painful conviction is forced on us that we will be unable to meet our own destitution, or extend our missions among the heathen. The decrease of ministers, if not remedied, must paralyse the Church. Her work must cease for lack of the instrumentality to carry it on.

T. A. HOYT,
WM. BROWN,
J. L. GIRARDEAU,

Committee."

"February 24th, 1881.

[Extract from Report of a Special Committee of General Assembly, and by it ordered to be read in the churches.]

"The Minutes of the Southern Assembly for 1879 show that five of

ists are of this class of men ; far from it ; but it is alleged that men of this class are uniformly thus disposed of by their Presbyteries. In any conflict between this work and the settled charges, experience has shown that the former will generally come out second best. There will be this conflict as long as the supply of ministerial labor falls short of the demand. It is idle to talk of extending our territory and advancing our denominational lines, without a marked increase in our preaching force. The evangelists are the aggressive force in this department of the work. Upon these does Presbyterianism depend for the extension of its territory in our own country ; a work in importance second only to Foreign Missions, if, indeed, it is second to any, and surely not encompassed with one-tenth of the difficulty of Foreign Missions ; giving greater and speedier returns for the men and means invested, and increasing the resources for Foreign Missions. We

the Synods have fewer ministers, one fewer churches, and four fewer members than five years before.

“Indeed, so discouraging is the condition of that denomination in some of its aspects, that one of its ministers in one of its papers asked the question, ‘What is to become of our Church?’ and the response from a Professor of Theology was, ‘It is a mere matter of arithmetic ; we must become extinct, unless something be done to increase the number of ministers. We have more actual applications for ministers from Texas alone than we have graduates.’ In another article, deploring the discouraging condition of the denomination, we read : ‘So long as our crop of candidates on hand does not begin to supply our annual death-rate, then no matter how aggressive, no matter how successful in reaching the masses, no matter how many evangelists we send forth to gather the people together and organise them into churches, our total extinction as a Church is a mere matter of time.’”—*Philadelphia Presbyterian, 11th March, 1882.*

“EDUCATION.

“The report on Education was read by Dr. Hopkins. It narrated the great field to be filled, and the scarcity of laborers. The candidates for the ministry are decreasing, the ranks of the clergy are being depleted by death. There were last year 144 candidates for the ministry, while this year there were 114, and thus it goes. The paucity of candidates is due to the absence of religious family training. Dr. Pratt, of Louisville, said there were no Samuels and Timothy's rising up to take the place of the ministers who were passing away.”

[*Proceedings of Assembly at Atlanta, Ga., May, 1882.*

repeat, to emphasise the statement, that the evangelistic arm of the service is the sole dependence of Presbyterianism for aggressive work at home. Let us institute a comparison in this respect also :

Va.	has	44	Baptist	Evangelists,	22	Methodist,	and	8	Presbyt'n.
N. C.	"	36	"	"	22	"	"	4	"
S. C.	"	26	"	"	11	"	"	5	"
Ga.	"	24	"	"	35	"	"	0	"

Total, 130 Baptist Evangelists; 90 Methodist, and 17 Presbyt'n.

We have seen that these denominations outnumber us five to one, and here we see one very influential reason for it, viz., their evangelists outnumber ours more than five to one. Of course we cannot compete with them in extent of territory occupied as long as there is this difference in the pioneer force.

A comparison of the means expended in this work is also instructive: first, we take the general aggressive work at home and abroad (adding together the Presbyterian funds, Sustentation and Evangelistic, and the "Domestic Missions" and "State Missions" of the other two denominations, under the general term Domestic Missions) and present the following table:

BAPTIST.		METHODIST.		PRESBYTERIAN.		
Home.	Foreign.	Home.	Foreign.	Home.	Foreign.	
Va.	\$9,082 99	\$7,184 11	\$6,390 77	\$8,728 73	\$14,729 00	\$13,928 00
N.C.	6,203 45	2,875 70	3,980 52	5,996 42	4,470 00	5,122 00
S. C.	6,371 64	124 14	5,240 60	2,698 54	3,303 00	5,013 00
Ga.	8,165 46	1,397 29	7,728 50	6,742 97	2,781 00	1,761 00
	\$29,823 54	\$11,581 24	\$23,340 39	\$24,166 66	\$25,283 00	\$25,824 00

For both causes the Baptists average *fourteen* cents, the Methodists *fifteen* cents, and the Presbyterians *seventy-nine* cents; and here the five to one is on the Presbyterian side of the balance, as we stated on p. 648. So much for the general aggressive work at home and abroad. The reader's attention is now asked to another table which compares the "State Missions" of these other

denominations with the Evangelistic Fund of the Presbyterians, and is thus *exclusively the aggressive work at home; i. e.*, the subject of which this paper treats :

	BAPTIST.	METHODIST.	PRESBYTERIAN.
Va.	\$6,936 81	\$6,390 77	\$3,965 00
N. C.	6,121 25	3,980 52	1,984 00
S. C.	6,265 58	5,240 60	1,045 00
Ga.	7,736 90	7,728 50	737 00
Total,	\$27,060 54	\$23,340 39	\$7,731 00

A comparison of the totals of these two tables is sadly eloquent on this subject.

A study of the three tables last given reveals several very important facts: (1.) Presbyterians are as far in advance of these other denominations in liberality as they are of Presbyterians in numbers. (2.) *These other denominations lay far more stress on aggressive work at home than do Presbyterians.*¹ (3.) They not only contribute more relatively to this work than we do, but what they do contribute also accomplishes more in the work in that (4) they are able to employ so many more men (even proportionally to the means expended) than we. In the territory under discussion they have *under official appointment* in the mission field in their own bounds, the Baptists 130 men, the Methodists 90, while the Presbyterians have only 17!

So that evidently one great difficulty in our aggressive work is fewness of ministers. However, when this want of ministers is alleged as the great difficulty, we have at best only removed the investigation one step farther back. This deficiency is felt and discussed and pastors are instructed to present and urge the claims of the ministry upon the attention of the Christian youth in their charges, as if this were regarded as the sole and satisfactory solu-

¹ N. B. The Presbyterians give *more* than these denominations for Foreign Missions; for Home Missions, *i. e.*, the strictly aggressive work at home, they give more than *three* times as much as we.

We are interested in discovering that *Christlieb* notices this and mentions it as an apology for the contrast between their contributions to Foreign Missions and those of other denominations.—*Foreign Missions*, p. 37.

tion of the problem. By tacit consent this increase of preachers is regarded as the one thing needful. Now we venture the assertion, that were these exhortations to succeed beyond our most sanguine expectations, and men were to press into the ministry in numbers sufficient to answer every demand, the *practical* solution of the difficulty would still be as distant as at present. Nay, further, suppose that not merely candidates, in numbers aforesaid, but *actual licentiates*, qualified in heart and mind for this work, were to say, Here are we, send us; what would be the response? Does any one think they could be employed? How many Presbyteries in these Synods can guarantee support to even *one* evangelist?

Here, then, the difficulty confronts us in full force. It is useless to continue harping on this one string of paucity of ministers, as if this were the only trouble. Let us recognise the truth that the difficulty is even more serious. After these men have signified their readiness to engage in this specific work, then arises the homely question of support; how are these men to live? Can they look with any confidence to the Evangelistic Fund? To ask this question is to answer it. Nor is this difficulty to be met by demand for greater consecration; consecration, even though perfect, could not lift one above the necessities of food and raiment. As it is, can he be expected to launch out into the work with no promise of support, depending entirely upon the liberality of the people among whom he is to labor; a people, mark it, who are Presbyterian only *in posse*, to whom he and his Church are yet unknown? If not only the evangelist, but *the people* also, were perfectly consecrated, doubtless the experiment might be safely ventured upon; but in practical matters we must consider the real, not the ideal, and the real is this: the evangelist comes to the work from a long course of preparatory scholastic training; if possessed of means in the beginning, they have been exhausted in acquiring an expensive education; moreover this very training, while exhausting his resources, has at the same time unfitted him for any other work save that in which he is to engage; he is fitted to preach and unfitted for anything else (except teaching, perhaps), and now young, inexperienced, and dependent, he is

cast forth into the world and his victuals and clothes must be the fruit of his labor. To such men as these we must look for the conquest of territory which, to us, is *missionary ground*, in which the people are ignorant of Presbyterianism, and, of course, not partial to it. If such is our dependence for aggressive work, such work cannot be contemplated with any reasonable hope of success.

But are we dependent upon such men? Practically we are. We publish to the world a high standard of qualification as requisite for entrance into the ministry, and we require this standard to be obtained in a slow, tedious, and expensive manner. A cast-iron procrustean rule having, from long custom, the force of an unwritten law, requires every candidate, regardless of previous training or future facilities for special study, to go through the Theological Seminary. It is true that there are here and there occasional exceptions to this rule, but they are so exceedingly rare as to form scarcely a disturbing element in the practical working of our system. We call attention to the effect of this unwritten law.

1. *As to the doctrine of God's sovereignty.* This almost invariable custom practically compels us to draw all of our recruits from the youth in school and college. The seminary is virtually an annex to the college. The candidate is expected to pass as directly as possible from the latter to the former. The natural, indeed, the almost inevitable, effect is to exclude all candidates over thirty-five years of age, or even under this age, if they are married, unless they have means sufficiently ample to support themselves and families while attending the seminary. Of course the Committee cannot encourage men to lay such a burden upon the educational fund of the Church, especially since it has strained these resources to the utmost to allow even scanty support to unencumbered single men. Presbyterianism thus seems to take it for granted that God calls only boys, not men in the prime of life, into its ministry. It is true that we have the very fewest instances of the contrary, but lack of provision for such may account for it. It is indisputable that some of the most useful ministers, and no small percentage either, of other denominations are from this very class. While the Presbyterian *theory* honors,

par eminence, the sovereignty of God's Spirit, yet the Presbyterian *practice* limits the exercise of his gracious call in this most important department to men under thirty-five years of age.

2. *It limits the ministry to one-fifth of the educated world.* It cannot be questioned, that for years there has been a strong tendency among students to ignore the dead languages. This tendency has actually invaded the colleges entrenched in the ramparts of the *curriculum*, and compelled acknowledgment even there, so that there are very few which have not made notable concession in the shape of *extra curriculum* courses, offering degrees for which the dead languages are not requisite. In the large universities, which offer optional "tickets," the tendency is still more marked—the lecture-room of the Greek Professor is attended by not more than twenty per cent. of the number found in other classes; and when the educated men in what are called the learned professions are considered, the percentage of scholars in these dead languages is still smaller. Without doubt there has been a great change in this matter within the memory of the present generation. The wisdom of this change we do not discuss; the fact we assert, and its effect we emphasise—an effect worthy of anxious consideration. This effect is to cut off from our ministry four-fifths of the educated mind, the sanctified talents of our Church.

3. *It limits us to an expensive class of ministers.* The education is a costly one; more so than that for any profession in the world; more so than that required in the ministry of any other Church—a college course followed by three years in the seminary. A man can prepare himself for any of the learned professions in less time and with less expense than for the Presbyterian ministry. This expense is a heavy tax upon the Church, even with the lamentable dearth of candidates; just suppose we had as many as we are working and praying for! After graduation and licensure, it is yet more expensive. One hundred and fifty dollars has been his support heretofore; now he must have, at the very least, four times this amount, and if "promising," he may expect even more; and, using the language of the world, he is worth it. There is no walk in life in which so much educated

labor can be had at so cheap a rate. All of our ministry is of this class—a class that deserves, demands, and commands a support as the fruit of its labors, and is dependent upon such support for a living. Such a class suits perfectly a self-sustaining church; but how about purely missionary work? The missionary field must be self-supporting from the very start, which is an absurdity; or else it must be supported by the voluntary contributions of the Church at large, which, on any extended scale, is, alas, almost an equal absurdity. Nevertheless, we are shut up to just this expensive class of ministers, and no other. It may be alleged that these men *could* live on much less; undoubtedly, and we believe they would, were such the only condition of their preaching the gospel; but when the destitute home mission fields come into competition with settled charges offering salaries sufficient to feed both body and mind, to gratify the tastes engendered and the needs created by their training, *cæteris paribus*, the licentiates will choose the settled charges, and the *cæteris* will generally be *paribus*. Perhaps this is wrong in the licentiates; but if the verdict were, “He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone,” we fear there would not be an indiscriminate rush after rocks on the part of the settled pastors.

4. *It limits us to one grade of ministry.*

Society presents us with numerous grades in the scale of education, cultivation, and refinement, to meet the demands of which we have only one grade of ministry. At this point we digress a little to recur to (16) in the prefatory list, according to promise given on p. 656.

This accounts in large measure for the difficulty in winning what are popularly termed “the masses.” *We have no ministry for the masses.* “Like people, like priest.” Presbyterians oftentimes make efforts to gather this class into their congregations. The pastor and his wife and some of the more zealous and warm-hearted of his congregation sedulously invite them, perhaps studiously court them, but they are not won. Occasionally some meagre percentage of them attend church for a while, and the pastor is much encouraged; they are courteously welcomed, but they do not feel at home. Unintentionally, perhaps unconscious-

ly, but inevitably, social differences are obtruded on their attention. They read it in the countenance, in the quiet and easy manners, in the tasteful and becoming dress; the very atmosphere is pregnant with the subtle and indefinable difference. Reference is not had here to anything so gross and rude as *hauteur* of manner and bearing, but to the unavoidable effects of culture. It is practically impossible to amalgamate these classes, and yet Christian fellowship must go hand in hand with social recognition. The only point of contact must not be in the church and at the communion table, but on the street, in the store, and in the parlor. It is useless to declaim against society lines, class distinctions, *et id omne genus*; these things will always exist, and "birds of a feather will flock together." Moreover it is not to be hastily taken for granted that the only difficulty lies in a want of affability on the part of the higher classes. The most insurmountable difficulty is in the lower class itself. Suppose in some city the higher class should unanimously agree to an attempt to amalgamate, to visit, and invite to their houses, this lower class. Suppose they should carefully hide every expression of social superiority in the matter of finery, etc., would not the humble folk feel just as sensibly and painfully the difference of rank, and would not these attempts, in their minds, savor of that bitterest of all flavors, condescension and patronage? Here we touch the deepest springs of human nature, and he is a shallow philosopher indeed who attributes the difficulty to ostentation of dress or pride of bearing; it is not the externals of wealth, not the vulgar parade and show, it is the insensible, unconscious, powerful, manifestly-self-revealing influence of culture, polish, and refinement. And this, mark it, operates against the minister as really as against his people; despite his kindness, his attentiveness, his earnest desire to benefit them, they *feel* this great difference. This vast social chasm, which lies deeper than dress, deeper than mere affability and the like, which is, on the contrary, inwrought into the very warp and woof of being. *He is not one of them*, and though they may admire him and respect him and feel grateful to him for his efforts in their behalf, they do not and cannot *feel at home* with him. Hence they invariably gravitate

towards that Church in which the air is not so heavy with this social superiority, where they will meet not merely fellow church-members or acquaintances but associates, friends, and intimates. You may elaborate as many theories as you please, you may preach until you are hoarse upon the communion and fellowship of the saints, you may instruct your people in public and private upon these things, you may set them an admirable example in the matter, and after faithful experiment you will find on these pages the record of your experience.

Presbyterianism as a Church needs some of that apostolic adaptability of becoming "all things to all men." The Baptists and Methodists accomplish this by having almost every grade of society and every degree of culture and education represented in their ministry. Their resources are so varied that they can suit any and every sort of a field, from a city charge to a cross-roads appointment. We have only one grade of ministers. The very same qualifications are required of him who is to labor among the most ignorant and unlettered rustics in the backwoods as of him who takes charge of the most cultivated congregation in our largest city. This is evidently a great waste of resources unless we are prepared to maintain that the same scholastic attainments are essential to edification in both cases. But admitting, what many practical men seriously question, that it is not only the glory but the advantage of Presbyterianism that it offers the very same grade of ministry to the ignorant and the cultivated alike, we assert that the advantage exists only in theory; practically the unlettered and ignorant rustic in the backwoods does not enjoy the benefit of these scholastic attainments, for the simple reason that the Presbyterian preacher is not to be found there. As long as the same qualifications are required of the city pastor and the backwoods preacher, the result will be that the backwoods preacher will be exceedingly rare. And even when the uncultivated classes have an opportunity to enjoy the advantages of this ministry in our cities, they do not avail themselves of the opportunity. They do not even allow themselves to be persuaded to do so. They attend other churches, though they sometimes acknowledge that the preaching is not so intellectual or scholarly.

5. The only other result of this unwritten law which we shall notice at present is its effect upon the sermon.

The Presbyterian ideal of a sermon is exceedingly high; the subject thoroughly mastered, matter abundant and well digested, order perfectly logical, the whole well considered and arranged from introduction to peroration, full of theological truth, condensed, complete, exhaustive. The manifest tendency is to exalt the sermon to too high a place—to lead the ministry insensibly to consider it the end instead of the means. In his desire to perfect the sermon the preacher is prone to overlook the great purpose of it all. His whole attention is absorbed in constructing the sermon as a matter of art, in making it as complete and symmetrical as possible. He overlooks the fact that the excellence of a sermon consists not so much in its perfection as a theological thesis, a critical exegesis, or a homiletical analysis, as in its adaptation to move the hearts of men. As a consequence, some of his best efforts (according to this false standard) fall perfectly flat. Possibly his surprise thereat is natural, but the congregation is not surprised at the ineffectiveness of these studied, intellectual, profound, essay-like sermons.

And here we may account for a portion of the difficulties mentioned in (4) and (11); a "reserve force" is needed because pastors are unable to meet the demands of "special services," and they are unable to honor this extra draft on their resources because they cannot find time to prepare the sermons requisite for such services, *i. e.*, such sermons as they would be willing to preach; they feel compelled always to meet the enemy clad in a *Saul's armor of a sermon*, when a smooth stone from the brook would be amply sufficient, if they went into the conflict with the sole desire of vindicating the honor and glory of God, untainted with anxiety about pulpit reputation, and with a simple trust in the name of the Lord of hosts, unweakened by reliance upon the powers of rhetoric. Possibly, dear clerical reader, this may explain the contrast in effectiveness between some of your least studied efforts and those set sermons which you consider "suitable for Presbytery or Synod."

Such are some of the effects of this procrustean custom, this

unwritten law, which, from long precedent, has become well-nigh as invariable as that of the Medes and Persians; and now, though this unwritten law is practically so binding in its force, and so far-reaching in its effects, we believe it to be, in several important particulars, inconsistent with our standards and inconsistent with itself.

The Theological Seminary occupies a very anomalous position in Presbyterianism. The institution is not recognised in our standards, and yet it is decidedly the most influential element in our Church life. These schools are the established channels through which men enter the ministry. When they enter the course, their minds are generally *tabulae rasæ*, so far as the subjects there treated of are concerned. They leave with views influenced, biassed, decided, by the Seminary. The institution is carefully watched, jealously guarded by a large Board of Trustees, representing different sections of the Church; men of affairs and men of books, and generally men of influence, a hard-working, experienced body, not yet ruined by the everlasting rotation system, which turns a man out for no other reason under heaven than because he has been in a good while. The Professors are carefully selected for fitness to fill the various chairs. They are inducted into this most influential position, and charged with its transcendent responsibilities as being the best qualified that the whole Church can afford; *and then, in the face of all this, the Seminary is practically ignored by the Presbytery.* The Faculties of these schools strenuously urge the Presbyteries to consult the good of the Seminary by arranging the time for their spring meetings so as to allow candidates for licensure to be present at the close of the session; and yet it is stated that at the last Commencement of Union Seminary, only *four* members of the Senior Class were present. The certificates of scholarship from these schools are nothing worth before the Presbyteries. A candidate presents himself before his Presbytery; he has just passed through examinations, oral and written, lasting for eight or ten days consecutively; his reports state that on daily recitations and final examinations he has attained an average grade of 97 out of an (*im*)possible 100; yet, notwithstanding the fact that this grade

is based upon long examinations, conducted by specialists in each department (and such specialists as we have just described), this candidate must go through an inexpressibly tedious tread-mill in open Presbytery, just as if he had never heard of a seminary. The very same examination is given to a candidate whose grade is not 45; if any difference at all, his examination is a little longer and harder than that of the man graded 45. If the candidate falls below the mark in the Seminary, there is some reason in the Presbytery's affording him another opportunity and exercising its own discretion in the matter of "sustaining" or "not sustaining," inasmuch as the Professor's sole business is to take cognisance of scholarship; but to select these specialists in each department as the best the united Church can furnish, and then thus ignore their verdict, is strangely inconsistent.

Again: there is the greatest variety in the strictness with which the standards are construed. Some Presbyteries discourage any application for licensure before the Seminary course is completed; others license at the end of the Middle year, with the distinct understanding that the licentiate is to return and complete his course; *i. e.*, they license a man, and then, by remanding him to the Seminary, virtually declare him unprepared for licensure. Sometimes a large portion of the Senior Class are licentiates. Some Presbyteries are very rigid in the examination upon the studies embraced in the college curriculum, and call for everything "nominated in the bond," without regard to "race, color, or previous condition," etc.; while in the minutes of others we read such sentences as, "having graduated at ——— College, the Presbytery accepted his diploma as sufficient testimony of his attainment in literature and science;" "being well known to the Presbytery, some of the usual parts of trial were omitted."

Theoretically, the license to the ministry (except in certain extraordinary cases) means the same thing everywhere—not that every holder has the same proficiency in the required studies, but that each holder of a license has at least a *certain definite* proficiency, specified in the standards; whereas, practically, this is not true; on the contrary, the standard is as variable as such a thing can be.

Moreover, our practice is inconsistent with our theory, in that it results in exalting licensure above ordination. There is a decided tendency towards this everywhere. The chief scrutiny and most stringent examinations are given at licensure, while those prescribed for ordination are greatly slurred in most Presbyteries, amounting in many instances to the merest form, or even farce. Our theory does not contemplate any such state of affairs as this. The ordination trials ought to be the most stringent and severe. Licensure does not change the ecclesiastical status of the candidate; it merely continues him on probation, extending his privileges simply to the extent of exercising his gifts. He does not become a member of Presbytery. He has no vote in the court, not even the privileges of a "visiting brother." Except by express permission, he has neither vote nor voice in the court. Presbytery may revoke his license without judicial process; without even assigning any reason except that they are satisfied that he will not become a useful and acceptable minister. Our theory certainly does not encourage us to lay all the stress on merely giving a candidate permission to test his fitness for public speaking, and then go through a burlesque of an examination as preparatory to the laying on of hands and constituting him a *Presbyterian preacher*.

Finally, under this head, we are inconsistent with our theory in the matter of receiving ministers from other denominations. A Methodist or Baptist minister, changing his doctrinal views and applying for admission into the Presbyterian ministry, is examined solely on soundness in doctrine; not a word is said about his attainments in scholarship. So far as appears to the Presbytery, he may not be able to read a line of Hebrew, or translate a verse in the New Testament Greek, or he may never have heard of the Council of Nice. We would not think of even *licensing* an educated Presbyterian lawyer living in missionary territory, and giving him permission to gather a congregation about him on Sabbaths; but at the same time we will welcome a minister from another denomination into our court, though he may not be one-half as well educated, provided only he is as sound in his *adopted* creed as the lawyer is in his *native* belief.

And this suggests the only remedy for paucity of ministers that occurs to us—a very simple one and not unencumbered with serious difficulty we must confess, but at the same time presenting itself to us as absolutely necessary, if we are to compete with other denominations in aggressive work in the home field: we must avail ourselves of the provision for extraordinary cases more frequently, and apply our system of licensure with more elasticity.

Let us learn something from the Methodists and Baptists in this matter. They are not limited to the youths in school and college, nor to only a small fraction of the educated members of their Church, nor to an expensive class, nor to one grade alone, nor has the sermon become the master instead of the servant of their preachers. All this they avoid, and in the following way: they have the "*local preacher*," and the regular "*elder*" or full member of Conference. The local preacher is a licentiate; he has been authorised to exercise his gifts in a certain territory; he stands ready to supply any vacancy, fill any appointment, assist the regular pastor in protracted meetings or in any other way desired. They are often found in pastorates working under the direction of the pastor to supplement his efforts, particularly in country charges where from four to eight congregations are to be supplied by one preacher; but their main serviceableness is in missionary fields where the denomination is not strong enough to support a minister or where the preacher may have two or three counties as his "circuit." In localities where there is no organisation, but where several members of the church live, the denomination selects some godly earnest man of good sense and discretion and devoted to his Church, and license him to call his neighbors together on the Lord's day and give them such exhortation as he is capable of; he attends to his farm or store during the week and "exhorts" on Sabbath. While this may be very poor preaching according to the Presbyterian standard, it is better than none; it is blessed to the salvation of souls; it results in the establishment of a Sabbath-school, in the gathering of a congregation and the building up of a church; then, if desirable, some regular "*elder*" is sent to carry on the work. The church has now become self-supporting and it has not cost the Conference one cent. Under

the Presbyterian system those three or four members would have waited for years, and finally despairing of ever having an organization of their own would have cast in their lot with the Methodists or Baptists or else stood aloof from all Christian communion and effort. Alas, how many localities are thus photographed! *The local preacher is a power in these denominations.* Ill or well as you may think, he fills a niche, but a niche which is entirely empty in our work. He helps to constitute an inexpensive class of preachers which is a vital need in evangelistic work. He is not fitted for conspicuous positions, city pulpits and the like, nor does his Church put him in such, but he commands the respect and confidence of his community, and by the aid of Henry, Scott, or Clarke, he preaches the gospel where there would be no preaching but for him. With us, on the contrary, the missionary field and the self-sustaining church must stand on the same level in the matter of expense. As long as this is true, aggressive work must "go on crutches" when it goes at all, and in the vast majority of openings for the work it cannot go at all. (See foot notes to p. 651.) For the successful prosecution of this work we need a ministry that can preach the gospel without "living of the gospel." And here we come in contact with the objection of (15) in the prefatory list, viz., a *secularised ministry.*

The bark of this objection is much worse than its bite. There has been more than one case in which at the beginning of an enterprise for church extension a Presbyterian pastor combined teaching with preaching. We have heard it stated that such was the case with the Second church in Richmond, one of the largest in our connexion, and that in the beginning Dr. Hoge devoted a part of his salary as a teacher to the support of the enterprise. Other instances might be given. The most influential Presbyterian preacher in the New Dispensation of the kingdom of God was liable to this terrible charge of a secularised ministry. *He* combined not teaching, mark it, *but tent-making*, with preaching. Here we have good apostolic-Presbyterian precedent. If Paul found it legitimate to do this rather than labor under the suspicion of preaching the gospel for gain, certainly it might be justifiable to combine secular labor with preaching in

such neighborhoods as give only the option between this and no preaching, and this is all we claim. We do not defend it as the best method in general, nor do we think there would be any danger of its becoming general. We think it might be employed with success in our wide destitutions which have never heard Presbyterian preaching, where there are no churches of our faith and where none are likely ever to be so far as we can see. In rare instances something like it is done. For example, the Philadelphia *Presbyterian* prints the following:

"An exchange says that 'Mr. J. A. Benton, of Nasonville, Wisconsin, an elder in the Presbyterian Church, found himself in the midst of Christian work. He did his duty and now cares for a congregation of one hundred and fifty families. His Presbytery gave him a temporary license. Mr. Benton's people wish Presbytery to ordain him, so that he may be able, in an orderly manner, to unite the young people in marriage, baptize the children, and administer the Lord's Supper.' "

And a correspondent of the *Evangelist* writes:

"There is much said upon the deficiency of the numbers preparing for the ministry in our Church, and but little done to supply the demand. The rigid rules which the Education Board are required to administer, in aiding candidates for the ministry, must stand in the way of many who would make useful ministers, were they encouraged by a more flexible policy. A course of study extending from eight to ten years, with an expense of from two to three thousand dollars, will cause many a young man to change his purpose and yield up his desire to preach the gospel. The means are lacking to pursue a long and expensive course of education. There is in my church a young man of a good academic education. He desires to become a minister, and would make a success in the sacred calling could he have the advantages of a theological seminary training. He is about twenty-six years of age, and is married. Since his marriage his mind has been turned to the ministry by some impressive providences. He is without the means to pursue a seminary course of study. Have we a door open for such young men to enter the ministry by the needed aid?

"A similar case to this occurred in a neighboring church. A young man was converted, who soon after hired as a school-teacher in a back district several miles from any place of public worship. He appointed meetings in his school-house and talked to the people, and a revival attended his labors; and during the year a church was organised, to which he continued preaching. The Presbytery would not license him; but a council did license him, and after two years of successful labor in two small churches one of his churches called for his

ordination and a pastoral settlement; and the council convened, ordained him, and two members of Presbytery were members of the council, and voted for his ordination. At the end of four years he was called to settle over one of the churches of Presbytery. He was received by letter from an Association, and was duly settled after an examination, and during a four years' pastorate very much built up the church, and is now one of our successful home missionaries at the West; and yet he had but a limited common-school education to begin with. He would undoubtedly have stood much higher with the advantages of a ten years' course of study. But for this he had no means. He had also a wife and one child before his conversion, and these must be cared for as the relation required.

"Another young man, the son of a poor widow, finding the way to the Presbyterian ministry so long and expensive, turned from the Church of his choice to begin preparation for the ministry in the Methodist Church.¹ He had a good academic education, and was put in charge of a small parish as a local preacher, and began preaching in connexion with a course of study assigned him. In four years he was a full-fledged itinerant, and is now a leader in his Conference. The gain to the Methodist Church was a loss to ours, and the loss was simply because we have no system by which to put such promising *poor* young men into the ministry without requiring exactions which cannot be met. . . . When my own mind was turned to the ministry, I examined the rules of the Education Society, to see if aid could be obtained in pursuing a course of study. The rules of the Society and my circumstances forbade my application for aid, and with my hands I worked my way through college; and for theology took a private course with a settled pastor, and by his influence was licensed and ordained without a full theological course, and as a practical worker in his parish, as was the New England custom years ago. The present cost of a college course shuts out of the ministry very many who would gladly enter it, could the financial mountain be removed.

"The ministry of the future as of the past will come mostly from poor families, or such as are not in affluent circumstances. Wealthy parents furnish but few ministers from their sons, though there are some noble exceptions to this rule. If it is not Presbyterian to obtain ministers without a full course of collegiate and theological study, is it not common sense to shorten the course for many who have more common sense than money?"

SENECA."

But in addition to this supplemental force, our Methodist brethren have a further advantage of us in having more than one door into their regular ordained ministry. They have the theo-

¹The writer recalls a similar instance in which the young man has proven very popular and successful.

logical school, to which their youth can go, and from which come prepared for regular elders' orders; but if the candidate is so situated that attendance upon school is inconvenient, they have a course of private study, running through several years. The candidate enters the *First Class* at Conference, is assigned study, and at the same time set at work, and so he is advanced by annual examinations, from class to class, combining work and study all the time, until finally inducted into the full work of the ministry. He has had the advantage of practice with theory, and at the same time, instead of being in any sense a burden, he has been a help to the Church. By this method, a way is opened to *all* who desire to enter their ministry.

Some such provision we would like to see made in our system. We have not the slightest prejudice against theological seminaries; we would double the number of their students, if possible. We would advise every candidate, who could do so, to attend one. But there is a class which the seminaries cannot reach, and for this class we plead. Every learned profession provides for such cases, and draws from them some of its most brilliant ornaments. There are schools of medicine and schools of law, ably manned and largely attended; but at the same time there are many men of conspicuous ability in these professions, whom circumstances did not allow to avail themselves of the advantages thus offered. Fortunately for them and for these professions, the children of this world were "wiser in their generation than the children of light," and other avenues were open; whereas, for our ministry, the professional school is *practically* the only opening. We have drifted gradually into this state of things; we do not believe this virtual usurpation on the part of the professional school was ever contemplated by those who sat at its cradle.

Under this system, if, despite our presumption to the contrary, God should exercise his sovereignty and throw the prophet's mantle over some godly Elisha at the plow, though that Elisha could assume direction of the schools of the prophets, *our* Elisha must leave business, family, and everything, to become himself a school-boy; and if he is not wealthy enough to support himself and family in the mean time, they must be supported by the

Church. Is it surprising, under such circumstances, that no modern Elishas or Amoses expect (or suspect) the prophet's mantle? Many of this class, however, are called into the Methodist and Baptist ministry, and God's Spirit owns their call, too, so far as results can indicate. We draw our candidates from an area so circumscribed and limited, that we cannot expect any very large supply. We do not hear the Methodists and Baptists complaining of dearth of candidates. They have as many as they need. "Such as they are," you add. Yes, such as have planted their churches in our Synods, from the seacoast to the mountains.

Let us take a *bona fide* illustration of our method in this matter—a real incident, which occurred once upon a time in a certain Presbytery. A candidate requested to be taken under its care; a man forty years old, a ruling elder, married, superintendent of a Sabbath-school, and having the reputation of being more than usually intelligent. There were three possible courses open to the Presbytery: (1) To send him to the Seminary; (2) To recommend him to study under the direction of his pastor and apply for license as soon as possible; (3) To put him immediately to work, an opening for which providentially occurred at that very meeting. Citizens from an adjoining county, and missionary ground to Presbyterianism, too, sent up a formal urgent petition through one of their number, praying the Presbytery to provide them with preaching, to send a man to travel as a Presbyterian circuit-rider through the county; and while admitting that they could not promise a specified salary, yet guaranteed a support to any man who might be sent, and expressed the opinion that their section was ripe for the effort. Here was a man forty years of age, an elder, and Sabbath-school superintendent, asking to be set apart to the work of the ministry. Here was a missionary field calling for the gospel; and yet the Presbytery recommended this man to leave his family and attend the Seminary, which he did. "And the missionary field?" Oh, *it* remains unsupplied to this day. Now, what prevented the Presbytery from licensing that ruling elder then and there, sending him into that missionary field, telling him to try all his doctrinal preaching by the Shorter

Catechism, and prescribing a course of study for him upon which to examine him at the next meeting? They might at least have pursued the second plan, one which antedates seminaries, and has turned out many able and useful men. But we think he ought to have been put immediately to work. Our theory makes special provision for such cases; and we say, without hesitation, that this provision should be called into requisition with much more frequency than at present; that it must be, if we are to do anything towards aggressive work. We must have a *wider, shorter*, and less *expensive* route into evangelistic fields than that *via* a course in the Seminary.

But what about the Greek, Hebrew, and Latin? We say, let them go, in all such cases, however numerous. And now some clerical brother raises his hands in horror, and protests against "lowering the standard." Let such a brother pause here, close his eyes, and take an inventory of *his* stock in this line; let him conjugate the Hebrew verb הִרְיָה , certainly a mild test, and then give the "principal parts" of the Greek verb $\text{\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\gamma\epsilon\iota\upsilon}$. We venture the assertion that not *one-tenth* of the ministers, ten years in the harness, can wrestle successfully with the common New Testament verb $\text{\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\gamma\omega}$; and as to the forms of הִרְיָה , imagination fails us to designate the fewness of those equal to this very moderate amount of Hebrew.

Gentle reader, did you ever witness the examination of a candidate in Hebrew by the Committee of his Presbytery? Were you not struck with the indescribably cautious, non-committal, *nil nimis* method pursued by the examiner? He enters upon the examination with a prudent reserve, which is strikingly suggestive of a man wading into a strange stream. Of course there are exceptions; but the vast majority of ministers who have been ten years in the active service are utterly innocent of any practical knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, and yet the study of these languages remains a *sine qua non*; many a minister who would be ingloriously "pitched" in a sophomore examination in Greek at any respectable curriculum college, is absolutely horrified at the idea of lowering the standard.

And now a word as to this standard. Can any reader recall

an instance in which a candidate was refused license for failure to pass his examination? There are many who can recall instances in which the applicant was licensed, though he had notoriously failed. The writer of this paper recalls one in which the candidate was voted "not sustained" on the majority of his examinations in detail (Theology and Church History among them), and then immediately voted "sustained" on the examination as a whole; another instance where the candidate failed miserably in the introduction to John's Gospel, could not even decline *οἰτος*; and still another, in which one of the Committee remarked that he did not see how a man could pass through the Seminary without learning more Greek than the candidate knew. When Presbyteries so notoriously fail to construe the standards strictly on these points—and we challenge denial here—what is the use of maintaining the figment of a high standard before the outside world, to prevent useful men from applying for entrance into this work? Would it not be more frank and candid to say that such is the desirable standard, and as such is recommended to all, but at the same time that failure therein will not be a bar to entering our ministry? That we will make some discrimination according to varied circumstances of the applicants and the providence of God, and not require a knowledge of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin from every candidate? There are more ways of drilling and disciplining the mind than one; and we know that many men become effective speakers without a knowledge of these languages. Is it incredible that such a man, by studying English literature, church history, theological works, homiletic manuals, the religious works which pour so ceaselessly from the press, and lastly and chiefly *the English Bible*, with the many excellent popular commentaries, could become an acceptable and instructive preacher? Is the ministry the only calling on the earth in which the inexhaustible wealth treasured in the English tongue is incapable of affording richness of thought, breadth of culture, grace of style, perspicuity and versatility of expression, and fluency of speech? What peculiarity is it in the ministry which gives to all these riches wings? But then you object, and say that the Bible, the minister's text-book, is written in Greek and Hebrew.

We beg pardon, but you are in error. The minister's text-book is English, inasmuch as the list given a few lines above is practically the course of study pursued by the overwhelming majority of our preachers. The Bible they study is the English Bible, expounded and illustrated by popular commentaries. Where *one* man habitually refers to Ellicott, a *hundred* refer to Ryle. What proportion of active ministers are equal to the appreciation of Ellicott's criticisms?¹ Very few men, who are capable of original investigation in these departments, now make such; they get it second hand. All this information is accessible in English dress, and far more reliable than the fruits of original investigation by any ordinary Greek scholar of the rank and file of our ministry; and upon such means does the rank and file depend.

While such a course as we recommend may relax the claims of our standards in the letter, it does not in the spirit; the standards prescribe learning sufficient to expound intelligently the word. No one will question the fact, that since our standards were framed, there has been a perfect revolution in the methods, means, and appliances of study. Our standards are nearly contemporaneous with King James's Version. Bearing in mind that they are nearly two hundred and fifty years old, read the following extract. Speaking of the period embraced in the life-time of his own father, Prof. Phelps says:

" * * There were no popular Commentaries. . . 'Doddridge's Family Expositor,' published about one hundred and thirty years ago, was the first work of this kind in our language, and was not of great value for the discussion of the difficulties of the Bible; nor was the circulation of it at all general. . . The best biblical commentaries were in Latin. . . Rev. Albert Barnes once told me, that when he began the preparation of his 'Notes on the New Testament,' the only books he could depend upon for his assistance were his Lexicons and a copy of the 'Critici Sacri,' a work in thirteen Latin folios, which formed the best part of his library. Yet that was not far from the year 1830."—*Theory of Preaching*, p. 206.

¹ A candidate for the ministry, an A. B. fresh from one of the largest, most famous institutions in the United States, was asked, in the spirit of a joke, what was the difference between the 1st and 2d Aorists (*i. e.* the difference of meaning). He said he didn't know; but he *did* know that the 1st Aorist and the Perfect were the same! Fancy him using Ellicott's Commentaries.

In our day learned Commentaries have been so simplified as to put their results within the reach of any industrious English scholar; even the critical study of the original Scriptures can now be successfully prosecuted through the medium of "Englishman's Editions" of the Critical Commentaries. We hazard the opinion that the facilities for Bible study have been so multiplied since the framing of our standards that a zealous conscientious student of our age ignorant of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin, can yet better interpret the Scriptures than he of the days of the Confession of Faith with no mean attainments in those languages.

Fifty years ago it was necessary for every writer to know how to make or mend a quill-pen; fifty years ago every farmer felt it a necessity to have a blacksmith shop upon his premises; now the writer buys his pens by the gross, and the farmer his plough-points by the pound. Just so, when our standards were adopted, the exposition of the Scriptures was confined to Greek and Latin and Hebrew, and it was absolutely essential that every preacher have his own "critical shop" and do his own commentary-making.

Sometimes when the air is so full of ozone generated by the energy exercised in maintaining the qualifications enjoined by our standards, we are almost tempted to fear that the letter of our standards would have excluded some of our Lord's own apostles. When discussing such topics as *The Success of Christianity a Proof of its Divine Origin*, some men wax eloquent over the "unlettered and obscure men" who were its first champions, but they grow indignant when their very words are used in other connexions. They emphasise the fact that while the Bible is to us a dead language, it was the vernacular of these men, and what this fact will not accomplish they relegate to the indefinite influence of inspiration; but inspiration was not *education*. The miracle at Pentecost gave command of languages—inspiration did not. We doubt if inspiration ever improved a man's fluency or did anything in the line of what education accomplishes. It *did* secure an infallibly correct record; and is it not one of the strongest proofs of inspiration that it prevented the record of many universal errors of which even the writers themselves were not free? As to this vernacular argument, if you wish to test its

force, go and talk with the most ignorant man of your acquaintance: English is *his* vernacular, and yet he may not be able to read a printed word, and much of the language of ordinary books is as unknown to him as Greek. Is it at all certain that all the apostles read the original Scriptures? Smith, in his Bible Dictionary, says: "For a long period the Septuagint was the Old Testament of the far larger part of the Christian Church." "It was manifestly the chief store-house from which the apostles drew their proofs and precepts." Barrow (*Companion to the Bible*, p. 202) says: "Then again the greatest number of quotations in the New Testament from the Old is made from the Septuagint."¹ So that it is at least possible that some of the preachers of apostolic and immediately post-apostolic times were dependent upon a *version*; one, too, not a whit superior to King James's Version. When we think of this we fear that inspiration must be made to include more than we have ever seen claimed for it, before the letter of our standards can be vindicated by apostolic precedent.

But aside from this, we think it doubtful whether the standard would be *practically* lowered. All whom ambition and conscience stirred up to it, would study to master these tongues. There would always be some inspiration to attain this knowledge; and, as it is, only that class now attains it or maintains it. It is the few who retain what they acquire in the seminary course, and the fewer still who make this the ground-work for further attainments. "Then why urge any change if this is already the case?" Because we have at present only the disadvantages of such a course and none of its advantages. Yes, it is true that a man ignorant of these languages *can* enter our ministry; but he must be one who has proved his lack of appreciation of them; one who has wasted his opportunities; one who has idled away his college and seminary courses and is not ashamed to risk the exposure of the fact. If he is a *young* man without the experience of any other calling, if he has been through the seminary, he will not be refused even though he comes out only "artificially and elaborately ignorant," with all the airs of scholarship and none of its

¹ See also Greenfield, quoted in Smith's Bible Dictionary; Angus's Hand-Book, p. 9 (old edition); and authorities generally.

substance, the blossoms and no fruit; one, in a word, who, if not too aspiring to accept an obscure field, would only deepen the prejudices of an ignorant people; for he has the brand upon him, and the fact that it is counterfeit does not lessen their objections.

“But such a course would involve a change of organic law.” Ah! reader, if you have followed us thus far, you cannot stumble at this Presbyterian stumbling-block. This objection reminds us of one curious freak of our grand old Church: she will fight to the last ditch against any law to do that which for years she has been doing without law. During the din and dust of the late long fight over the Book of Church Order, did it ever occur to you that some of the most hotly contested points were just those which made it lawful to do exactly what we had long been doing unlawfully? And at every Assembly at present, some Presbytery represents it as *absolutely necessary* that in some instances a pastor and one elder (where there are only two in the Session) be allowed to transact business; certainly it must be done under some circumstances, *e. g.*, to receive members into full communion, to prepare reports for Presbytery, and other things of like importance which cannot be postponed and which ought not to be passed over on account of chronic sickness or long absence of one of the elders; but it must be done *unlawfully* and the Presbytery must criticise the Sessional records on account thereof!

But the law is not the *end* of the Church (though ours sometimes comes near being the *end* of us), the law is but a *means*, and if it stands in the way of efficiency, *change* it.

Can we afford to stickle for organic law in this matter when the pressure upon us is so tremendous? when the fields white to harvest are ever opening around us and calling for laborers? When we see such statements as those in the foot-notes to page 659 above, filling our reports, telling us that, whereas in 1872 there were two hundred and five candidates, in 1882, after ten years of growth on the part of the Church and of the needs of the work, there are only one hundred and fourteen, may we not fear that our prayers for more laborers are “hindered” by our machinery for putting them into the field?

There is abundant evidence that the Church feels that there is

something wrong in this matter, and ever and anon there are voices anxiously pleading for some relief. They come from platform and press, they are heard on the floors of our Presbyteries, and they knock at the doors of our General Assemblies in the shape of overtures. During the last ten years numerous overtures have gone up on the subject, indicative of dissatisfaction with our present system of education, its failure to provide for evangelistic work, its expense, etc., etc.

In 1871, *Nashville* overtures to require licentiates to spend two years in missionary work before settling as pastors. Minutes, p. 15.

In the same year, *Western District* wishes candidates employed as colporteurs. Minutes, p. 19.

In 1872, *Nashville* repeats her overture of 1871. Minutes, p. 156.

In 1873, *Tombeckbee* and *Muhlenburg* each send an overture making the request again. Minutes, p. 313.

In 1874, *Augusta* overtures on defectiveness of ministerial training. Minutes, p. 484.

In 1875, *Concord* wishes present scheme abandoned and the subject remanded to the Presbyteries. Minutes, p. 17.

In 1876, *Fayetteville* overtures "on the subject of education." Minutes, p. 208.

In the same year it appears from the Report of the Standing Committee that there were overtures from *Mecklenburg* and *Charleston* on the subject. The Report says: "We learn from these papers that considerable dissatisfaction exists in the Church with the present scheme of education, as expensive, inefficient, and failing to meet the wants of the Church." Minutes, p. 229. See also Report of Special Committee, Sec. 2, p. 274, of same year.

In 1877, *New Orleans*, overtures. Minutes, p. 416.

In 1880, *Tuskaloosa* wishes candidates to spend six months in each year laboring among vacant churches or in destitute fields. Minutes, p. 192.

In 1881, *Bethel* sends an overture, from which the following is an extract :

"3. That with a view to effect this result, as well as to put the opportunity of a thorough training for the ministry (subject to such restrictions and limitations as the Assembly shall deem necessary) within the reach of that numerous class of active, able, and highly competent young men, many of them business men, as have never enjoyed the advantages of a classical education; and in view, furthermore, of the speedy reorganisation of Columbia Seminary, Bethel Presbytery would urgently pray the General Assembly to lend its sanction and approval to the plan of substituting in that institution, for the exegetical study of the Scriptures in the original Hebrew and Greek, that of the English Bible, old and new versions, confronted with and corrected upon the originals in all cases of real or supposed error or other serious difference of opinion."

And finally, in 1882, *Fayetteville* overtures on the same line; the text we have been unable to obtain, but the following, from a correspondent, appeared in an account of the meeting:

"We omitted to mention that Presbytery overtured the General Assembly in reference to making some provision for such probable candidates as were, from the force of circumstances, debarred the opportunity of prosecuting a course of classical study."

And so they come from the North and from the South, from the East and from the West, *thirteen* of them in about ten years; and what becomes of them? Punch says: "The best way to kill a thing is to get a Committee to sit on it." They generally die decently and in order in the Committee on Bills and Overtures; and as the non-Assembly brother walks mournfully through the cemetery, he finds it difficult to identify the remains; there is nothing on the head-stone but the name or number, followed by the simple and unpretentious epitaph: "*Your Committee recommends that this overture be not granted.*"

We have announced the tentative character of this paper. We admit there are grave objections to the scheme we suggest; some of them have been mentioned. *We have heard of the Cumberland Presbyterians, too*; but if pressed, we should confess that we think even that Church better than none, and we are just as Calvinistic as any man since the days of the Apostle Paul.

We long to see another avenue opened into our ministry: an avenue open to deserving energetic men who cannot attend a theological seminary; an avenue opened to men in the prime

of life, educated in the schools of experience and observation of human nature and contact with men; an avenue through which men may enter the ministry without expense to the Church, and from which they are not obliged to come entirely dependent upon a self-sustaining church for a support; *an avenue which leads through missionary territory into the ministry*; an avenue which does not bind the sovereignty of God in the mummied bands of languages long dead; an avenue which shall give the Spirit of God opportunity to blow not only through the silver trumpet, but also through the rams' horns against the modern Jerichos, if he chooses so to do. This is a class which the Presbyterian army cannot do without, if she is to compete with the other hosts of the Church militant.

And here we are reminded of the various branches of arms in an army—the infantry, the cavalry, the heavy artillery, the light artillery, the skirmish line, the pioneer corps, the professional soldier, the volunteer, and the conscript. We fight at present with only one branch of the service; a most valuable one; we consider it *the* most valuable, notwithstanding the tenor of our article. It deserves to be called *the regulars*; but we remember also that the volunteers are not to be despised; and after seeing hard service, the very militia often prove themselves not inferior to the regulars, tried and true.

Of course, under such a system we could not boast that a Presbyterian minister is always an educated (?) man. We would have some ministers who would be liable to the fun and ridicule that is sometimes lavished by the shallow pate upon the ministers of these other denominations, when comparisons are instituted between them and Presbyterian preachers. Such comparisons suggest the experience of the city boy when he goes fishing with his country cousin. He arranges his jointed rod, grass-seed line, and painted float, to the open-mouthed admiration of his rustic friend, while the country boy sits beside him, throws in his home-made line, with its bottle stopper cork, *and catches five fish to the city boy's one.*

We cannot tolerate any such ministry in our Church; we cannot lower our standard, and so we lay ourselves liable to the charge

of sacrificing to our net and burning incense to our drag, and in the mean time the Methodists and Baptists catch five fish to our one. When we are exalting our standard of qualification and protesting against an uneducated or a secularised ministry, it will be wholesome to recollect that the labors of this class of men have gathered into the Baptist Church 291,328 souls, and into the Methodist Church 299,858, while the ministry on which we plume ourselves have gathered 64,360.

The city boy and his country cousin!

But the amount of manuscript lying around us warns us that this interview is growing too protracted. We must bid you farewell for the present. If the Lord wills, we will meet you again with the new year.

ARTICLE IV.

THE POWER OF WOMAN.¹

Our subject is the Power of Woman in her own sphere, and it is to be discussed with a practical design. Probably the first topic this theme would suggest to the merely logical mind is the proper sphere of woman. But it is not deemed necessary to discuss this question now. Ours is a Christian civilisation, and therefore it is assumed that woman's place in society is that which the Bible authoritatively indicates. Our discussion is therefore narrowed to the influence which woman may, in her own heaven-appointed dominion, exert upon the world. What we propose to show is, that, although woman is to act in comparative retirement from the bustling, noisy, obtrusive activities which agitate the surface of human life, her power upon society is not therefore less but

¹This article constitutes the lecture recently delivered before the Teacher's Normal Institute at Columbia by the Rev. Dr. Mullally, the President of Adger College, Walhalla, South Carolina. [Eds. S. P. REVIEW.]

rather greater than that of man. To bring the subject clearly and interestingly before our minds, let us consider which of two babes, the one male and the other female, each physically perfect, and each placed in the circumstances most favorable to the highest development, will, in all probability, under the conditions of Christian civilisation, most influence the world.

For our own part, we could never see any good reason why the birth of a male child is almost universally hailed with more joy than that of a female, why the father is so apt to be disappointed that the first-born is not a boy, and why the letters of congratulation written to the parents when the baby is a girl contain words of consolation, by which, however well chosen, they are made to be really letters of condolence. If we look at the children while yet under the paternal roof, the girls are the more easily managed, the more tender, affectionate, and devoted from infancy up; the difference between the sexes as to amiability is as marked as that between the hoarse mischievous crow and the cooing gentle dove. The explanation that boys can take care of themselves better than girls will not stand a moment's candid examination in the light of ordinary observation. Young men are far more apt to make shipwreck in the voyage of life than young women. How seldom has the death of the mother, and how often has that of the father, proved beneficial to the children, whether in a temporal or spiritual aspect! Who has not seen the daughter nobly taking care, not only of herself, but also of her aged parents and perhaps other helpless ones of the family, while the son, having run the race of prodigality, was burying himself in utter ruin? Have we not in the wards of every city, and in almost every town and hamlet in the country, a practical proof of woman's ability to be, without exceeding the strictest bounds of female propriety, to the highest degree useful and independent, in the person of some truly admirable lady, who, both as to dignity of vocation and probably amount of salary, or if not, of real desert, leaves the great majority of the "lords of creation" far behind?

But probably that which most tends to make people attach higher importance and value to boys, is the common impression that power is the prerogative of the man, and that the woman sus-

tains and must sustain only a mere passive relation to all the great social and moral interests of the race. There is nothing men generally prize so much as power. The hope of gaining it for themselves and their children often leads them to sacrifice ease and comfort to scale the ice-clad Alps of difficulty, and risk precious life itself. This love of power is an element of the divine image impressed on man in his creation, and duty requires not its eradication but its proper exercise. The boy is deemed superior to the girl because he may, while she may not, occupy a public position in life, and wield a mighty influence under the immediate gaze of the multitude. He may one day enter the great arena, where, under the admiring eyes of the public, he can show his prowess by swaying human passions or overcoming the opposition of nature, or triumphing over the machinations of art. He may, as a great statesman, a distinguished soldier, a profound jurist, an eloquent divine, glisten in the eyes of the many with a dazzling glory. But the daughter must ever dwell in comparative seclusion, within the veil of the holy of holies in the social temple. She must shun the vulgar gaze, and so is debarred from the stage where power, in any high sense of the word, is thought alone to be won or exercised. This is precisely the view upon which the complaint that our present arrangement of society is unjust to woman is based. Yet it is really, though unconsciously, the view of thousands who loathe the agitations of the Sociologists of advanced thought. Its fallacy is in the assumption that the greatest power is that which, working above the surface, appeals directly to the cognitions of sense. A moment's thought should suffice to show that precisely because woman's position in the great social machine is an interior one, woman's power over its movements is greater than that of man. When we see the resistance of the towering rock-built mountain annihilated to make way for the fiery chariot of impatient commerce, or the heaving mighty ocean compelled to bear in his arms as a menial her various burdens, or the mysterious and terrible lightning of heaven made to speed as her confidential couriers obedient to the touch of her finger, it would be unbecoming in rational beings so to lose ourselves in the mere phenomena, however grand, as not to think of the wonder-

ful, though hidden, power of mind, of which these are but the manifestations. It is the office of reason to go back of the mere suggestions of sense, and discover powers far more splendid than any which appeal to us directly through the bodily organs. And the farther the mind goes behind the seen and the tangible the nobler and the better are the things which it discovers. That which is the most startling and the most exposed to the gaze of the unthinking is not the highest, the greatest, or the most desirable or beneficial kind of power. A steam-engine in motion is a mighty power, but who wants to be a steam-engine? It does indeed exhaust the admiration of the awe-struck untutored African. But to the thinker there is a higher power exercised in the control and guidance of the great machine, and a higher yet displayed in its construction, and still lying back of these a still higher is that which created the idea that the locomotive realises, and then beyond all is the almightiness that made and endowed the inventive genius, the mechanic, and the engineer. Look at that grand old forest tree, consider its massive trunk, its strong branches, its waving boughs, its multitudinous sprays, its umbrageous rich foliage. Where is the power that produces, energises, supplies this sublime display of life? It is hid as deeply beneath the soil as the lofty top extends into the bath of sunshine above. And when you multiply this force by the growths of the whole forest, how mighty becomes the power, how vast the hydraulic system that is hid beneath the surface presented to your eyes. If the power which lies nearest to the cognition of sense be the greatest, then not only is the power of the Creator himself less than that of any of his works, but its inferiority is multiplied in geometrical ratio by every link in the chain of cause, through which philosophy traces up the particular work to his creative hand. Those who regard science as antagonistic to religion forget that the more links of law found between the work and the creative hand, the more is the divine wisdom and power manifested, and the more God is seen to be worthy of our worship. The knowledge of God, whether as Creator or Saviour, is a reward reserved for the thoughtful. The Almighty does not anywhere obtrude himself upon the vulgar gaze. In his nearest approach to our race, he

mysteriously enshrined himself in a human soul and body. The most precious power of Jesus, flesh and blood cannot discover; it is to be apprehended only in the supernatural light of heaven. The influences of the Holy Ghost are in themselves inscrutable, and the life they produce is hid with Christ in God. It is not by the great strong wind, or by the earthquake, or by the fire, that the triumph of divine grace is accomplished in the human heart, the saving presence of God revealed, and the sinner at once humbled and comforted, but by a still small voice. Hence the remarkable saying of David, "Thy gentleness hath made me great." Therefore, although the power of the orator, the statesman, the soldier, the divine, appeals directly to the senses, and is certain to attract the admiration of the populace, yet it is not to be regarded as the greatest power. The thinking mind sees in the acorn more to wonder at than in the oak; for there, in the circumference of half an inch, is enshrined by a strange combination of strength and weakness the life, the cause, the moulding principle, of the sublime king of trees. Thus does the hidden, gentle, yet mighty, power of woman underlie and cause and prompt and mould the power of the men who fill the public eye. Well has the sphere assigned to women been called a celestial sphere. They are indeed the stars which preside over and decide the destinies of men. Their work is done in a way so hidden that to be known and appreciated, it must be "sought out of those that have pleasure therein;" and this is more God-like than to stand forth unveiled to the gaze of the careless and profane. It is peculiarly their mission to influence mind, and probably none but God himself has more intimate access to human hearts than woman has. To her every human mind is submitted under the conditions most favorable for the reception of her influence.

But will it be suggested that whatever woman's opportunity may be for impressing human hearts, yet such is the connate inferiority of her mind that she can never equal him in power? The unworthy suggestion will at once be discarded by those who are even slightly acquainted with the testimony of history, ancient and modern, on this subject. They will remember that the character of Queen Isabella inspired our probably favorite historian to

write, and afforded him the subject of the most beautiful page to be found, not only in his own delectable volumes, but (doubtless all will agree with us in saying) in all the lore of the historic muse. They will expose the unjust taunt by pointing to Hannah More, Lady Morgan, and Mrs. Jamieson. They know that there is no intellectual pursuit in which women have not shone with a far-beaming lustre; that Corinna gained the poetical prize five times over Pindar, who ranks amongst the most charming of lyric poets; and that her image was crowned in the gymnasium of Tanagra with the chaplet of victory; that to Sappho her admiring countrymen erected temples and altars, and paid divine honors; that Aspasia taught the Athenians eloquence, had Socrates among the admirers of her wit, and captivated the accomplished Pericles by the manifold charms of her mind, rather than by the attractions of her outward beauty; that few monarchs beam forth upon us in the panorama of fame with purer, more heroic and sublime lustre than Zenobia, Palmyra's renowned queen.

Nor does the utmost development of woman's inherent power necessarily render her less womanly. This is finely illustrated in the example of Deborah, the wife of Lapidoth, recorded in the inspired volume, no doubt, to show that woman can be at once great and womanly, in the highest degree. The mighty influence by which this mother in Israel prepared the minds of her countrymen to assert their liberty after twenty years of oppression went forth from the dwelling of her husband—thither the children of Israel came up to her. It first affects her own family, then her immediate circle of friends, and then, circling wider and wider, it soon includes the whole nation, and her wisdom and piety attract the people from all parts of the land. But she is still "the wife of Lapidoth;" her presence blesses her own house, and her authority is only that of godliness, wisdom, and love. When, indeed, an extraordinary occasion called her forth, that she might inspire her people and their appointed commander with courage, she does not refuse to accompany her countrymen to victory. But having celebrated the great deliverance by a song of triumphant and grateful exultation, uttered in a

strain of the loftiest poetry, she again returns to her own sphere. Throughout all she never forgets that she is the wife of Lapidoth. The essential elements of Deborah's history have again and again been illustriously exhibited in the great drama of human life; and no truth hath received more confirmation than the one which we have just now before us—that a woman can be great without losing one element of womanly delicacy and tenderness. We cannot forbear, however, from calling attention to two Christian women of different nations, but alike accomplished and adorned; the one an Italian, the other a Briton. Olympia Morata was born at Ferrara in the year 1526. So rapid was her progress in learning that she was able to converse in the languages of Homer and of Virgil with ease and fluency ere she had yet studied them one year. At sixteen, she wrote Greek poems of such beauty as to call forth the enthusiastic praises of eminent scholars. In recognition of the vigor of her understanding and the splendor of her attainments, she was called the Tenth of the Muses and the Fourth of the Graces. Yet she was not less renowned as a Christian than as a scholar, and the brilliancy of her verses did not surpass the purity of her life; and not more for her great accomplishments than for her womanly worth and wisdom did the best and most learned of all countries delight to do her honor. Lady Jane Gray, in the loveliness of her person, the elevation of her intellect, the dignity of her station, the goodness of her heart, and the greatness of her misfortunes, combines all the elements that can move the heart and call into exercise whatever is noble in the soul of man. This great woman, although she spent that time in the profound study of Plato in his own unrivalled tongue, which others spent in the pleasures of society and of the chase, was yet more devoted to the study of his words "who spake as never man spake," and to the writings of inspired evangelists and apostles; and both as a daughter and a wife, manifested the most tender and heroic fidelity. Notwithstanding the example of her heroic constancy in the prospect of a speedy and bloody death was such as to inspire the manly heart of her husband with a more noble courage, yet she was not less distinguished for all the tender generous affections of woman's nature, than for her

sublime fortitude. Who, in view of such examples as these, will be bold enough to define the limits of combined beauty and strength to which the mind, enshrined in the delicate form of the little infant daughter, may attain. Though, as compared with man, designed for a sphere in which less physical strength is employed, and all the retiring and tender virtues are to have fuller play, nevertheless woman is not inferior to the ruder sex in moral or in intellectual capacity.

But it must be kept in mind that power to affect the world does not lie in inherent ability alone, but in this and opportunity to exercise it combined. How greatly, for instance, is the power of an orator increased when it avails itself of circumstances that lay open the hearts of his hearers to his appeals. Solomon celebrates the excellency of "a word spoken upon his wheels." Here it is we find woman's great advantage. Mighty in the highest degree are the allies which heaven has given to woman to aid her in impressing the human heart. Parental, fraternal, and filial affection, romantic love, and conjugal devotion, conspire to expose the heart to woman's power, and to soften, and in every way prepare it for the reception of her impress.

Would that we could present, from the gallery of our memory, a cartoon, painted by observation, in the distinctness and beauty which it has to our own mind. We would describe a gentleman of commanding appearance, noble bearing, liberal education, and elegant culture. His estate is ample, and the luxury in which he lives is limited only by a delicate refinement. The votary of earth's best pleasures, he is indifferent to the interests of eternity. Social in his disposition and unsuspecting in his impulses, he has formed intimate relations with men who know how to commend to a cultivated worldly taste the excitement of the wine-cup and the gaming table, and who have carried the art of amusing and flattering to such perfection that it hides itself in the guise of ingenuousness. We would next describe his daughter, a young lady just returned to the paternal mansion from school, where she had been for three years. She is beautiful, because her mind is well disciplined and has been stimulated by severe study into great activity, and her every look and movement is instinct

with mental life. We do not think she would have been handsome had not her mind been thoroughly cultivated. We would next tell you how the noble father has been under the influence of this lovely daughter for one year, and how, after its expiration, he has become another man—more joyful, more happy, more dear to his true friends than ever, he has become a real, active, zealous Christian, and his affections are set on the things which are above, not on the things which are upon the earth. Piety seen in his own accomplished daughter, appealing even to the pride of a parent's heart, made even that its ally. How could he resist her who was the ornament and glory of his hospitality and his attentive self-denying nurse in sickness. He delighted to feel the strength of such weakness as hers, and to yield to the charm of holy solicitation from the lips of a darling who manifested a total abnegation of all right in her own behalf, and of all self-will. Eternity alone can reveal the mighty effect of that daughter's mysterious, gentle, hidden power in elevating her father's great heart, and prompting to beneficence his influential life, and through him upon the characters and destinies of many others.

To woman's power who can tell how fraternal affection opens wide the doors of the heart in those years when the elements of manly strength are to be developed, tempered, and directed? If the youth is to be a great rational force for good in the world, his affections must be cultivated, his sympathies awakened, and all that is pure and kind and elevated in his nature cherished. The hardening tendency of those studies and pursuits and sports which are necessary to the development of manhood must be counteracted in order that the tenderer elements which belong essentially to true greatness of character may have growth. Affection gives to the refined, intelligent, winning sister, opportunity to do this great work, to win the brother's heart from rude and gross pursuits to pleasures which soften and elevate, and to shed attraction for him upon the soul-saving enjoyments of home.

As a man advances in life from stage to stage, a new avenue ever opens through which the power of woman may operate upon his heart. We know, as a fact, that all men who are of any consideration, do fall in love, and the more elements of greatness the

youth has in him, the more danger there is that his love of some woman will amount to adoration. Whether love appear as romantic affection, to be afterwards called love's young dream, or as more staid conjugal devotion, looking forward with prudent delight to the wedding-day, it is another mighty ally of woman's power. "Indeed, what is young love's profession but duty and observance and humbleness and purity and faith and service and tenderness?" This love thoroughly prepares the heart to receive inspiration from the woman's lips, to feel the motives she may inculcate, and to be prompted by her noble spirit to the highest aspirations. There is solid truth, as well as beautiful poetry, in the following language of the great poet from whom we quoted a little above :

"But love first learned in a lady's eyes,
Lives not alone immured in the brain,
But with the motion of all elements
Courses as swift as thought in every power,
And gives to every power a double power
Above their functions and their offices.
It adds a precious seeing to the eye ;
A lover's eyes will gaze an eagle blind ;
A lover's ear will hear the lowest sound,
When the suspicious head of theft is stopped ;
Love's feeling is more soft and sensible
Than are the tender horns of cockl'd snails ;
Love's tongue proves dainty Bacchus gross in taste ;
For valor is not love a Hercules
Still climbing trees in the Hesperides ?
Subtle as sphinx, as sweet and musical
As bright Apollo's lyre, strung with his hair ?
And when love speaks, the voice of all the gods
Makes heaven drowsy with the harmony."

What will not a true man do to please the woman whom he loves? Who that has wooed and won a queen to preside over his home and his heart, "one whom the king delighteth to honor," cannot tell how, for the sake of her whose love alone could make life valuable to him, he strove to please her parents, to gain the admiration of her sisters, the good-will of her brothers, and to be well thought of by all her cousins and acquaintances? Let the germ of power inherent in the fair sex be duly developed and

exercised, and man will be cured of all his bad habits, and this world become an Eden of bliss.

Nor does woman's power over the lover necessarily cease when he becomes the husband. We remember that the Bible says: "Wives, be obedient to your husbands." But is not obedience the secret of all power in the creature? It is by obeying the laws of nature that man annihilates time and space, and sends the still small voice of intelligence from this continent to the shores of Europe, as though three thousand miles of ocean did not roll between, and that he has extended a system of iron nerves over the surface of the earth, through which we communicate with points the most distant from us, almost as rapidly as the mind controls the extremities of the body. Just as it is by learning and obeying the laws of matter that man governs matter, so it is by learning and obeying the laws of mind that man can govern mind. To obey in the right way is to rule. Let the wife, then, render the obedience to her husband which the Scriptures require, and she will influence him so as to make him a wiser, happier, nobler man. Husbands are like pianos. Conform to the laws of the instrument, and you will produce sweet music; violate these laws, and the result will be discord. There are pianos and husbands so sadly out of tune as to be utterly unmanageable, we confess, and one is tempted to regret that we cannot do with the latter as we do with the former—sell them off. But woman has at least the right of rejecting a discordant instrument, whether we take the word in the figurative or literal sense. Besides, you seldom see a piano that cannot be made to give forth to the touch of the skilful musician, some harmonious sounds; and so I believe there are few husbands from whose hearts a judicious wife may not extract the melody of kindness by gently touching or wholly passing over the chords that are out of tune, and only dwelling upon those that are in harmony. But suppose the husband to have in him the elements of true manliness, and to have felt the full influence of woman in the relations of son and brother and lover, what response will his heart give to that influence when it comes in the person of the faithful, patient, self-denying wife, who has intrusted herself wholly to his generosity?

“Woman’s warm heart and gentle hand, in God’s eternal plan,
 Were formed to soften, soothe, refine, exalt, and comfort man,
 And win from pleasure’s poison cup to life’s pure fount above,
 And rule him as the angels rule, by deeds of peace and love.”

Let our daughters endeavor to fit themselves for the requirements of maturer life, and to lay the foundation of an attractiveness that is to be felt when the roses of youth shall have ceased to bloom; and if they are not reckless in bestowing their affections, they will find the love of the husband to have gained in depth what it may have lost in romance, and to be dearer than ever after the almond tree has blossomed. Many are the noble hearts whose conjugal affection finds true utterance in the words of the poet:

“Oh, no—not even when first we loved,
 Wert thou so dear as now thou art;
 Thy beauty then my senses moved,
 But now thy virtues bind my heart.
 What was but passion’s sigh before,
 Has since been turned to reason’s vow;
 And though I seemed to love thee more,
 Trust me, I love thee better now.

“Although my heart in earlier youth
 Might kindle with more wild desire,
 Believe me, it has gained in truth
 Much more than it has lost in fire.
 The flame now warms my inmost core,
 That then but sparkled o’er my brow;
 And though I seemed to love thee more,
 Trust me, I love thee better now.”

We have time only for a word on a topic that deserves volumes, the power of woman as a mother. Behold her standing at the very fountains of society, giving to each stream of human life its character, direction, and force, and deciding whether it shall enrich or lay waste, whether it shall poison or give health, whether it shall purify or pollute. Close observers agree in regarding the first ten as the most important years of life. The impulses which are apt to give direction to the soul irresistibly throughout the voyage of life are then awakened. The discord of the living growing harp must, in the natural course of things, grow harsher and harsher for ever, if it is not then tuned into harmony. But

if that harp's notes are then made musical, they will gain power and give gladness in all after years. Then are planted the prejudices which are to bear deadly fruit, or the principles which are to yield the bread of life in coming time. Nothing can set aside the truth of the inspired words, "Train up a child in the way that he should go, when he is old he will not depart from it."

We conclude, then, that women are in every sense the mothers of men. The degree and character of a Christian civilisation must ever be in proportion to the degree and character exerted by the women whom it includes. As the moral character and tone of the individual may be justly measured by his respect for woman, and as this will be according to the character of the women of his acquaintance, so the moral character of a nation will be according to the learning, virtue, refinement, and piety of its daughters. Those periods in every national history in which woman has commanded most real honor have been the purest and the happiest.

Such is the germ intrusted to us within the shrine of the female infant form. We may crush it by rudeness, we may kill it by inattention, we may dwarf it by niggardly, or distort it by foolish, treatment. We may through ignorance or perversity so misdirect it as that it may become a horrible misery in itself, and a terrible source of unhappiness and evil to the world. But, on the other hand, by care, by diligence, by liberal expenditure, by watchful patient culture, we may make it a large, lovely, living fountain of comfort, joy, and progress to the human family.

The worth of the female mind we have rested on a triple foundation: in itself it is capable of indefinite expansion, its function is peculiarly to influence the mind and heart of society, and it has the most intimate access which the closest relations and tenderest affections can give. We have had throughout the discourse two objects in view. One has been to enforce the wholesome truth that woman's power lies in her retirement, her weakness, and her womanliness, and that she throws away the sceptre of her power, the magic wand by which alone she can achieve great results, the moment she abandons the object of raising man in tenderness, generosity, kindness, and nobility, to lower herself to the very pursuits which, if not counteracted by her influence, must harden

and roughen and dehumanise our race. The other object has been to direct attention to the truth which points out what the standard of education is which we should adopt for our daughters. If their minds are as valuable as those of our sons, if they are designed to be helps meet for men, if they are the mothers of the mental and moral man, then they should have the advantage of a discipline no less thorough, a culture no less deep, and acquisitions no less extensive and substantial, than we seek for the ruder sex. To move good men to provide to the utmost for the accomplishment of woman, needs only that the way be pointed out. For they agree in declaring to them—

“Ye are stars of the night, ye are gems of the morn,
 Ye are dew-drops whose lustre illumines the thorn;
 And rayless that night is, that morning unblest,
 When no beam in your eye lights up peace in the breast,
 And the sharp thorn of sorrow sinks deep in the heart,
 Till the sweet lip of woman assuages the smart.
 'Tis hers o'er the couch of misfortune to bend
 In fondness a lover, in firmness a friend;
 And prosperity's hour, be it ever confessed,
 From woman receives both refinement and zest,
 And adorned by the bay or enwreathed with the willow,
 Her smile is our meed, and her bosom our pillow.”

ARTICLE V.

WHAT WERE THE CHERUBIM?

In answering this question with perhaps a novel theory, we shall say but little of other theories, and present our own as briefly as possible, consistently with clearness and force, making free use of Fairbairn's Typology (sixth edition.)

The Cherubim were a symbol and type of the person and work of Christ. Let us substantiate this view by the following considerations:

I. The first is only presumptive; still, if we mistake not, is strong of its kind, and is this: the design and the nature of the

system of symbols and types, as used in the development of revelation, would lead us to expect to find some comprehensive symbol and type of the person and work of the promised Messiah. If this comprehensive type be not found in the Cherubim, it is nowhere found.

It was evidently God's method, in revealing to man the plan of redemption, at first to propound to our first parents a grand central truth (Gen. iii. 15); and then, by a progressive development, to evolve therefrom the whole system of revelation. Why he chose this method and gave to the world the Book of his revealed will as the result of four thousand years' growth, rather than to present it finished and complete to our first parents we do not here inquire; suffice it at present to observe that he did choose this method.

A striking characteristic of this chosen method was that the truth first revealed, if clearly understood and practically received by the hearer, prepared the way for the truth to be next revealed. This, in its turn, prepared the way for the next, and so on until the whole was revealed. This characteristic evinces at once the divine wisdom displayed in the appointment of symbols and types to be daily used during all the first periods of revelation. For the symbol being a visible representation of a truth already revealed, its use enabled the believer more clearly to apprehend such truth; but the clear apprehension of the truth revealed, prepared the mind for the reception of some coming truth. Thus the symbol indirectly aided in the development of revelation. The type aided directly; for it was the visible representation of the truth to be revealed in future. Therefore, concerning the use of symbols and types as aids to revelation, we may safely conclude—

- (1) That if any specially important truth was in future to be revealed, such truth would, if possible, be typified;
- (2) The more nearly related any truth already revealed stood to any important one yet to come, the more certain was it to be symbolised; and hence,
- (3) If, at the beginning, the germ of a great central truth were revealed, which was by future revelation to be developed in differ-

ent lines of doctrine, and these were to converge again to the corresponding grand fundamental truth, we should surely expect to find the first (*i. e.*, the germ to be unfolded) set forth in a symbol; and the second (*i. e.*, the corresponding central doctrine to be evolved from the germ) set forth in a type, and the symbol and type to be identical. That Gen. iii. 15 was such a germ, all agree. That it was designed to develop in the manner above stated, into the great central doctrine of the cross, facts have proved. But where is the comprehensive symbol and type setting forth each? According to received views, the only symbol and type for ages possessed was the bloody sacrifice, which set forth in symbol and type "the shedding of blood for the remission of sins." It is granted that this was one fundamental truth; yet it was evidently not the only one, for it was simply one of several other equally important ones. It will be readily seen to have been only a part of one of those deductive lines of doctrine through which the germ was to be developed. Therefore it was not the only, nor even the most important, truth at that time revealed. Why, then, should that alone be honored with a symbol and type? The predicted fact of the incarnation stood antecedent and paramount to it. How ill does this accord with the chosen method for revealing truth! The whole gospel (Gen. iii. 15) was greater in every sense than any of its parts; and yet here is one of its parts (the heel-bruising) exalted not only above all the other parts, but also above the whole, by being the only one kept before the mind of the worshipper in symbol and type. On such a plan might not men, after lapse of time, be led by their form of worship away from the truth, and forget all the other functions of the promised Saviour, save the shedding of his blood? If it be said that symbols and types of his kingly and prophetic offices were afterwards given, the irrefutable reply is, (1) What could guide the faith of those who lived and died before these new types were added? and (2) How could men understand that the bleeding sacrifice, the Priest, the Prophet, and the King, should all be found in one and the same person, if they only saw the lamb as sacrifice, Aaron as priest, Moses as prophet, and David as king? Here the diversity of types would mislead, unless

preceded and accompanied by a comprehensive type, in which all were joined.

But bear in mind the germinant nature of revelation having Gen. iii. 15 for the germ, and remember the use of symbols and types in developing revelation, and consider the Cherubim as a symbol of Gen. iii. 15, and the type of the person and work of the Messiah, and you will perceive in the chosen method of revelation a beautiful symmetry not otherwise to be seen. Thus, the whole gospel is first propounded in the comprehensive germ. Thenceforth, as God sees fit, truth after truth is evolved, until we behold the full-grown tree of revelation, grown from that one acorn of truth. Of this acorn-like truth, a wonderfully appropriate symbol is given, illustrating all the essential parts of the protevangelism, and therefore at the same time constituting a striking type of the person and work of the promised Seed. And as truth after truth is evolved and elucidated, the system of symbols and types is enlarged *pari passu*, which is accomplished, as far as possible, by unfolding the central type, that being all the while preserved in order that the unity of the Mediator's person and work may not be obscured by the multiplicity and diversity of types necessary to the setting forth of the different phases thereof.

That the Cherubim did constitute such a comprehensive symbol and type, we now proceed to argue affirmatively from the names applied, the forms, the positions, and the agencies ascribed thereto. We shall see that in each respect what was said of the Cherubim, appertained preëminently to the promised Seed, and was well calculated to point to some truth concerning his person or work.

II. Let us first examine the names applied to the Cherubim.

It is said that a hopeless obscurity hangs over the term "Cherubim," which was the first term by which this object was designated, and that we can therefore see no appropriateness in the application of this particular name.

When we reflect that significant names were at that time almost universally employed, and that such usage nicely corresponded to, if it did not really spring from, the then existing circumstances, it seems incredible that this term, applied as it was to that which

was so important and was to be used till time should end, should have been wanting or obscure in significance. An erroneous idea of the object named might greatly obscure the appropriateness of the name; but we can hardly believe that the name lacked significance. The following derivation (see Gesenius) gives a meaning very appropriate, if the Cherubim was what this thesis claims. כָּרַב is equivalent to קָרַב (a derivative of קָרַב, to draw near.) כְּרַבִּים signifies, therefore, "the ones near."

As applied to the wonderful object placed at the east of Eden, it would indicate nearness, or the ones near to God, for Eden was God's earthly dwelling-place; it was there that Adam had enjoyed daily access to God; and driven from Eden man had been driven from God. That, therefore, which stood just outside the garden eastward in the way by which man had been expelled, might well be called "the ones near" to God. If Eve was taught to see in the Cherubim a type of the promised Seed, there was surely rich comfort to her in the very name by which she was taught to call it, for it signified that he, the promised *Seed*, should dwell near to Jehovah. The appropriateness of this name to the type of Christ is too obvious to need remark.

Another term afterwards applied to this type was in the Hebrew חַיִּוִּת. The corresponding Greek term is ζῶα. The true rendering of each is "the living ones," or "the living creatures." These terms are applied to this object by the prophets Ezekiel and John. If the Cherubim was intended to represent the person and work of the promised Messiah, this name, indicative of a plenitude of life, was peculiarly appropriate, for as the Father had life in himself, so he gave to the Son to have life in himself (John v. 26). See also John xi. 25; 1 John i. 2. These and many other passages show beyond doubt the appropriateness of applying a term denoting life, or plenitude of life, to the type of the promised Messiah. He who was to be revealed as the fountain of life might well be called "the Living One."

There is still another term which was applied to this symbolical representation, for, as Fairbairn clearly shows, that which Isaiah (vi.) saw in his vision was the Cherubim. Isaiah called

them the Seraphim (*i. e.*, "the burning ones"). Examine the passage and you will perceive at once the appropriateness of this new name. The feature of God's dealing with his people presented in this vision is his vindictive justice. Hence the attributes most prominently displayed are holiness and justice. The promised Messiah was to have to do with distributing justice and displaying the holiness of Jehovah. Hence as the type is seen engaged in this feature of his work, it is given the appropriate name of "*Seraphim*" (burning ones).

Here we would observe that if there was given a symbol of the truth taught in Gen. iii. 15, and that symbol was the type of the fully developed gospel as it was to be seen centred in the cross, then not only would there be, during the development of revelation, the addition of particular symbols and types illustrating the different lines of deduced truth, but we might surely expect some progressive use of the central and comprehensive type. This will be seen to have been strikingly true of the Cherubim, considered as such a symbol and type. While it will appear more evident as we proceed, still it is to be clearly seen in the meaning of the names applied. For a long while the only name applied was "Cherubim," indicating simply nearness to God. Afterwards, when by the development of revelation it was or might be known that the Messiah was to administer justice, the term Seraphim was applied. Then, when it was or might be understood that he was to be the Fountain of Life, the type is called "the Living Creature."

Before passing from this part of the discussion, we must remove an evident and seemingly forcible objection. It has been asked, "Why should plural types (Cherubim instead of a Cherub) at the same time and place represent a single Messiah?" The irrefutable reply is, (1) that the nature of the case demanded just exactly this seeming incongruity. For in that single Messiah there was to be a plurality of natures, and of his work there was to be a multiplicity of parts, and some of these essential parts so diverse, that they should seem to be incompatible, *e. g.*, he, a holy One, was to die *for sin*, and yet not see corruption. If, therefore, revelation was to make known a plurality in unity

in the person and work of the Messiah, of course there must be a plurality in unity in the type setting him forth. (It will be shown under the next head that Scripture clearly teaches the *unity* of the Cherubim.) And, of course again, the type being plural, the name would be so too. But (2), if this objection has any force against the Cherubim as types of Christ, it must apply with far greater force against other types which inspiration tells us were types of him and his work. Aaron, Moses, and the bleeding sacrifice, were all at the same time and place types of Christ. Here there is not only a plurality, but a plurality without indicating unity, and such a plurality as must, if not strongly guarded, indicate *diversity*. Let the plurality of the natures in Christ, and the multiplicity of the parts of his work be remembered, and there will be clearly seen a necessity for *plural* types, and also great beauty in such a compound type as is here argued for. Here it may be well to remove another objection which has been made to the theory of this thesis, viz., If the Cherubim were a type of Christ and his work, why were other types, such as Moses, Aaron, David, etc., afterwards added? The evident and just reply is this: they were added more fully to predict specific parts of the truth. The whole plan of salvation was proclaimed in Gen. iii. 15. Still, this comprehensive germ was to be unfolded by the revelation of many details of the work. The comprehensive type was therefore given to elucidate the comprehensive central truth, and individual types were afterwards appropriately added to elucidate deduced parts of the truth. This is in strict keeping with the acknowledged design of symbols and types as aids to revelation.

III. Let us next consider the forms ascribed to the Cherubim.

Until we come to the prophecy of Ezekiel we find very little mention made of the *form* of the Cherubim. It is everywhere spoken of as something with which the Jews were entirely familiar. It is, however, very clear that the appearance was that of a man with the heads or faces of certain animals joined to it. It is also evident that there was some variety of form. Sometimes the heads of three animals are seen, at other times there are only two. The animals chosen are not in every case the same. Fairbairn shows that there were two points of universal agree-

ment: (1) The predominating appearance was in every case that of a man; and (2) in every case there was the union of two, and only two, different natures, viz., rational and animal. He justly infers that these are two essential features. It was not an accident that these two features corresponded so exactly to the two prominent features in the promised Seed. He was to be in appearance a MAN, and yet he was to have, united in himself, two, and only two, distinct natures; for he was to be "God and man in two distinct natures and yet one person for ever." A seeming difficulty here is that the divine nature seems to have been symbolised by the *animal* nature. But observe, the design of the type was not to show the *essence* of the nature to be joined in the person of the Redeemer to the human nature, but simply to show the junction of two, and only two, natures in the one person. More than this could not be aptly set forth, for nothing material and created could aptly represent the uncreated and divine nature, even had it been desirable to give to man an image of this. It may be that the excellency of the divine nature was hinted at by the selection of the best from among the animals. But if the worshipper (Abel, Noah, or Moses) would only get clearly these two ideas, that the Messiah was to be man and more than man, then there could be no danger of mistake as to the kind of nature to be joined to the human, for man's conscience told him that the circumstances of the case demanded some nature superior to his own, and didactic revelation everywhere taught that the Saviour should be divine.

Further, this theory explains very clearly why those particular animals were chosen. As revelation unfolded, it became known that the incarnate Saviour should offer himself a sacrifice for sin, should rule as a king, and with divine swiftness and omniscience move among human affairs as the providential Disposer. These different aspects of his work were to the greatest possible extent indicated by the animals chosen: the ox representing the sacrifice, the lion representing the king, and the eagle representing his providential agency. Many types, afterwards added, appear to have been developed from this central one. (An extended examination will show that this theory, more fully than

any other, accounts for the selection which was made of animals to be parts of the type; still we do not push the inquiry on this point, for it seems, on any theory, to be rather the line for the play of fancy than the direction in which valuable truth is to be found.) But to return to the discussion of the form of the Cherubim. We have seen that its manlike appearance and its two natures, and also the animals selected to constitute parts of it, strongly indicate that it was the symbol and type of Christ. There is another fact concerning its form which still further corroborates this view. We refer to its unity. That it was intended to be considered altogether and as one type cannot be overlooked, if we will notice the representations given of it. In Ex. xxv. 18-20, Moses is commanded to make two Cherubim out of the *same piece* of gold from which the mercy seat was made, and to make them on to, or rather *in*, the ends of the mercy seat. Nor can it be said here that no reference is had to the unity in the command to make them of the same lump of gold of which the mercy seat was made, for why else was this command? It had just been said that the mercy seat was to be made of gold, then added that the Cherubim were to be also of gold, then comes the direction that all be made of the same lump. Turn over to chapter xxxvii. 7, and you see that Bezaleel understood it as we do, for he made both of "*one piece*." In Ezekiel's vision the prophet saw them so joined together and moving with such simultaneousness and concert that the unity is evident. Still, lest some one should fail to perceive the unity, he speaks more than once of the whole structure as constituting one thing, and says twice, "This is the living creature that I saw." True, in many places it is spoken of in the plural and no mention is made of its unity. But if it had been previously declared to be *one type* composed of different parts, then while these parts are being separated in their differing directions (the diverging lines of truth), the plural form may be appropriately referred to without militating against its unity.

Let the fact of its unity be fairly considered, and we need have no difficulty about the plurality afterwards ascribed to it. The truth to be taught was a plurality in unity; *ergo*, we have an ex-

actly analogous case in the Revelation of the great doctrine of the Trinity. God at first declared his *unity* and then set forth his own plurality in unity. There are two other facts concerning the form of the Cherubim—its wings and its eyes. It will at once be seen that there was a striking development made in the use of this type, as to its form. Although we are not told so, still the probability is that, as seen before Eden, it was more like the figures placed in the tabernacle and temple than like the creatures seen in the visions of the prophets. We know that there certainly was this development in form after Moses' time; for while Moses saw them with wings, they had not the multiplicity of eyes, and were inanimate structures. To the prophets they appeared as living creatures and full of eyes, before and behind, and afterwards as having hands.

We conclude, therefore, that the form of the Cherubim clearly indicates that it was the type of the person and work of Christ; for it presented to the eye of the beholder the union of two natures in one structure (or creature), and the general appearance of that creature was that of a man, while the whole was so compounded and composed of exactly such parts as that it was fitted to predict the different features of his work. Abel could know that the Saviour should offer himself a bleeding sacrifice, because there in the type was the bullock's head on the man's body; yet Abel could see that this Seed should not be held by death, for the bullock is only one-fourth part; the other three are there still. The Seed should be King, for there in the type is the lion.

IV. We proceed now to argue, from the positions ascribed to the Cherubim, that in every case, as a symbol and type, it pointed to Christ, because, in every instance, it was placed exactly where, under the circumstances, revelation would lead us to expect such type to be found. Just where the mediatorial work required the Mediator to be, there we find this type.

As first seen, the Cherubim was placed at the east of Eden, or "before the garden, eastward." Evidently it was between man and God, and therefore between man and the tree of life. It stood *in the way*, so that man could not go back to the Eden of bliss unless he passed by this curious structure (or possibly, crea-

ture). Jesus said, "I am the way," and, "I am the door; by me, if any men enter," etc. He has ever stood in the way, and between man and God. Never since Adam sinned has an humble penitent drawn near to God and not gone through Jesus Christ; and never since Cain has any rebel sinner attempted a new method of approach, who has not found an awe-inspiring obstacle to hurl him back as a thief and a robber! The exactness of the type here is so remarkable, that it is curious why every one has not always beheld it.

The next position in which the record states that the Cherubim was placed, is that to which it was assigned in the tabernacle. Not to mention the figures painted on the curtains, though the position of these too is best explained on this theory, we will perceive at a glance that the position of the Cherubim placed over the mercy seat, and *joined to it*, is exactly the position in which we should expect to find the type of Christ. Where has he ever been found, save hovering over the mercy seat? He not only bought it for us with his blood, but keeps it always for us.

"Beneath his shadowing wings' defence,
We find our only confidence."

Does not this evince new beauty and force in the appurtenances of the Ark? Within is the holy *inviolable* law. Above and upon this rests the mercy seat. Into the ends of this, and hovering over it, is the curious representation of the One who bought and preserves this place of safety for his people. And above the mercy seat, but between the Cherubim, hangs the Shekinah. It need not, indeed, it ought not, to be here inquired, why the Shekinah, in addition to the Cherubim, was placed above the ark. For whether the Shekinah was a symbol (or, as we think, the real presence) of the Father, or was the symbol of the Son, it matters not. Since the Son is the same with the Father, and therefore must receive as well as open the way for and present the prayers of his people; since he as God must be reconciled, and as the Son must make the reconciliation, such complexity belongs to the doctrine to be set forth, and therefore must be found in the types used. Recognise this complexity, and then apply the theory here presented to the furniture of the most holy place, and it will stand forth in new light.

Again, there are quite a number of passages which can only be fully apprehended on this theory of the Cherubim (see Ex. xix. 4; Deut. xxxii. 11; Psalms xvii. 18, etc., etc.; and Matt. xxiii. 37); for they were all written with reference, at least in the wording of them, to this type of Christ. *E. g.*, see Matt. xxiii. 37, in connexion with preceding context. Jesus is about to be slain by men who say that they would not have slain the prophets. He uses two singular expressions in his dreadful rebuke of these true descendants of those who had killed the prophets: (1) "Fill ye up the measure of your fathers," *i. e.*, their iniquity, verse 32; and (2) "that on you may come all the righteous blood," etc., verse 35. Allow us to interpret by the following paraphrase: "Your fathers, standing near by, or in sight of many types of me, your true Messiah, slew the prophets, who pointed them through those types to me. Blinding their own eyes to the types, they slew the righteous ones, who saw the true meaning of the types; and also blinded your eyes to the great Antitype; so that you are, in rejecting me, carrying out what they began. On you is come the fruit of their sin. Poor Jerusalem! through age after age I stood in your heart of hearts with outstretched wings (the wings of the Cherubim above the mercy seat) longing to gather in thy children; but they would not. Now it is too late."

But to return. We have seen that as placed before Eden and in the tabernacle and the temple, the position of the Cherubim clearly shows that it was intended to be the symbol and type of the person and work of Christ.

The discussion of other positions in which they were placed will be more appropriate under the next head of this thesis.

V. Let us proceed now to examine the agencies ascribed to the Cherubim; and we are persuaded that the evidence from this source, for this theory concerning the Cherubim, will be found conclusive. Let us again follow the order of revelation and examine these agencies as they were revealed, that we may perceive the progress which was made in the use of the type.

The work assigned to it at first was to keep the way to the tree of life.

At this point we could, on several accounts, sincerely wish

VOL. XXXIII.. NO. 4.—8.

that we were told more of the particulars of the Cherubim as first seen. It was placed there with the flaming sword to keep the way, etc. Was the sword held in the hand of one of the Cherubim (or of the Cherub), and by the Cherub turned every way? Or was the sword seen above the heads of all the figures, and turning of its own accord? However this may have been, it is evident that it was the Cherubim, and not the sword, which was to keep the way. The sword must have been, as it has ever been; and indeed could only be, the instrument with which some agent was to work. Perhaps, since revelation had not yet declared how burning fiery justice should be administered by the same hand which should bleed with mercy, God saw fit not to place the sword in the hand of the symbol. To have done so at that stage, might have unduly terrified some trembling believer. Still it was evidently the work of the Cherubim to "keep the way of the tree of life." How clearly the type spoke on this point! It might appropriately have uttered the very words which afterwards fell from the lips of the great Antitype; "I am the way; . . . no man cometh unto the Father but by me." See also Rev. i. 18, and iii. 7. The Saviour says that he holds the "keys of hell and of death." He has ever kept the way to life. For every penitent soul, however weak and trembling, he has kept it securely opened; against every impenitent one since Cain he has kept it closed by the flaming sword of justice. The evidence from this first agency alone is too clear to be misunderstood. As placed in the tabernacle, and afterwards in the temple, but little advanced truth was set forth by the agency ascribed to the Cherubim. This is as we should expect. For from Moses (we might say from Abel) to Isaiah developing revelation had to do chiefly with unfolding the truth concerning the different parts of the work of Christ. The details of his priestly, his prophetic, and his kingly offices were to be given, for the most part, separately. Hence it was fit that the advance in the system of symbols and types during this period should be by the addition of individual types, setting forth those individual and deductive truths; and very much advance in the use of the comprehensive type was not to be expected. It fulfilled its appointed work, if it

remained as it did, setting forth the unity in plurality of the person and work of the Redeemer, and showing how he stood in the way, and kept the way to God. There was, however, even during that period, some slight advance made in the use of this central type. This we learn by "good and necessary inference" from such passages as Ex. xxv. 22. Here we learn that God would deliver to Moses decrees for the people, as he dwelt upon the mercy seat and above the law and between the Cherubim. Have we not here a typical prediction of 2 Cor. v. 19, where we learn that God dwelt in Christ to reconcile the world unto himself? It was only when sitting on the blood-bought mercy seat that he would allow sin-ruined creatures to draw near to him. Here, then, was the agency of the Cherubim. Made into the ends of the mercy seat, and hovering constantly over it, some advanced light was thrown upon the doctrine of reconciliation (*i. e.*, the keeping the way to life for sinners). Still, during all this long period, while different aspects of the mediatorial work were being revealed, there was but little advance made in the use of the central type. Little, if any, change is seen in the names applied, or in the forms, positions, or agencies ascribed thereto. But when revelation had proceeded in its divergent lines of truth, and declared that to Israel should be given a bleeding sacrifice like the lamb, a priest like Aaron, a prophet like Moses, and a king like David, etc., etc., and the prophets began to see these lines converging again upon one person, and to tell how the same one who "cometh with dyed garments from Bozrah," and has trodden "the winepress alone," shall tread down the people with fury, and bring salvation with his own arm (Is. vi. 3); then the comprehensive type is again needed. It is brought forward, in the visions of the prophets, to throw new light upon that grand central truth which it typifies, and to which all these other lines of truth are to converge. Doubtless Ezekiel had carefully studied the truth set forth by the Cherubim in the temple. The Spirit of inspiration shows him this same wonderful type in a vision. No longer, however, as a mere material and inanimate and motionless structure, but as living creatures, and endowed with such active and untiring energy, filled with such plenitude of life, and per-

forming at its own instigation such agencies, as belong not to created beings, but are prerogatives of the Deity himself.

Let us examine the visions in the order in which they are recorded, and see how clearly the agencies, and sometimes the positions, therein ascribed to the Cherubim, prove it to have been the type of the person and work of Christ.

If the Seraphim seen by Isaiah were the same with the Cherubim (which ought not longer to be doubted), then the first to be examined is recorded in Isa. vi.

In this vision the position in which the Seraphim are seen is not appropriate (if our Version be correct) to any but the Messiah. Redeemed souls and angels stand around the throne, but not above it.

The first acts recorded of these typical creatures are the covering of the face and feet with their wings, flying, and crying "holy," etc. This part of the vision has been so universally understood of angels, that most of us have grown up actually believing that in heaven some (and those, too, the highest orders) of the angels do really veil their faces in the presence of the Deity. Since, so far as we know, this idea is gathered from this passage alone, we would modestly inquire, would other Scriptures lead us to believe that in heaven angels do really veil their faces? The adoring cry of "Holy, holy," would be very appropriate; but would the *highest* order, and that, too, when in a specially favored position, veil their faces? They have never sinned, and therefore never had cause to cover or lower their countenances. Nor should it be said that "thus they indicate their inability constantly to behold divine glory." Were this so, then the arrangement of heavenly hosts would be more propitious to some, if they were not so close to the throne. We hide our eyes from the sun-light when it pains us. Surely God is not like the haughty tyrant, who delights in the lowered countenance of an innocent subject. True, we are taught that holy angels bow before God; but many passages of Scripture expressly teach this, and it is perhaps the most common posture to indicate inferiority simply, and not sinfulness; thus it is among men, but not so with covering the face. Suppose, however, the Seraphim to have repre-

sented the coming One; then this act, as well as all the others, is highly appropriate. Thus the work immediately in hand is the administration of dreadful justice. Judicial blindness is to be visited upon the rebellious Jews. Their covenant-keeping God is to shut out from their eyes the light of saving truth, and this in fulfilment of repeated threats. In Deut. xxviii. 28, 29, it had been said: "The Lord shall smite thee with madness and *blindness* and astonishment of heart, and thou shalt grope at noonday as the blind gropeth in the darkness," etc. Not an infrequent repetition of such threats as this had taught others among the Jews besides David and Isaiah to conceive of God as angrily hiding his face from his people, and thus causing them to wander in darkness.

Now, observe that in Isaiah's day the light of truth was ready to beam brightly. True, the sun was not yet at high noon; but the morning had far advanced, and now the great and glorious central light was about to burst through the clouds, behind which it had so long been sending forth diffusive light, and to pour down its concentrated rays upon the earth beneath. The holy prophet's humble, faithful, longing heart looked quickly, and before the clouds again gathered, learned his fifty-third chapter and many other precious truths. While, however the Sun of Righteousness is thus ready to shine forth, the people are grovelling in their sins, and unwilling to look at him. He justly determines to darken their eyes, so that when he comes to shine forth in the zenith, and the whole world is to see him, they shall not be able. Under these circumstances, what more appropriate than that the type of Christ should be seen hiding itself, and adoring the holiness of Jehovah? If a traitor is before his king to hear his doom, and begins to sue for pardon, and sees his majesty hide his face by holding up the arm covered with the royal robe, and hears him extol the impartial justice of the throne, well may the condemned wretch skulk away, for all is lost.

But further, consider the next act (verses 6, 7). "Then flew one of the Seraphim unto me, having a live coal," etc. Here we have the twofold work of forgiving sin and qualifying man to preach. What creature, save the God-man, ever did either? It

is worthy of special notice here and at other places, that these Cherubim act as if on their own authority. Angels are *sent*; Christ *comes*. If the blinded Jews could have understood the type in this vision, they might have understood how the "Son of man should have power on earth to forgive sins." Here we meet again the oft-returning objection, Why the plurality of types or representations? • If the Seraphim represented Christ, who is it seen on the throne? The answer is the same that has already been given, viz., the nature of the case demanded it. So long as there was a complex work for the Mediator to perform, just so long must there have been a complexity of representation. Pictures can only show one set of features at a time; therefore, if the front and back are both desired at once, there must be *two* pictures.

We shall not turn aside here to show how the different parts of the Mediator's work are in this vision ascribed to the Seraphim, and thus centred on Christ. It is sufficient if it has been shewn, as we think it has, that the agency here ascribed to the Cherubim (Seraphim) was appropriate only to the type of Christ.

The vision next in order is that of Ezekiel (see chapters i. and x). At the very outset we would confess a felt lack of apprehension of many parts of this vision, and also of the prophecies of Ezekiel. It may, however, be readily shown that in this vision the Cherubim typifies the person and work of Christ.

The prophet begins by saying (i. 1) that he had seen "visions of God;" not one only, but more than one representation of God. Then he describes the whole, as it had appeared to him. First, a whirlwind coming out of the north; then a great cloud; then a fire unfolding itself. Recall the scene on Sinai, where the holy law had been given, and reflect that God's design in manifesting himself to Ezekiel at this time, was to show the prophet that the threats made from Sinai had already begun, and should continue, then say what should we naturally expect to find coming out of the cloud and the fire? Would not such scenery fitly precede Jehovah's appearance, and especially so now, when his coming is to judgment? But what did come next? The four living creatures; and Ezekiel "knew that they were the

Cherubim" (x. 20). Then follows a lengthy specific description of these living creatures ; it is, indeed, so full that it constitutes the greater part of the vision. If it be said that this was the representation of angels, the appropriate attendants of Jehovah, the reply is twofold : (1) That such view is out of keeping both with the prophet's assertion concerning the visions, and with the visions themselves. Ezekiel says he is going to record, not visions of God and of angels, but more than one representation of God. And then these living Cherubim appear exactly where we would expect to behold one of the representations of God. These creatures constitute by far the greater part of the vision, and beside them there is only seen *one* representation of God. Moreover, there is a connexion between the throne and the creatures far more intimate than other Scripture would lead us to believe exists between God and angels. (2) Most of what is said of these creatures is inapplicable to angels, while some things said are entirely inappropriate. It has been already shown that the new name here applied to the Cherubim, and the new form in which it is seen, strongly indicated that it was the type of Christ. It may be clearly seen that the position and the agencies here ascribed to it, corroborate this view.

Only a brief outline of the agencies and the position can here be noticed.

Four living creatures are seen. They are recognised as being the Cherubim, but are now seen under new circumstances, with additional features, and engaged in new and wonderful employment. They stand under the throne which rests on their upstretched wings. Between them is fire and over their heads is a firmament, very like the fire and firmament round and above the throne seen above them. Each one of these creatures is attended by a mysterious wheel. This frame-work of wheels moves always exactly in unison with the creatures, for the spirit of the creatures is in the wheels. The movements of the creatures are self-directed and with divine energy, precision, and power. The noise of their wings is as the voice of the Almighty, and when the noise of their wings is heard, no voice is heard from the throne above. They take fire from between themselves and give it to

the man clothed in linen (the angel serving) to scatter it over the city. Now let the Cherubim (here called "living creatures") be the type of the person and work of Christ, and the vision is strikingly plain and instructive. Here are two distinct but closely allied representations of the Christ. The living creatures beneath and supporting the throne, represent him as he should be until the end, when he shall have subdued all things to himself. As thus set forth, he is engaged in the administration of providence. His Spirit is in the wheels. He sends out his ministers of judgment or mercy. On the throne he is seen as he shall be when he has finished the work of redemption and comes again in glory. The throne which he will then occupy shall be the purchase of his mediatorial work; therefore it is appropriately seen resting on the wings of the Cherubim. All the details of this vision will be seen to correspond accurately with this view. So, too, the verbal prophecies afterwards given are entirely consonant; for in those prophecies we have an outline of the work of Christ as Head over all things for the Church until the Church is brought home to the heavenly city. We would press the point that the position of these creatures in this vision is entirely incompatible with any other view. The throne of God cannot be appropriately represented as resting (either in its origin or continuance) on any created agency. The Redeemer's throne is to be the purchase of his mediatorial work.

We come now to the last visions in which the Cherubim appear. (Rev. iv. and v.) It is worthy of notice that this type, whatever it was intended to represent, was given to man immediately after the Fall, and *right along with the Protevangelium*; and was kept in use through the whole Mosaic dispensation, and continued under the Christian dispensation, for it is seen in the Apocalyptic visions, and never disappears until the mediatorial work is finished; after which nothing more is heard of it. This fact is very significant.

There is another significant fact. Types are always more difficult of application and clear apprehension before the fulfilment is seen in the antitype than afterwards. If we mistake not, this is strikingly true in the case discussed. This type of Christ's

person and work only becomes obscure when it sets forth those parts of his work which are still but vaguely understood, because they are now transacting or are in future to be transacted.

But let us examine the vision, and we shall find clear evidence on some points, indeed, almost demonstrative proof, that the living creatures appear here again as types of the Mediator. We read, Rev. iv. 6, that these living creatures were seen "in the *midst* of the throne and round about the throne." Here the proof is almost demonstrative, because (1) the context clearly shows that all other inhabitants of heaven (redeemed souls and angels) are seen in their respective and appropriate positions around the throne, therefore the living creatures do not represent any part of them. (2) Because these living creatures are seen not only around about the throne, but also *in the midst of the throne*. What else can this be than the type of the Messiah? Who else has the privilege or occasion to occupy positions around and *in* the throne?

Here we must meet two objections: (1) The old one as to a double type. How can the Cherubim and the Lamb represent the same person? This has already been several times answered by saying that the nature of the case demanded just such complexity of the type. The Church was yet militant. The wonderful book of God's providences was yet to be opened. The slain Lamb, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, was to unloose its seals. But the poor struggling saints were also to be guided in their worship, and their prayers poured out as sweet incense before the throne. Hence, while the Lamb opens the book, another type of the promised Messiah is seen *at* the head, and *as* the Head of the Church presenting the whole body, and each patient suffering soul, to the throne of the heavenly grace. Such plurality of work called for a plurality of type. Moreover, let it not be forgotten that Moses, Aaron, and the lamb, had long ago been given as plural types of Christ. (2) Another and far more troublesome objection is, that the living creatures are represented as saying to the Lamb (v. 9), "Thou hast redeemed us to God." How could the type of Christ speak thus? If Tischendorf (8th ed.) has given us the true text of this passage (the late revisers have so

determined), there is no room for the objection, for vs. 9, 10 are found to read thus: “. . . Worthy art thou to take the book and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood (men) of every tribe and tongue,” etc. So that the creatures are not heard to praise the Lamb for their own redemption. We would not reason in a circle by saying the living creatures were types of Christ, and therefore could not have been heard to praise the Lamb for their own redemption, therefore the revision must be correct, and then claim the revised rendering to substantiate this theory of the Cherubim. Still we do claim justly that whatever evidence has been from other passages adduced in favor of this theory of the Cherubim, does to the same extent establish the revision, and thus aids in proving that which will in its turn constitute good evidence for the theory.

Let us offer in favor of this revision of this passage this further exegetical proof: the expression as given in our Version was not appropriate even for the elders and the redeemed, who were heard to follow the living creatures in this song of praise for redemption. For the book to be opened contained God's decrees which concerned directly, not the elders and souls already redeemed, but those who were in future to be brought to glory—many thousands of them to come from nations yet unborn. How, then, could the fact that the Lamb had redeemed those already in glory, render him worthy to open decrees concerning others yet to be saved, and the persons most concerned in the book? Nor can it be said that the elders, etc., represented the whole body of redeemed, for the context shows the contrary. But if the decrees in that book were directly concerning those yet on earth, or to come on earth, and whom the Lamb purchased, then surely he was the one worthy to unloose the seals. This, we think, is sound presumption in favor of the revision. If the new reading is correct, then the objection is null.

But even should it be proved that the living creatures did use the language attributed to them, still this would not constitute an insuperable objection to the theory herein contended for. Let it be remembered that while the Church is yet militant, the Saviour

is her Head and Leader, and it will not appear strange that he be represented as leading the saints in a song of praise for redemption. While on this earth he led them in prayer, and taught them to say, "Our Father, which art in heaven, . . . forgive us *our sins*," and yet did not mean to imply that he was a sinner. Why should it be thought incredible, therefore, that he be represented as teaching them to sing a song of redemption appropriate only to themselves? We take it that, as our gracious and divine Teacher, he is doing this very thing in our hearts constantly. This is a part of his work as our Head and Guide. There is, therefore, no force in this objection after all. But to return from these objections to the vision. There is one agency ascribed to the Cherubim which is again well-nigh a demonstration of this view. It is said that the living creatures held in their hands vials full of odors (*the prayers of the saints*), and that they poured out these vials before the throne. Here, surely, is an agency which belongs exclusively to our great Intercessor; and the type is hereby emphatically declared to be the type of Christ. There is not within the lids of Holy Writ any intimation that any one except the Christ ever thus intercedes. It is everywhere declared that he does do thus for his people, and we are taught that this is one of the most prominent phases of his work since his resurrection and ascension. Hence it must be he who is here represented. Utter and dangerous confusion must ensue if any other party or parties be represented as doing that which is so emphatically *his prerogative*.

We have seen, therefore, that the chosen plan of revealing truth by evolving the whole from one germ, and the use of symbols and types in this development as aids thereto, strongly indicates that there would have been given some comprehensive symbol illustrative of the germ, and which should at the same time constitute a type of the person and work of the promised Seed. And that if such symbol and type were given, it was the Cherubim. And, also, that the names applied, and the forms, the positions, and the agencies ascribed to the Cherubim, everywhere clearly indicate that the Cherubim was such a symbol and type.

An article longer even than this might be written contrasting

this theory favorably with others; but if this is established, such an article is not needed.

We shall conclude with the mention and removal of the only other objection which has yet been raised to this view. It may be asked, "If this theory of the Cherubim is correct, why do we not find some use made of it by New Testament writers?" The reply is, (1) The writers of the New Testament did not, at any time, profess to be writers on Typology. They only used the types to further reveal or establish truth. Therefore it was not to be expected that they would expound all the types. Evidently they did not do so. (2) Whether they would or would not make use of any given Old Testament type in elucidation of truth, depended not solely on the fitness of the type to be thus used, but also, and to a great extent, upon the amount of the knowledge on the part of those to whom they wrote or spoke. Paul expressly states this concerning Melchisedec (Heb. v. 11, etc.). Melchisedec would have served a most excellent purpose in Paul's argument, had it not been for the lamentable and dangerous fact of the extreme ignorance of those to whom he wrote. We need not be surprised, therefore, that no mention at all was made of this type, which had not yet met its entire fulfilment in its prototype, and to which the eyes of the Jews had been judicially shut. This type had long ago, even in Isaiah's day, veiled its face with its wings. They could not now see even the Sun himself in his noon-day splendor. No wonder that the blessed Jesus wept as he thought how the same loving wings which would so tenderly have hovered over every self-ruined Hebrew, had to be folded back upon and shut out from their eyes their only Saviour! May God hasten the day when those wings will unfold, and show to poor perishing Israel the loving face of Immanuel, and spread in divine love and mercy over all nations.

Fly abroad, thou mighty gospel,
Win and conquer, never cease;
May thy lasting, wide dominions
Multiply, and still increase!
Sway thy sceptre,
Saviour, all the world around.

R. K. MOSELEY.

ARTICLE VI.

A CALL TO THE MINISTRY.

Ever since Jesus Christ commissioned his apostles, there have been intruders into the gospel ministry, pretending to a call which they never received. It is to be supposed there are such now, and will be such to the end of the world. Meanwhile, in every age God has his true ministers whom he calls to the work. How are the true to be distinguished from the false? How is the Church to know the men Christ has given to her to be her ministers and his? How is an individual to know whether he in particular is or is not called to be a minister of Christ and his Church? A man may err on either side, may run unsent or refuse to go when commanded. On the one hand, he may take to himself the honor of the ministry, not being called of God; may aspire without divine warrant to the priesthood, like Korah whom God swallowed up in the earth; may touch the ark unbidden and not "after the due order," like Uzzah upon whom God made a deadly breach¹ for this merely uncommanded and therefore unhallowed touch. Or, on the other hand, like Moses, he may be reluctant to obey the call; like Jeremiah, may plead to be excused through excessive diffidence; like Jonah, rise up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord and from the commission to go and preach to Nineveh. Upon which side of the question it is the greater error and the greater sin to stray from the right path, who shall undertake to decide? And yet the prevailing tendency in the Church appears to be towards urging young men into the glorious ministry of reconciliation—towards persuading them to undertake the awful care of souls.

It is clear that a call to the ministry must be from God. The Lord of the harvest alone must thrust forth laborers into his harvest. If, when God passed over Israel on the night when the first-born of Egypt's men and beasts were destroyed, he set apart as a memorial of this deliverance the first-born of men and beasts in Israel as sanctified to himself; and if afterwards he exchanged

¹ 1 Chron. xv. 13.

these first-born for the tribe of Levi and so these Levites were publicly consecrated to him, and if amongst these Levites he set apart Aaron and his sons to be the priests of the Lord, and so they were publicly set apart for an holy priesthood, and then if he ordained that whosoever should intrude into the Levite's or the priest's office should be put to death,¹ it is clear that, under the Old Testament dispensation, it was God's sole prerogative to designate those who should minister to his people in holy things. But *a fortiori*, we might expect him to claim this for his prerogative under the New Testament dispensation, seeing that under it the ministry is so much more perfectly and completely a spiritual and holy work. Accordingly we find that God the Saviour called his ministers when he was upon the earth by a direct personal call from his own lips. Then, he commissions them to preach to all nations and promises to be himself with them down to the world's end. And Paul so describes the ministry of reconciliation everywhere as to signify that God himself calls men into it. He says of himself that he was "allowed of God to be put in trust with the gospel,"² and that Christ had "put him into the ministry."³ Next he tells Timothy that the same had been committed to his trust, and that in turn he was to commit the same to faithful men who should be able to teach others⁴ also down to all generations. The ministry is indeed the Lord's special gift to his bride for her edification, and it would be passing strange if he did not himself choose the individuals whom he will present to her. Ministers in all ages are God's ambassadors with plenipotentiary powers sent to treat with men, and it is incredible that he should not himself appoint them. The apostle sets forth fully in various places how they are to fulfil their ministry, and although he himself sits as the pattern for the picture which he draws, there can be no doubt whatever that he is making a portrait of the faithful and true ministers of every age.⁵

But how is the call of God to be ascertained? There are three elements which when all found existing together in the case, constitute, according to the Presbyterian doctrine, the evidence of

¹ Numbers i. 51; iii. 10. ² 1 Thess. ii. 4. ³ 1 Tim. i. 12. ⁴ 1 Tim. vi. 20. ⁵ 2 Tim. ii. 2. ⁶ See 2 Cor. v. 18-21; vi. 1-10.

such a call. Our standards contemplate three parties coöperating in this matter, and each party furnishing a share of the proof of the call from God. They suppose "a candidate applying to the Presbytery to be licensed;" a "people prepared to elect a pastor" after the probationer shall have preached amongst them to their satisfaction; and a Presbytery "fully satisfied with the qualifications for the sacred office" which the probationer has exhibited upon examination time and again in various ways. This account applies, of course, to the final determination of the case towards which all the steps previously taken have from the first been looking. The three elements of the evidence that any man is called to the ministry accordingly are:

I. The individual's conviction that he is called.

II. The desire of a people for his ministerial labors.

III. The concurrent judgment of the proper court of the Lord's house.

All these together do not constitute the call, for that is from the Lord; but by these three elements of evidence concurring, the call is ascertained. Inwardly moved by the Spirit and outwardly invited and commissioned by the Church, a man may be said to be called of God to the ministry. Let us take up these elements in their order:

I. The first is *the man's own convictions*. Convictions of what? His convictions that he is called to preach the gospel. These may be more or they may be less clear and definite. In some cases they are like a fire in the bones, as Dr. Thornwell expressed it, and the man feels like Paul, "Woe be unto me, if I preach not the gospel." He must preach or die, he must preach or perish! This kind of convictions it is manifest is much to be desired by all ministers, and they all ought to pray God to give them such a clear and decided call; whilst all who have received such impressions have the greatest reason to thank the Master for peculiar favor and distinguishing grace and honor and happiness. It must, of course, be a great comfort to any minister to enjoy this unquestioning sense of duty. In the midst of the toils and temptations, the difficulties and discouragements, of the ministerial work to feel no misgivings that one is running unsent or speaking without a specific

commission must be indeed consolatory. Every candidate for the ministry may well implore from the Lord some such experience as this during his preparatory course, for he is looking forward to a work of the greatest magnitude, perplexity, and difficulty. He is expecting to assume responsibilities at which (as Thornwell said) "an angel might tremble." And to be assured of his call from heaven, to be certified of his divine commission beyond every doubt, would be like the assurance of his own salvation—an anchor to his soul in every storm.

Now, does it not seem natural to suppose that the degree of life and force and earnestness which shall attach to the convictions of different men whom God really calls to the ministry that they are thus really called of him, will in ordinary cases depend somewhat upon the mental and moral constitution of the individual? Do not different men ordinarily *know* things and *feel* things, even the very same things, in a different way? Is not clear conviction a different thing ordinarily in different men? Does not the very life of God in the soul of man—does not this heavenly force and power itself ordinarily manifest itself in different persons with certain differences which depend on constitutional peculiarities? Can we say of true Christians that they all have the same degree of clearness and the same degree of depth and the same degree of vigor of perception in regard to the dreadfulness of sin, or in respect to the preciousness of Christ? May we not, then, expect a difference of the accidents, while the essence is the same, in the convictions severally of men whom God has really and truly called to preach? There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are diversities of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.

What, then, is the essence and what are the accidents of such a call to preach as we are considering? What are the true and sufficient grounds of the conviction of being thus called, and what grounds are unreal and unsatisfactory ones? In other words, what things prove or disprove an individual's call to the ministry?

1. It is not essential that a man should so desire the work that he feels no reluctance to enter upon it. The apostle says: "If a

man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work," but he by no means asserts that every one called does desire it. He begins his statement with an "if." In fact, it has often happened that God's truly called ministers did not desire to go at his bidding. Moses did not and Jonah did not desire to go, yet both were certainly called of God to go. Many an ancient bishop of the best character cried "*Nolo episcopari*—I wish not to be made bishop"—and hid from those who desired him ordained. Augustine shed many tears in vain when the people seized him and brought him by force to the bishop and required him to be ordained a presbyter. Paulinus also was ordained by force. Cyprian and Gregory, Thaumaturgus and Athanasius and Evagrius and Ambrose, all absconded to escape ordination. Calvin, time and again, excused himself from entering on the work of the ministry, until God, to use his own expression, "seized him by his awful hand from heaven." On one occasion it was Farel, on another, Bucer, who adjured him in the name of God, and "terrified," says the great Genevese, "by the example of Jonah held up before me, I again accepted the teaching function." So Knox long resisted his call, but being publicly adjured by John Rough from the pulpit, at the desire of the people, he was compelled to yield. And in our own times, the same experience belongs to faithful ministers truly called of God. Dr. Thomas L. McBryde, a well known and much loved minister of the Synod of South Carolina, now deceased, resisted his call for a long time; but there have been few of our ministers whom God has more highly honored. So, too, Dr. Thornwell struggled long and hard against his convictions, much preferring to practise law and aspiring to statesmanship rather than to preach the gospel; and he did not yield until there was made upon his mind the distinct impression that he must either preach or be damned.

A man's desiring or his not desiring to preach, therefore, is nothing whatever in the case we are considering. Some who are called do not desire it, and many desire it who are not called to it. Many a German Anabaptist and many an English sectary in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, could not rest, but intruded themselves into the ministry. As the London Ministers

express it in their *Divine Right of Church Government*, "Aversion at manual work, pride of abilities, a disturbed imagination, a carnal project to promote self, prompt the man to be preacher." In these very days a young man may think it would improve his social position to be a minister, or give him ease, money, name, and power, and so he may very much desire the office, but not be called of God. On the other hand, from the very same or from similar motives, he may not desire the office, although God is really calling him to it. His ambition to become eminent at the bar or in medicine, his desire to grow rich, his indolent love of ease, his cowardly fear of men, his selfish desire to be settled pleasantly and speedily in life—some such disposition may cause him to be greatly averse to the self-denying and laborious and painful duties of the ministry, whilst nevertheless the Almighty may in his sovereignty have selected this very man, as he did the persecuting Saul, for a chosen vessel to bear his name before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel. It comes, therefore, to this, that the desire of a man for the office of the ministry does not prove his call, nor his lacking this desire disprove it.

Yet, in our Form of Government, the candidate is expected to declare that he has been "induced to seek the office" "from love to God and a sincere *desire* to promote his glory in the gospel of his Son." Now, what is the significance of this question, if the desire we have been considering is no proof of a call? The answer is, that the plain and simple meaning of that question is to ask whether the man being himself convinced that he is called of God, and therefore seeking now to be inducted by Presbytery into the ministry, is able solemnly to profess that he is moved by no improper considerations, but operated on simply by love to God, and the wish to glorify him in this work. He is not called on to affirm that he bases his conviction of his being called on his desiring the office; and oftentimes a truly called candidate would have to reply that he is conscious of no such desire at all. All which the question in our Form calls on the candidate to profess is, that his motives are proper and not improper ones.

2. Promising appearances in the circumstances which surround a man do not prove, and unpromising ones do not disprove, his

call to the ministry. A popular writer on this subject urges the individual to "notice the indications of providence," and maintains that "this kind of evidence is available to strengthen or diminish his convictions of duty." But great is the mystery of providence. That is a hard book to read. Like prophecy, it has to be read mostly backwards. "We are prone to misinterpret what are called the *leadings of providence*," says Dr. Thornwell, "and to take those things as intimations of the divine will, which are perhaps only designed to be trials of our faith. I am quite satisfied that no one can ever reach the will of God in his own particular case, by judging merely from promising appearances. The measures of human probability—it is a lesson recorded on every page of the Bible—are not the standard of divine wisdom. Every striking instance of faith commended in the Scriptures was *against* the conjectures of our narrow philosophy. Had Moses reasoned according to the prevailing principles of our day, he would not have refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. The prospect of extensive usefulness was so much greater at the court, the sphere of his influence would have been so much wider, he had been singularly raised to that elevated station, and the hand of God was so visibly in the whole affair, that if he had reasoned as multitudes do, from the *leadings of providence* and probable appearances, he would have felt justified in accepting the glittering bribe which was offered to him. In this, however, he would have followed the impulse of human reason and been no example of faith."—SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Vol. xxiii., p. 330.

3. Nor does zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls make a call to the ministry, for then every true believer would of course be called to it.

4. Nor is love for the kind of employment which pertains to ministers any part of the essence of the call, for many love that who are certainly not called.

5. Nor is the belief that greater usefulness may be attained in this than in any other service, essential to this call. It is very common for candidates to assign this as their main reason for seeking the ministry. The eminent Dr. Spring of New York, in

his excellent volume on the *Power of the Pulpit*, states the case thus: "Whether he can the better serve God and his generation by engaging in some one of the learned professions or in the ministry of his Son—this is the only question which a conscientious man will look at." Now, how is the conscientious man to form any proper judgment upon such a question as this? How can any man tell where he in particular can best serve God and his generation? That depends on what may be the will of God respecting him and his calling. What good will he do in the ministry, if God does not put him there? What good can he do out of it, if God's will is that he go into it? The question where he can the better serve God and his generation is, therefore, not a question for any man to determine. "No man," said Dr. Thornwell, "is anything in the kingdom of God, except as God makes him so." Many a truly called minister has spent his whole life sowing in tears without having any visible or external evidence that his labors were in any degree blessed. Vague and uncertain calculations of expediency must not be substituted in the place of God's call. "Duty," says Dr. Thornwell, "must ever be the measure of expediency; and a man can only know in what line he can produce the greatest good by knowing in what line God has called him to labor." Paul may plant, and Apollos water, but only God can give the increase. "The grand question, then, is, Will God bless? and that depends for its answer upon this other, Has God called?"

6. Nor, in fine, are any good motives, nor all the best possible motives combined, what constitutes a call to the ministry. Nor are any external proofs, nor all combined, enough of themselves to evince that a man has that call from God. It is a question for him, of inward conviction, where no motive should have any place except the motive to obey the call which he feels convinced that God has issued. It is for him a question of *consciousness*—or rather it is for him a question of the Spirit's testimony, where the individual himself must believe that he is called, or the call is not authenticated.

But yet neither

7. On the other hand is it essential to this call that a man

should be addressed by any voice from heaven, or have any vision from God, giving him audibly, or in any other extraordinary way, a commission to preach. No sane Christian would plead that he is not called because he has had no such extraordinary manifestations. No intelligent Presbyterian can fail to acknowledge that the Scriptures are our rule, and that they are the sufficient as well as the only rule, as well of practice as of faith. God makes no new external revelations now. "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." Such is the language of our Confession; but it explains afterwards that the things upon which Scripture enlightens us are "those which are necessary to be known, observed, and believed for salvation." We do not claim that the Scriptures are always a precise and specific rule of duty; for, in regard to some things, they give only general instructions, and constitute in some things only a negative and not a positive rule. Where does Scripture tell this or that man in particular to go and preach, or the reverse? Where does Scripture tell any minister whether he must accept this or that particular call? Such questions of duty, from the very nature of the case, Scripture can determine for us only generally and negatively. The world could not contain the books which must have been indicted by the Spirit, had it been intended to give us a written rule of practice touching every case we might have to decide. No intelligent Protestant holds that the Bible can positively direct us in regard to every question of daily duty. But all Protestants hold that we have a divine *guide* as well as a divine *rule*. The Scriptures hold forth, and the Presbyterian Confession acknowledges, the necessity of the Spirit's illumination for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the word. And believers do enjoy the supernatural guidance of the Spirit. We are taught to pray for him to guide us into all truth and all duty. We need to hear, and we do hear, his voice saying unto us: "This is the way, walk in it." The Scriptures are full of this doctrine of the guidance of the Spirit; and often, indeed, are we comforted by it, for we are constantly

liable to perplexity and doubt about the choice between two or more ways set providentially before us. But we never need to have any new external revelations to guide us, for the word is sufficient, taken negatively when it cannot be taken positively. And the Spirit, so far as he uses means at all in dispensing illuminating and other grace, always honors his ordinary and appointed ones. These are his only channels of grace when he makes use of any channel at all. But we may not confine him to any channels; we may not assent that he acts always through the word and by the Church. He is a person, and he sometimes works in and upon and amongst men directly and immediately. When the word gives us no specific directions, the Spirit often guides by imparting a "*sense of duty*." "My deliberate conviction," says Dr. Thornwell, "is that the only way of arriving at a knowledge of the divine will in regard to us, is by simplicity of purpose and earnest prayer. If we really desire with an honest heart to know our duty, and apply to God to be instructed by him, he will impress upon the conscience a sense of duty just in the direction in which he would have us to move, and which we shall feel it perilous to resist. This 'sense of duty' may be produced by some principles of the word which we perceive to be applicable to the exigency, or by an immediate operation of the Spirit upon the mind, which we are unable to explain. This is my test; and I confess that until after having sought from God, with simplicity and honesty, his divine direction, I feel such a 'sense of duty' upon my conscience, such a 'woe is me' upon the heart, I should feel it unsafe to move. . . . The meek will he guide his way."—SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Vol. XXIII., p. 331. Nor, so long as those inward monitions which claim to be immediately from the Spirit are found to be in concurrence with the word, can there be any danger of their leading to any fanatical abuses.

8. It is not of the essence that the candidate be young or old, poor or rich, trained in a theological school or trained for the ministry in some other way; only he must not be a *novice*. Perhaps God may call him from eminent distinction and a wide and lucrative practice of law or medicine; or perhaps from neither of

these learned professions, but some sphere of common life. The ambassador of God may go from the schools of the prophets, or from the plow-handle, the shoemaker's bench, the blacksmith's shop, the counting-house, the halls of justice, the hospital; but wheresoever he goes from, whether he knows or knows not Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, he must be mighty in the Scriptures, skilled in the doctrines, able to speak the word with wisdom and with power. The call is sovereign. God calls whom he pleases to call, and whom God appoints God anoints. He does not always call boys, but sometimes men of middle age; not always the poor, but sometimes the rich. Nor is there anything in our Form of Government which signifies that ministers must all enter the service by the same door. All the ordinary tests which the Church has appointed, and which ought to be strictly and faithfully applied, belong to ordinary cases, while it is plainly signified that peculiar cases may arise, to be determined in other than the ordinary ways. Even licensure itself is only a way of testing and trying a probationer in ordinary cases; so that even licensure may be dispensed with, if Presbytery judge proper in the circumstances. The Book distinctly puts all the trials upon the ground that the ministry is not to be degraded by being committed to weak, ignorant, or unworthy men, and it everywhere implies that it is for the Presbytery to judge of the individual's qualifications. Accordingly, the sole limit set to the trials which are to be had is *the Presbytery's being satisfied*, and the whole responsibility is thrown, as it ought to be and must be, upon them. All this evinces plainly that the way in which a man is trained to preach, and his age and his condition in life, with other like peculiarities, are all mere circumstances, and not of the essence.¹

¹ "Mr. Brownlow North, as to whom 'many ministers and elders who had opportunity of hearing him, believed that his exceptional gifts deserved exceptional recognition,' received a public welcome from the Free Church Assembly of 1859, of which Dr. Cunningham was Moderator. In the course of an address, in which he said he 'concurred heartily in the grounds on which this judgment had been come to,' Dr. C. remarked:

"It is proper, in the way of explanation, for me to say that I have adopted the resolution of declining to take any active part in promoting

Having thus looked at what is not essential, let us pass on to consider briefly what is to be considered of the essence.

1. A man cannot be called to preach the gospel who has not the necessary *gifts and graces*. Manifestly God does not ordinarily call any man to do what he has no fitness to do. The needful gifts are understood to be a measure of bodily health and strength, a tongue which does not stutter or stammer intolerably, such native and acquired powers of mind as constitute a man not "weak and ignorant," and such force and goodness of character as constitute him not "weak and unworthy" in the sense in which those terms are used in our Book. Feeble, inefficient, shallow, empty-headed dawdlers and drones; fickle, inconstant men with-

cases of deviation from our ordinary rules in regard to the licensing of probationers. But although I thought it prudent in my circumstances (Dr. C. was Professor in the Theological Seminary) to adopt such a resolution, it did not arise in the least from any jealousy as to the perfect warrantableness and expediency of occasional deviations from our ordinary arrangements. I never could see the warrantableness of any Church of Christ, however deeply impressed with its importance in ordinary circumstances, venturing to lay down as a resolution that she would not see and would not recognise gifts for preaching or for the ministry, except in men who had gone through the whole of the ordinary curriculum. No Church has a right to lay down that rule. This Church has not laid down that rule, and I trust never will. The Church must lay herself open to consider exceptional cases, mark God's hand, and make a fair use and application of what he has been doing. Everybody admits this in theory, but I have sometimes thought there was some unwillingness to apply it; but I must say I have been of late very desirous to see two or three very good cases of exception of that kind—not only because I would like to see the Church practically recognising the principles to which I have referred, but for this additional reason, that I have a strong impression that in the actual position of the Church we will find considerable difficulty in keeping up a high standard in regard to the mass of our students, unless we have an open way for occasional exceptions. I believe, if we leave such an opening, it will be of far more importance in enabling us to maintain a high standard, and full compliance with our strict regulations in regard to nineteen-twentieths of our students, than by attempting to carry out the same rule to the whole twenty-twentieths, and thereby running the risk of lowering the standard of the whole body, and losing besides the benefit of the exceptions.' "

out purpose or aim, show no signs of being called of God to preach the gospel. Men who could not be expected to succeed in any other calling are not the sort of men the Lord of the harvest will ordinarily thrust into his harvest.

In like manner the needful *graces* are piety, humility, unselfishness, faith, and zeal, without the possession of which no man can give any evidence of being called. These things are essential.

Yet let no son of the Church, who feels in his heart some conscientious impressions that it is his duty to preach the gospel, excuse himself, like Moses or Jeremiah, on the ground of felt weakness or incompetency. Be it that you have not ten talents nor even five, but only two, or, let it be only one. A double measure of grace can more than make up the lack of large gifts, and grace is freely bestowed by the Lord when he will. God often makes choice not of wise men after the flesh, not of mighty or noble ones, but of such as the world calls foolish and weak and despised, that no flesh should glory in his presence. He can and he sometimes does so plentifully endow with his grace men whose intellectual furniture is small that they are made to be eminently useful in the ministry. So is it likewise with men lacking physical strength. Some men of feeble frame, like Calvin and Brainerd of past times, and like some of our own time known perhaps to us all, display so much patience and perseverance and endurance and system and energy of mind and heart as compel us to acknowledge that, feeble as their bodies appear, God has nevertheless made them giants for work. We must, therefore, always couple gifts and graces together in judging of fitness to preach the gospel.

2. A man cannot be called to the work of the ministry who lies providentially under any obligations to others which stand in the way of his devoting himself to that work. It is one of the divine proofs which accredit Christianity that it never sets up religion against morality or justice. God forbids the neglect of duty to man on any plea of duty to himself. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught, . . . leave there thy gift," . . . "If a man love not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not

seen?" "He that provides not for his own, especially those of his own household, is worse than an infidel."

It was on this principle that the ancient Church would not ordain a slave. His time belonged to his master, and God and the Church would not come in betwixt the man and his legal owner. Christ did indeed say when one whom he had called to preach desired to go first and bury his dead father, "Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the kingdom of God." But that was an extraordinary call from the very lips of the Lord Jesus, and moreover there were probably other sons at home prepared to do what was necessary for the remains of their father. No argument is to be based therefore upon this case to prove that any may now plead a divine call to preach in denial of the just claims of a helpless parent or a dependent sister or a lawful creditor. Yet let it be remembered that Providence may seem to hedge up before us the way of our felt duty only to try our faith and zeal and to drive us to more earnest prayer.

3. It is of the essence of the call that a man have a conviction that he is called to this work of the ministry and to no other work. Whenever God calls, he will convince of the call; otherwise it can be no call. How vain it is to talk of a call from God which is not such as can be heard by the person called, or which cannot be recognised as indeed coming from God! A man whom God calls must needs be impressed with a sense of that call. He will know that he is called by an inward conviction wrought by the Spirit of God. He will know it just as he knows any of the operations of his own consciousness—that he believes, loves Christ, and hopes for heaven. He knows these things because he feels them, and in the same way does he know what the Spirit convinces him of respecting his call—he *feels* it. The conviction may be more or less clear, it may be more or less definite, it may be preceded by more or less severe struggles and conflicts within his soul, it may be accompanied with more or less doubt and misgiving—all these differences will be found in men of different physical and mental and moral constitution, and all these differences will mark the different dispensations of the same Spirit and the different operations of the same grace. But in every case of

the call to preach there will always be that essential thing—the man's own inward conviction, whether it be calm and deliberate or profoundly agitating to his soul.

Without such an internal persuasion of his own call, let no man be encouraged to enter the ministry. For such a settled conviction (more or less clear and determinate) that the King eternal commissions him to this specific work, it is dangerous and it is wicked to substitute any persuasions of private friends or any election by the Church or any favorable judgment by the Presbytery. All these are valuable in their place—two of them are absolutely indispensable. But let no man go forward into this fearful pathway upon any such intimations of his duty by other men, without having in his own soul the settled conviction (more or less decisive and strong) that not man only but God also calls.

The call to preach must be a specific call of this particular man to this particular work of preaching the gospel, and it will and must differ therefore from the general call of duty which is to direct men generally in their general, ordinary, secular operations. The call to be a shoemaker or a butcher or a tailor, the call to be a farmer or a manufacturer or a banker, is, of course, a providential thing, and the Lord and Maker of us all has, of course, a determinate choice as to which one of these worldly callings each of his people shall pursue. But the call to the ministry is not one of these common things, but a very sacred thing and very nigh to our Lord's heart, because it concerns his Church's well-being and his own honor. Amongst these common callings a man is to choose upon general and common principles according to the circumstances which in the providence of God do surround him at the time. But the call to hold office in God's house, to execute an embassy to immortal sinners, clothed with powers plenipotentary to make peace betwixt God and them—this call is to a high and holy office in the Church to a solemn and to an awful work for the Lord Jesus, and we must not degrade it by comparing it to any secular calling. Low views of the call to preach, like low views of the Church, her doctrines, order, and worship, are the sin of the world, the weakness of certain branches of Protestant Christendom and the reproach and

dishonor of all lax Presbyterians. The consequences of the prevalence of these low views are deplorable. Let any man whom they govern enter the ministry upon some such general ground as that he thinks he can do most good in that service, and he will be very liable to a change of opinions just as soon as he begins to encounter trials and difficulties. His opinion changed, of course his call has vanished and he abandons the work or else through false shame hypocritically holds on to it. This is one chief reason of so much secularisation in the ministry. Men who have no specific call to it by the Holy Spirit weary of the arduous labor and are glad of any excuse to quit it for a secular employment. No man can be relied on to abide constantly faithful in the ministry amidst all its difficulties and discouragements who has not had solemnly impressed upon his heart and conscience a call from God himself.

Dr. Spring, in the volume already quoted, says: "Every man who possesses the necessary qualifications and is approved and set apart to the office by the express judgment of the Church . . . is a divinely commissioned minister of Christ." If Dr. Spring intended to say that the call of God can come to any man from or through the Church without being accompanied by any direct operation or impression of the Spirit upon the man's own heart, or if he intended to say that the favorable judgment of the Church is enough to evince that a man is called to preach without any inward conviction produced by the Spirit within his soul, it was a great error. Many an uncalled man has had, according to the Church's judgment, all the necessary qualifications. There can be no due authentication of the call without that other element also of the inward conviction wrought by the Spirit on the heart of the called man.

The call to preach, therefore, is *direct and immediate*, in the sense that it is not given through any human agency external to the man himself. It comes directly and immediately from God, not indirectly and mediately through human testimony. It is *direct and immediate* also, in the sense that it is not given through any special truths of the word, although it is always, of course, in concurrence with the general principles and testimonies

of the word. It is also *personal and specific*; not like the general call which comes to all men to serve God in all possible ways and do all the good they can in this sinful and sorrowful world, but coming to this man in particular and requiring him to serve the Master in this one work of his life. It is, further still, *supernatural*, in the sense that it does not depend upon his possessing in himself, either naturally or by ordinary grace, the needful qualifications of body, mind, or heart, and is not derived simply from his consciousness that he does possess these powers, but that it arises from a supernatural operation of the Holy Ghost within him. And finally, it is a call of which the individual called is himself *inwardly persuaded*, so that albeit with misgivings and doubts and fears, nevertheless he is convinced by the Spirit's own witness that there is but one way of duty for him, and that is, to go and preach the gospel.

Now if the call to preach be indeed a call from God to be certified distinctly to the man's own heart by the Spirit, then it clearly follows that God's action in sending forth preachers is not to be stimulated or its fruits increased by the Church or by any other power except in two ways, revealed both of them in the Scriptures. The first is prayer to God to send forth more laborers; and the second is the use of proper means for instructing the Church and her sons on this whole subject. We may not throw wide open the door of entrance into the ministry and invite and persuade all to enter, so that those who are really called may come in with the rest. Easy, indeed, it may be for men to multiply ministers, but impossible for them to multiply such as are called of God, except by the power of prayer to the Lord of the harvest and by the force of his truth as he shall impress it upon the conscience.

It is, therefore, perfectly right and very necessary to urge upon Christian men who have the needful gifts and graces the truth that the harvest is plenteous and the laborers few. Not to the young nor to the poor is God confined in the choice of his ministers, for the call is sovereign and extends to all classes and all ages. To young men and to middle-aged men, to poor men and to rich men, therefore, who have the necessary qualifications, it

may be properly said, "Lift up your eyes and look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest," and God may cause this looking at the fields already white to be the means of impressing his call upon their minds and hearts. The Almighty is, of course, able to call them without any human agency whatsoever, merely by his word read or preached as the Spirit shall apply it to their conscience. But the Saviour has expressly commanded us to use prayer as a means of procuring a greater supply of ministers from the Lord; and why are we not required to make all suitable exertions to get what we pray for in this case, as well as in every other? In regard to every other blessing we must pray always and trust always as though all depended on God, which indeed it does, yet we are to labor and strive in the use of means as though all depended on ourselves, which indeed it does not. We pray for the common blessings of life, but we must diligently use the proper and appointed means whilst we are praying. We pray for the conversion of sinners and the edification of believers, but we must ply them both with the word that the one class may be converted and the other edified. And whenever we meet with a man or a boy who appears to us to possess the needful gifts and graces for the ministry, why may we not bring to his mind the question, For what were these gifts and graces imparted? That question may be God's way of impressing the conviction of the call upon that individual's mind. If a church may signify to any man whose ministrations it is satisfied would be profitable to itself that it desires him to be its minister, and if that might legitimately be the very first step in the process of his being introduced into the ministry, why may not one Christian believer signify to such a man his sense of benefit from those ministrations as they have been hitherto privately and unofficially exercised and urge him to undertake the ministry? If sitting in my place in Presbytery I may encourage an individual to go forward, why may I not do the same in my pulpit addressing many persons together, and why may I not do it in private conversation with the particular individual? If a pious mother may in secret offer to the Lord her son for the work of the ministry because she loves the Saviour and desires for her boy the

honor of his being one of the Lord's heralds, why may she not tell that boy what a glorious thing it is to preach Christ, and why may she not set before his mind every scriptural view of that subject, and paint before his eyes the condition of millions who are perishing, and urge the necessity there is for many to carry to them the word of life?

This inward call of the Spirit is not the extraordinary call of prophets or apostles, although it is a definite, individual, and supernatural call. It is the ordinary call of God to his ministers and other office-bearers. The question arises, Must not the sin of neglecting this call be in proportion to its solemnity and importance? When God bids a man go preach and save souls and the man refuses, does not this refusal involve the deepest criminality? It follows that while it is important for ministers and those seeking the ministry to be assured of their call, the assurance that they are not resisting this call is of importance to those at ease in Zion and not coming up to the help of the Lord against the mighty. The difference between the two cases is that the one requires assurance positively, but the other negatively. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind, and that by intelligent and prayerful consideration, whether he knows his whole duty and is striving to discharge his whole duty to God and the Church and mankind. If there be danger and evil in running to one extreme of opinion and practice in urging men to enter the ministry, there may be danger and evil in going to the opposite extreme of not faithfully instructing those who have the requisite gifts and graces concerning their duty in this regard.

Let us recapitulate. It is not of the essence of the call (1) that a man desire the work, so that he has no reluctance to enter on its duties; nor (2) that the circumstances surrounding a man be favorable to his undertaking the work; nor (3) that he be full of zeal; nor (4) that he loves preaching; nor (5) that he suppose he can be more useful in this service than in any other; nor (6) that he have the best motives within and the best outward proof, so long as he lacks the internal conviction of his own call; but yet (7) on the other hand, it is not of the essence that a man hear any audible voice from God out of heaven, or see any vision,

or have any extraordinary manifestations whatsoever, for the word is the only and the sufficient rule of every man's faith and practice ; nor yet (8) is it essential that the candidate be of any particular age or class or training, only he must not be a *novice*.

But it is essential to the call :

(1) That a man have the necessary gifts and graces ; (2) that no clear obligations of duty to other persons stand in his way ; and (3) that he be inwardly convinced of the Spirit that he is called to this work and to no other. The call, therefore, is personal, specific, direct, and supernatural, though it is not manifested by any extraordinary external signs whatsoever. And as it does not depend on the mere general notion that the ministry is the most useful of callings, this specific personal vocation will not vanish into thin air whenever difficulties arise, but the truly called will patiently endure, by sustaining grace, all which the call may involve. And as it is from God, man cannot stimulate its operation by any devices of his own, but only by the ordained means of prayer to the Lord of the harvest and instruction to the Church and her sons.

One more remark shall finish the discussion of this branch of the subject. It is that the very idea of a call to the ministry implies that, in a certain sense, the individual is passive. He is called by the Lord and called by the Church, and being called, he obeys the call. It is the part of enthusiasts and fanatics to thrust themselves forwards ; but he that is truly called, is oftentimes loth to enter on the work and consents to come forward only when urged. Real merit is usually modest and self-distrustful, and frequently needs the encouragement of being called. Indeed, the true attitude of every candidate is not that of a volunteer asking Presbytery to examine him or license him, any more than afterwards he would ask a church to call him. From the very beginning and always to the end, the individual's proper attitude is, that, being wanted, he is called ; and being called, he answers to the call.

II. We are now prepared to take up the second element of the evidence that any man is called to preach the gospel, which is, *The desire of a congregation for his ministerial services.*

The individual's own conviction that he is called has been discussed first, but not because necessarily that element of the evidence appears and manifests itself first. It might be affirmed that, ordinarily, personal conviction does not precede, but follow the convictions of others; but, indeed, no particular order is essential or invariable. The individual's convictions may come first, or the church's or the Presbytery's may precede them.

But whensoever these convictions of the individual emerge, they do not of themselves prove that he is called. They are essential to the evidence of a call, but a second element is likewise essential. Some church must desire his ministerial services with a desire based on their experience of his gifts and graces for the ministry. Let the man's convictions be never so clear and powerful, they are nothing unless some congregation having first tried him, express their earnest call and desire for him to undertake the pastoral office amongst them. And their promise of a competent support for him is the indispensable proof of the sincerity and earnestness of the call. Ordinations *sine titulo* have always been and are still condemned in the Church. Now, the *Titulus* of old was a church which yielded a *support* to the *In-titulatus* as well as furnished him a field of labor. It has ever been the conviction of the Church in all ages, that a ministry not supported properly is a ministry undervalued and dishonored, and so made to be unprofitable and useless. The ground of any call which a congregation makes out is their desire for the services of the minister called, and they evince the reality and strength of this desire in what they promise to pay for his services. There lies the only real evidence that he is wanted amongst them, and from this may be judged accurately and safely how much he is wanted. It never is considered in the markets of the world that a demand for any article exists where the full and fair value of the article in question does not readily come forth to be exchanged for it. And this principle applies, in a sense, to the call of the minister—there is no call for his services where the people will not promise him at the least a fair support.

It is for the purpose of discovering whether any particular church is able and willing thus to evince a hearty desire for his

services, that we license our candidates to go and preach the gospel *as probationers for the holy ministry*. The licentiate is in no sense at all a minister of the word. His licensure is only one part of his trials. The Presbytery can withdraw it at any time, without ceremony. But whenever a people, having had experience of his ministrations, do send to Presbytery a call for the services of a probationer, then that body has before them two of the elements which evidence that that man is called of God to preach the gospel.

III. The third element of this evidence is the concurrent judgment of the Presbytery. They tried him before, and being so far satisfied, they sent him forth amongst their churches. Called now by one or more of these, the Presbytery, with solemn and anxious care, does, or ought to, try him strictly again. If satisfied, the third element of the evidence emerges, and thus at last God's call to the individual is authenticated. All these three elements do not constitute the call, for that is from the Master himself; but when these elements concur, the call of God is evinced. There is no call from God unless the man is inwardly persuaded thereof; unless some church or churches have been edified by his labors and desire their continuance, and are willing to pay for them; and unless the Presbytery, under whose care and government both parties are, feels prepared to join them together in these sacred bands of ecclesiastical wedlock. And those bands no power on earth, except the Presbytery, can lawfully unloose again.

JNO. B. ADGER.

ARTICLE VII.

DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE ASSEMBLY OF
1837.

We present our readers with two papers under this title, taken from the *Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine* for the year 1837, both written by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge. They are valuable, rare, and of living interest—in fact in some of their aspects very apposite to the present case of our Church.

The former of these two documents discusses the ABRIGATION of the fatal PLAN OF UNION which well-nigh proved the ruin of the Presbyterian Church. The *Plan* itself is given, as adopted by the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1801, and also by the General Association of Connecticut, and then the *Resolutions* of the General Assembly of 1837 abrogating it. Then follows Dr. Breckinridge's paper, illustrating "the justice, propriety, and necessity of this vote."

The latter document discusses THE CASE OF THE FOUR SEPARATED SYNODS. It is a twofold argument in defence of the action of the Assembly of 1837, first, from *the nature and duty of discipline*, and secondly, from *constitutional power and duty*.

[EDITORS SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.]

I.—ABROGATION OF THE PLAN OF UNION.

In the digest of the Assembly's acts, on pages 297–299, is printed the famous *Plan of Union*, whose abrogation by the last Assembly had so prominent a place in its acts, and will undoubtedly exert so great an influence on the future destinies of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. We print the *Plan* itself, that our observations on it may be more simple and intelligible.

Plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the new settlements, adopted in 1801.

"The report of a Committee appointed to consider and digest a plan of government for the churches in the new settlements, was taken up and considered, and after mature deliberation on the same, approved, as follows:

"Regulations adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America, and by the General Association of the State of Connecticut, (provided said Association agree to them,)

with a view to prevent alienation and promote union and harmony in those new settlements which are composed of inhabitants from these bodies.

“1st. It is strictly enjoined on all their missionaries to the new settlements to endeavor, by all proper means, to promote mutual forbearance and accommodation between those inhabitants of the new settlements who hold the Presbyterian and those who hold the Congregational form of Church Government.

“2nd. If in the new settlements any church of the Congregational order shall settle a minister of the Presbyterian order, that church may, if they choose, still conduct their discipline according to Congregational principles, settling their difficulties among themselves or by a council mutually agreed upon for that purpose. But if any difficulty shall exist between the minister and the church, or any member of it, it shall be referred to the Presbytery to which the minister shall belong, provided both parties agree to it; if not, to a council of an equal number of Presbyterians and Congregationalists agreed upon by both parties.

“3d. If a Presbyterian church shall settle a minister of Congregational principles, that church may still conduct their discipline according to Presbyterian principles; excepting that if a difficulty arise between him and his church, or any member of it, the cause shall be tried by the Association to which the said minister shall belong, provided both parties agree to it; otherwise by a council, one-half Congregationalists and the other half Presbyterians, mutually agreed on by the parties.

“4th. If any congregation consists partly of those who hold the Congregational form of discipline, and partly of those who hold the Presbyterian form, we recommend to both parties that this be no obstruction to their uniting in one church and settling a minister, and that in this case the church choose a standing committee from the communicants of said church, whose business it shall be to call to account every member of the church who shall conduct himself inconsistently with the laws of Christianity, and to give judgment on such conduct; and if the person condemned by their judgment be a Presbyterian, he shall have liberty to appeal to the Presbytery; if a Congregationalist, he shall have liberty to

appeal to the body of the male communicants of the church; in the former case the determination of the Presbytery shall be final, unless the church consent to a further appeal to the Synod, or to the General Assembly; and in the latter case, if the party condemned shall wish for a trial by mutual council, the cause shall be referred to such council. And provided the said standing committee of any church shall depute one of themselves to attend the Presbytery, he may have the same right to sit and act in the Presbytery as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church.

“On motion,

“*Resolved*, That an attested copy of the above plan be made by the Stated Clerk and put into the hands of the delegates of this Assembly to the General Association, to be by them laid before that body for their consideration, and that, if it should be approved by them, it go into immediate operation.” Vol. I., p. 261, 262.

SECTION 6.—*Adopted by the Association.*

“The delegates to the last General Association of Connecticut reported that they all attended the Association during the whole of their sessions and were received and treated with great cordiality and friendship.

“That the regulations submitted by the last Assembly respecting the establishment of churches in the frontiers, consisting of members partly of the Presbyterian and partly of the Congregational denomination, were unanimously adopted by the Association.” Vol. I., p. 276.

One of the large business committees of the General Assembly of 1837 submitted a report, of which the following is a portion:

“In regard to the relation existing between the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, the Committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, viz.:

“1. That between these two branches of the American Church there ought, in the judgment of this Assembly, to be maintained sentiments of mutual respect and esteem, and for that purpose no reasonable efforts should be omitted to preserve a perfectly good understanding between those branches of the Church of Christ.

“2. That it is expedient to continue the plan of friendly inter-

course between this Church and the Congregational churches of New England as it now exists.

"3. But as the 'Plan of Union' adopted for the new settlements in 1801 was originally an unconstitutional act on the part of the Assembly, these important standing rules having never been submitted to the Presbyteries, and as they were totally destitute of authority as proceeding from the General Association of Connecticut, which is invested with no power to legislate in such cases, and especially to enact laws to regulate churches not within her limits, and as much confusion and irregularity have arisen from the unnatural and unconstitutional system of union, therefore it is

"Resolved, That the act of Assembly of 1801, entitled 'A Plan of Union,' be and the same is hereby abrogated. See Digest, pp. 297-299.

"4. That our delegates to the bodies representing the Congregational churches be instructed to explain to them the reasonableness and even necessity of the foregoing measure."

On the 23d of May these resolutions were adopted by a vote of 143 to 110. It is the object of this paper to illustrate the justice, propriety, and necessity of this vote.

They who will consider the past history of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches in this country, will see abundant reason for the close sympathy which has always united them to each other, and the cordial good understanding which has so long existed between them. Our sincere desire is, that our Congregational brethren may not allow themselves to be hurried into measures in the present crisis which shall have any tendency to break up this state of things. And that the sound Presbyterians of the present day are actuated by no unfriendly feelings towards Congregationalism in itself considered, nor towards those who prefer that system, is abundantly manifest from the resolutions printed above. Let each party manage its own affairs in its own way, and let the other have the delicacy to mind *only* its own affairs. And when such Congregationalists as those at New Haven and those of the *Evangelist* become hot partisans of an erroneous and evil-spirited minority in our Church, let them be

discountenanced by all pious men in their sect who do not wish to inflame the whole land by a controversy on the radical principles of the two denominations. Presbyterianism seeks no controversy with any branch of the true Church of God; but it should be borne in mind that she has and can have no cause on her own account to fear any.

The Taylorite Congregationalists and the New School Presbyterians are very bold in declaring themselves the true descendants of the Puritans. "*We are Smithfield men,*" was the repeated and most shameless boast of Dr. Peters and Dr. Beman, in the last Assembly. "*A Puritan, therefore,*" (says Daniel Neal, History of the Puritans, Vol. I., p. vii., of the Preface to the London edition of 1822,) "*a Puritan, therefore, was a man of severe morals, a Calvinist in doctrine, a Non-conformist to the ceremonies and discipline of the Church, though they did not totally separate from it.*" Now to which part of this description may the two classes we have named above honestly pretend? Are they men of "*severe morals*"? Yes, if it be so to swear to a creed which one does not believe. Yes, if it be so to enter a Church only to revolutionise it and at the same moment swear to study its unity, purity, and peace. Are they "*Calvinists*"? Yes, if it be so to deny, revile, and studiously caricature some of the fundamental truths of Calvinism and zealously contend for opposite and irreconcilable errors. Are they "*Non-conformists*" through conscience? Yes, if he is a Non-conformist through conscience who conforms for convenience, from ambition, or through carnal self-seeking, to one system when he so decidedly prefers another, that even a bastard one, between the two, is precious as life compared with the one to which he immorally conforms. When men sacrifice principle, there is little wonder if they give up sense and knowledge also.

The truth is, however, that the Congregational denomination in this country was much more really the descendants of the Puritans than their Independent brethren in England, and therefore they were perhaps as nearly akin to Presbyterianism as to Independency.

The Church spoken of in the sentence above extracted from

Neal was the Established Episcopal Church of England, and the Non-conformist party was that which became the Presbyterian body of England after the formation of the Westminster standards; was the same which carried England almost in solid phalanx for the League and Covenant; the same which amidst the fiery trials which attended them before the rise of the English Commonwealth sent out many of those colonies and ministers who laid the foundation of the New England churches. These churches were indeed Puritan, Non-conformist, Calvinistic, and severely moral. Their principles, in all essential respects, and their creed, almost in terms, were those that formed the basis of the Westminster standards. Hence, while the English Independents to the present hour are upon the mere and absolute Brownist or pure Congregational foundation, and universally reject all creeds and authority above a church, the so-called Congregationalist churches of this country, and especially those in Connecticut, (with whom the *Plan* we are now discussing was formed,) became united under systems widely departing from the English model of the present day, and not only adhered to creeds, and for a long time to perfectly sound ones, but use them until now, with a profuseness unparalleled in the history of the Church.

Whilst, therefore, many principles were common to us and the churches of New England, and our creed almost identical, it is not wonderful that good men in both churches sought for closer union, and loved to get as near together as possible. In this spirit the *Plan of Union* was formed; and we are inclined to think that if it had been executed in its own true intention, and with fidelity on the other side, it might possibly have continued for an indefinite period. But as we shall show, the *Plan* itself, at first not consistent with the real principles of either party, was speedily and entirely perverted in practice. The Congregational churches, on their part, tended to change in two most important respects, either of which would have been fatal to the *Plan of Union*. They have gradually departed from the doctrines of their ancestors, and they have gradually inclined their systems more and more towards Independency, in both respects becoming more and more unlike to us and us to them. A plan which was hard

to manage at the best, became intolerable under these perversions, and left the injured party no alternative but its abrogation. But let us go a little into detail.

1. It is perfectly clear to our minds on the mere perusal of the Plan itself that it was meant only for *new* settlements and *weak* churches there. It makes provision only for such. Therefore the moment *frontier settlements* became thickly peopled and churches permanently established, the Plan should have ceased to operate in *that region*, and the churches there formed become fully Presbyterian or fully Congregational. As long as *new and frontier settlements* existed, the Plan would exist there. But it was never intended to be constant in such a way as to erect a new sect, bastard between the two parents, and finally capable of destroying both.

2. It is equally evident that the Plan never contemplated the formation of Synods out of churches absolutely heterogeneous in at least four respects, set forth in the paper itself; still less was it ever supposed that these motley churches should be represented in the General Assembly by persons neither ministers nor elders; and least of all could it be imagined from the examination of the plan that it could ever be made the ground of a system of organisation by means of which persons who never adopted our standards, and churches which did not believe them, should absolutely hold the balance of power in our entire body, and so use that influence as to threaten a total revolution in the doctrine and discipline of the Church.

3. There is no evidence at all that where a Presbyterian minister served a Congregational church, this should justify that church in calling itself Presbyterian and sending some private person as an elder to our Church courts; nor that when a Congregational minister served a Presbyterian church, this should justify him in calling himself a Presbyterian and sitting in our tribunals; nor when a church consisted partly of Presbyterians and partly of Congregationalists, that any member of it should have the rights and privileges of a ruling elder in all cases merely because he was a standing committee man. None of these things were ever intended. Yet they were all done to the ruin of both Presbyterian and Congregational discipline and order.

We assert, therefore, that the Plan itself was never executed according to its own obvious meaning; that the matters in which it was perverted and misapplied were entirely contrary to the principles and Constitution of our Church; and that the influence thus produced in our body illegally and contrary to the Plan itself, was constantly evil and constantly increasing. But the Plan itself, in its own real and obvious intent, was originally contrary to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church; and even if it had been faithfully executed from the beginning, it never was and never could have been compatible with our standards. Moreover, the General Association of the State of Connecticut never had any, the slightest, power to execute on its part such a plan in any of its parts. For—

1. Every Presbyterian minister has the right to be tried by his own Presbytery when any difficulty exists between him and his church, or any member thereof, and this right is most explicitly secured by our standards. But the second article of the Plan deprives him of this right and directs such cases to be referred to a certain mixed commission utterly unknown to our system.

2. Every private member of our churches has the same right to have all his church difficulties examined by his Session as our ministers have to bring theirs before the Presbyteries. But the third resolution of the Plan deprives the members of purely Presbyterian churches of this important right inherent in all our people, and substitutes an Association, or a mixed tribunal, both alike unknown to Presbyterianism, for the church Session.

3. By our Constitution every Presbyterian church must have a Session composed of a board of elders. But resolution 4 abolishes this board in certain cases. With us none but ministers and elders can administer discipline in any case. But this 4th resolution appoints a standing committee, who are neither the one nor the other, to perform this important work. By our system every member of our Church has a right to carry his case, by appeal, up to our highest tribunal. But by this resolution, in certain cases, this clear right is abolished. By our Constitution no human being but a ruling elder, regularly ordained, can act as a ruling elder in any of our Church courts. But by this monstrous

resolution, in certain cases, a member of the standing committee of a mixed church, and who is as to us a mere private person, is declared to "have the same right to sit and act in the Presbytery as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church."

4. But the General Association of Connecticut never claimed any sort of authority over the private members of the churches of Connecticut even at home. Of course it never could have any over them after they left the bounds of the Association, which were no more extensive than Connecticut itself, even if it had any over them at home, which it had not. But above all, it had no shadow of right to bind church-members from any of the other New England churches, even in Connecticut, much less in their own native regions; and least of all, after they had emigrated into the *new settlements* of New York and Ohio.

It has always appeared to us one of the most humiliating exhibitions of human weakness and inconsistency ever made by men professing to act with reflection and on principle, that the very same persons who, in the Assembly of 1836, argued that the body had transcended its powers in the case of the agreement with the Pittsburg Board of Foreign Missions, should assert that it had acted enough within them in the case of this Plan of Union. Our Constitution expressly empowers the Assembly to conduct Missions; the Assembly made a covenant with the Western Foreign Missionary Society to appoint a Board to carry on Foreign Missions, and to take its stations, etc., under its care. But these "*Smithfield men*" find out pretexts to refuse to execute the agreement, and forbade the Assembly, of which they and theirs were the majority, to do what it had covenanted towards the world's conversion. Yet these same "*Smithfield men*" find other pretexts to declare the *Plan of Union*, which violates our Constitution pointedly in six or seven particulars, to be good, wise, and *sufficiently* constitutional; and being a *covenant*, say they, unalterable without consent of parties; and even after that, the sacred vested rights under it intangible and unreachable by any human authority. How true it is *that they who cannot turn cannot spin!*

Though Presbyterianism and American Congregationalism

agreed originally in many things, and do still agree in some, yet they also differ fundamentally in some very important respects. Dr. Alexander observed on the floor of the General Assembly, that we had as much right and power to direct a part of our churches to be governed on the principles of diocesan episcopacy as on those of this *Plan of Union*. Does not the remark commend itself fully to every man's conscience? Is there a particle more resemblance, if so much, between a committee-man and a ruling elder than between a pastor of one of our churches and a diocesan bishop? The plan is, then, as far as it is executed upon its true intent, a thorough subversion of our whole system of Church order; and it is no mitigation of its injury to us that it departs from true Congregationalism about as far as from true Presbyterianism, and threatens it almost as seriously as it does us. The truth is, that the operation of the thing has been to rear up a new system, which has not only constantly troubled both those which formed it, but has been a sort of hot-bed out of which all sorts of monstrous things have issued. Monster itself, from the hour of its birth, its vigorous growth has only developed features which alarmed both its improvident parents, and the brood of its self-created progeny has been mainly stamped with its own evil image and superscription, and like itself, boasting for the most part a power "to dash wise counsels," to pervert good systems, and to educe from good the power to do hurt. Where did men learn to be Pelagians from revivals of religion? Where did the temperance cause teach men to deny the use of wine in the sacrament? Where did the cause of human freedom degenerate into an agrarian and Jacobinical crusade for levelling and amalgamation? Where did high spiritual effort and excitement terminate in Antinomianism, perfectionism, and licentiousness? Where, reader, where but in the very churches and regions where a most fatuitous *Plan of Union* between things which could not be thus united first grossly perverted itself, afterwards perverted portions of two Christian denominations into the wildest, most erroneous, and most fanatical sect that any portion of the Church of Christ ever acknowledged to be Christian?

It is not wonderful, then, that multitudes in our Church have

long bewailed and long striven to remedy this state of things. The writer of this article sat for the first time in the General Assembly in 1831. That Assembly, after full argument, decided that a committee-man, then present, should take his seat in the body as a ruling elder. And he did so: and out of an Assembly of about two hundred and thirty members only about seventy, or one member in three, could be induced to sign a testimony against this audacious violation of the Constitution they had all sworn to support. The following year the Synod of the Western Reserve was directed to take order and report in regard to the alleged disuse of the office of ruling elder in its churches and the prevalence of certain doctrinal errors in that region; and the next spring, that is in the Assembly of 1833, that Synod appeared by its delegates, and partly by evading the subject, partly by un candid statements and promises, and partly through the connivance of a New School majority in the body itself, the whole matter was for that time hushed up. The following spring (1834) the *Act and Testimony* was issued, and the Assembly of the next year, 1835, had become so thoroughly convinced of the evils of the whole subject, that it forbade any new churches to be formed under the *Plan of Union*, and made an overture to the General Association of Connecticut for its abrogation. That Association has remained profoundly silent on this subject, even to this very day. Even the act of the Assembly of 1837, now printed by us, has failed to make the oracle speak, and we are therefore obliged to wait still longer on its dumb and solemn meditation.

It appears to us to exhibit clearly the sense of weakness under which the minority of the last Assembly and their partisans every where have attempted to defend this Plan of Union—to hear them continually harping with a cuckoo note “it is a treaty, it is a covenant, it is a covenant, it is a treaty.” We beg pardon of Mr. Elipha White of Massachusetts and South Carolina, who did take a different ground in one part of one of the almost frantic bodily exercisings with which he entreated the Assembly. If we understood him, this was the syllabus of his argument: This Plan is and always was clearly unconstitutional; it has always given trouble and may be always expected to do so (Ah! thought we,

this is very good, when lo! the conclusion); *therefore we ought to adhere to the Plan for the sake of peace!!!* Truly a "new measure" in "seeking peace."

And what is a treaty and what a covenant? Does either word occur in the whole course of this Plan? Or is there one feature or element of either in it? Or is there in it any subject which could be the basis of either as between the acting parties? Or had those acting parties any sort of power to make a treaty or covenant about the matters and persons here involved? Surely, there is no absurdity of which men need any longer be ashamed, nor any assertion too hardy to be made. But above all, that the very "*Smithfield men*" who had, *on principle, broken the covenant and annulled the treaty* about Foreign Missions between the Assembly's Committee of 1835 and the Board of Directors of the Western Foreign Missionary Society should so soon discover that the acts of the same body, with others, do in fact immediately become unalterable and sacred both as treaty and covenant when an Association takes the place of a society and Taylorism stands in the stead of Missions, is a triumph of "New Light" which no one will dispute with Colonel Jessup, Dr. Beman, Dr. Peters, *et id omne genus*.

But suppose it were both treaty and covenant, what then? Are all treaties eternal? Is there no equality to be regarded as between contracting parties? Is there no such thing as a failure of consideration? Is there no making void that which was once good but which becomes wholly vitiated by reason of fraud, deceit, and perversion of articles, and consequent injury to an innocent party? Is there no redress for things done through mistake or in ignorance? Is there no such thing as a usurpation of power and the doing of acts which one or both the parties contracting had been forbidden by competent authority to do? Or are all third parties indissolubly and forever bound by the unauthorised acts of those who pretend to have full power and may have colorable authority to act for them? Our New School friends incur much risk of public exposure and contempt when they act hastily on the hypothesis that all men are as ignorant or as reckless in their statements as themselves.

We will not enter at present into the question of the effects which would lawfully or logically follow the abrogation of this Plan. That whole subject will properly occupy our attention in our next paper when discussing the resolutions declaring the four Synods out of our communion. At present we will close this disquisition by suggesting what seems to us sufficient reasons why the Plan of Union should in any condition of things have been abrogated; and why, under existing circumstances, the resolutions actually passed by the late Assembly were both wise and necessary.

1. We have demonstrated, as it appears to us, that the Plan of Union was at first improvidently made. It was evidently not wise, nor likely to be well executed. It was complex; it was uncalled for; it was a needless revolution in the habits of all the parties proposed to be benefited by it, for those parties could well have lived in harmony without it, and could hardly hope to escape trouble under it. It may have been a well-meant, but was surely a most ill-contrived affair.

2. It is as clear as any proposition ever can be made, that the General Association of Connecticut had no sort of power to make such a plan, and that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church were expressly forbidden to do, and solemnly sworn not to do, any of the material things herein complained of respecting it. The thing was, as to both sides, wholly unconstitutional, and therefore both were bound, and were sworn, never to make it; and having inconsiderately and illegally made it, to abrogate it as soon as possible.

3. It was a source of constant trouble, confusion, and disorder in our Church. One party in the Church considered those claiming rights under the Plan intruders, while they considered these opinions and feelings hard and unjust. There could be with us no peace or harmony while things remained as they were. All which is proved by the history of the seven last Assemblies.

4. The operation of the system, and the whole influence of the Plan, rendered constant difficulties between our Church and the Congregational churches probable, if not inevitable. It put great temptations in the way of Congregational churches to interfere in

our affairs. It seemed to make it a sort of duty on the part of the General Association of Connecticut to exercise a protecting sort of regard for a portion of our churches. It held out, or seemed to hold out, improper inducements and facilities to Congregational ministers to enter another sect, without in fact changing their former principles; and indeed held the two denominations in a sort of relation to each other that in all periods of commotion and excitement was extremely unpleasant, if not critical.

5. The churches formed on this Plan were neither wholly Presbyterian nor wholly Congregational, nor wholly on the half and half system. As a whole, they constituted a new sect, and yet their various parts constituted at the same time three or four new subordinate sects. The necessary result was the rising up of a new and strange thing in the country, which neither Presbyterianism nor Congregationalism could justly be expected to foster, and which must always trouble both. And in the process of its formation it would necessarily occur that all sorts of new creeds and church covenants (which are in their very essence and being anti-Presbyterian) would be formed; and that not only great errors might creep in, but great truths creep out, of these little creeds. And precisely such results to a most deplorable extent have followed; yea, and all attempts on our part to get at the real extent and posture of these evils have been constantly resisted, so that even now no man knows the full state of these matters. Bad as we know the thing to be, every new examination and development has proven the thing to be worse and worse. Mr. Colton admits that he himself, though no great dabster at such work, formed no less than *fourteen creeds* in the region covered by this Plan of Union.

6. The growth and progress of these things had already brought matters to such a pass that no man of common discernment could see any alternative but for the Presbyterian Church to cut loose and fall back on its own principles or be totally revolutionised. It was already a mere question of life or death. Everything strange, unsound, and troublesome in all our borders had made common cause with this Plan of Union sect, and its spirit per-

vaded the entire New School ranks. Not to have abolished that Plan would have been tantamount to a direct vote for the total subversion of our Church order, the entire perversion of our testimony, and the utter prostration of sound Presbyterianism, so far as the General Assembly was concerned.

7. This course, so absolutely necessary for us, was hurtful to the interests of no one whatever in any sort of way that we should or could regard. It might injure error; but that was a reason why we should do it. It might disturb the disturbers of the earth; but should we go back on that account? Whom does it injure? The cause of Christ, says one. We shall see that better by-and-bye. The Presbyterian Church, says another. That also the future will reveal. Has any man a right to be a Presbyterian without believing our doctrines, adopting our standards, or holding to our system? But we are willing, and more than willing, to receive all who will do these things. All others who seek to join us are either knaves or numskulls. If the churches in the separated Synods wish to join our body, let them enter by the door; all who enter otherwise Christ himself has denounced. If they wish to be Congregationalists, there is no hindrance; let them do what seems good to them. Would they form a new sect? Who hinders them? Would they be as they are? So let them be. All that is asked of them is, that they will be what they pretend to be, and nothing more or less.

Here, then, is the whole case. If the churches of Connecticut choose to find fault with the Assembly's act of abrogation, let them speak, and doubtless they will find a prompt and respectful answer, the very reverse of their dumb dignity. If they are satisfied, who else has any right to complain?

2.—THE CASE OF THE FOUR SEPARATED SYNODS.

On the 1st of June the Assembly passed the following resolution by a vote of 132 to 105:

Resolved, That by the operation of the abrogation of the Plan of Union of 1801 the Synod of the Western Reserve is, and is hereby declared to be, no longer a part of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

VOL. XXXIII., NO. 4—11.

On the 5th of June the Assembly passed the four following resolutions, the *first* by a vote of 115 to 88, and one *non liquet*, and the *three* last by a vote of 113 to 60.

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America—

1. That in consequence of the abrogation by this Assembly of the Plan of Union of 1801, between it and the General Association of Connecticut, as utterly unconstitutional, and therefore null and void from the beginning, the Synods of Utica, Geneva, and Genessee, which were formed and attached to this body under and in execution of said Plan of Union, be, and are hereby declared to be, out of the ecclesiastical connexion of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, and that they are not in form nor in fact an integral portion of said Church.

2. That the solicitude of this Assembly on the whole subject, and its urgency for the immediate decision of it, are greatly increased by reason of the gross disorders which are ascertained to have prevailed in those Synods, (as well as the Synod of the Western Reserve, against which a declarative resolution similar to the first of these has been passed during our present sessions,) it being made clear to us that even the Plan of Union itself was never consistently carried into effect by those professing to act under it.

3. That the General Assembly has no intention by these resolutions (or by that passed in the case of the Synod of the Western Reserve) to affect in any way the ministerial standing of any members of either of said Synods, nor to disturb the pastoral relation in any church, nor to interfere with the duties or relations of private Christians in their respective congregations, but only to declare and determine, according to the truth and necessity of the case, and by virtue of the full authority existing in it for that purpose, the relation of all said Synods, and all their constituent parts, to this body and to the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

4. That inasmuch as there are reported to be several churches and ministers, if not one or two Presbyteries, now in connexion with one or more of said Synods, which are strictly Presbyterian in doctrine and order, *Be it further resolved*, That all said churches and ministers who wish to unite with us are hereby directed to apply for admission into those Presbyteries belonging to our connexion which are most convenient to their respective locations, and that any such Presbytery as aforesaid, being strictly Presbyterian in doctrine and order, and now in connexion with either of said Synods, as may desire to unite with us, are hereby directed

to make application, with a full statement of their cases, to the next General Assembly, which will take proper order thereon.

These various resolutions present a case of most unusual and thrilling interest. They exhibit a course of proceeding unparalleled for its firmness, decision, and efficiency, in the Churches of the United States, and rarely exceeded in the history of the Church of God. Whether it was prompted by zeal for the truth and faithfulness to God, or by a base love of power and a blind devotion to party, this and coming generations will decide according to their own views of the value of truth and purity, and the necessity of obeying Christ at all costs. But none can deny to the authors of these acts the most resolute adherence to the principles they embraced, the most admirable candor in the full and unreserved avowal before earth and heaven of those principles and the ends they aimed at by obeying them, and the most sagacious constancy in the patient and courageous following out of means calculated to attain their avowed objects.

Surely it is a remarkable sight to behold a Church, which has been for ages laboring to extend itself, suddenly stop short and so act as to deprive itself of a fourth or fifth part of its apparent strength! It requires a blind faith indeed to believe that a communion which had thrown open its doors for many years, with a confiding frankness before unknown, and allowed free entrance, nearly without question, should, *without reason*, against its whole habits of life, modes of action, and apparent interest, not only shut these doors abruptly, but, as some say, force out of doors in doing it so prodigious a portion of those claiming to be lawfully within the house. Men do not ordinarily allow their conduct to be so glaringly in contrast with their interest without some exceedingly weighty reason. And while we fully admit that reasons the most weighty are necessary to justify the conduct of the last Assembly in the matter now under review, we are convinced not only that a full justification can be made out for it, but that any less decided action would have been at once faithless, childish, and futile, under the actual circumstances of the case. We crave the reader's candid attention while we attempt the proof of this declaration.

We have published in a former number of this periodical the *Testimony and Memorial of the Convention of 1837*. There are set forth minutely and in order the errors in doctrine and the disorders in practice of which the orthodox complain. Any man who now doubts that the errors there condemned are the errors of the New School party, only thereby proves his own ignorance of passing events. New School men who deny that they hold the chief part of them, only show that they are unworthy of belief in stating a fact. They are the root of the whole trouble, not only in our Church but in all the Churches; and if men do not hold them, why do they hold so tenaciously to all who do hold them? If men do not hold them, why do they refuse to give ample satisfaction to those who at first *feared* and then were forced to *believe* they did hold them? Why do they allow the Church to be convulsed on account of non-existent figments? It is too late now to discuss this matter as a question of fact, and he who requires it gives just suspicion at once of his sincerity and soundness.

Neither shall we now attempt to prove that these errors and disorders are utterly intolerable by any Christian Church. No man who has experienced the saving grace of God, surely no man of evangelical views, and beyond dispute no sound Presbyterian, can possibly hesitate one moment on such a subject. The whole aspect of these heresies and irregularities is utterly inconsistent with the gospel of God; so clearly so that even those who have published them did in the late Assembly, when brought plumply up to assert or deny them, generally decline voting or voted against them.

The third step in the case brings up the question before us. The wide extent of these errors has nearly proved fatal to our Church. They have rent the body of Friends; they have split up the Congregational churches; they have *deluged* the Baptist Church; they have infected all bodies of professing Christians. But a few years ago excellent and wise men in our Church did indeed believe that *very few*, perhaps not above a few dozen, Presbyterian ministers actually held them. If such views were then correct, how sadly have these few dozens multiplied since? For

in 1836 the majority of the Assembly voted in substance that the chief part of these errors were solemn truths, by rejecting the resolution of Dr. Miller in regard to Mr. Barnes's Notes on the Epistle to the Romans; and Dr. Peters, Dr. Skinner, and all the leaders of the New School party in that body, are reported by their own friends, and in friendly prints, to have declared openly their adhesion to Mr. Barnes's sentiments. Nor is this all; for repeatedly in the last Assembly did the various speakers of that party assert that they had the majority of our Church, and that our majority in that Assembly was merely accidental.

Here, then, is the state of the case. Fatal errors and disorders prevail in the Church. They who hold them believe themselves to be the majority of the whole body, and need only carry out their plans for usurping power by making small Presbyteries, to give them the rule, even if they were considerably the smaller portion. These persons, by the full and unqualified admission of all interests, are too much unlike the other portion of the Church to enable them to continue a union profitable or pleasant to either side. The orthodox had proposed terms of voluntary separation which were not only just and liberal but most generous, and these were rejected after equivocation and uncandid chicanery and amid boasts of future power and majorities, sneers at our *accidental majority*, and unmeasured abuse of our leading men, our best measures, and our general policy. The Plan of Union had been abrogated, and that abrogation was pronounced to be high-handed, unconstitutional, void, and so on; and would of course be undone when these "Smithfield men," with the price of slaves in the pocket of one abolition leader, and we know not how many shaven bills in the pocket of that other leader whose taste and instinct led him to do the abuse of his party, should return to power. The plan of citation had been proposed, and was hardly passed by a small majority, under the scouts and derision of the New School party, with open assertions that it could never be executed, and should never be obeyed!

Thus stood the case. And if ever a party was shut up by the hand of God to do what his grace and providence required, we were. We remember that the Committee of Citation met on the

adjournment of the Assembly one Saturday afternoon, and after a painful session and much diversity of opinion, adjourned without seeing their way clear. The same afternoon the Committee for Voluntary Division met, and after several adjournments, finally failed of doing anything! And so we stood on reporting the issue to the Assembly. We well remember the anguish of our own spirit at this juncture, and the trembling of heart with which we looked first towards what seemed to us the impending ruin of the Church, and then humbly for the appearing of the Lord to succor us. And never shall we cease to bless the Great Shepherd of Israel for his glorious coming to our deliverance.

Our own conviction had long been that the Presbyterian Church was solemnly bound, and that all its tribunals had full power, to separate from her communion all such as having intruded into it, should be found on full consideration and in the judgment of charity, unsuitable or unworthy members. We contended in short, for *Christian discipline*; and we always considered this a complete remedy for all our troubles. In this mind the writer of this article ventured to suggest to the General Assembly that as we had failed of voluntary separation, our plain duty was to separate as many members as should be found unsound in the way of discipline; and that we should commence at once by ordering Presbyteries to try unsound members, Synods to arraign unsound Presbyteries, and for the Assembly to act at once and promptly on the Synods by citing such as it should appear necessary to cite, and separating from our communion forthwith such as the necessity and justice of the case required. Well do we remember the scowl of derision and the laugh of open scorn with which the "*Smithfield men*" received this statement. And long shall we be cheered by the lesson which the issue gave us, that an honest and manful course is not only the most creditable one to our Christian character and the most comfortable one to our consciences, but is also the only one that promises at last certain and permanent success.

There is another episode to tell. Dr. Baxter of Virginia was a member of the Citation Committee. And here we may be excused for expressing our deep sense of the obligations which

the whole Church owe to the delegates of that ancient commonwealth, both in the Convention and in the Assembly. Well and nobly have they redeemed the character of the Virginia churches. At the head of this admirable delegation was the fine old gentleman whose name I have just written. It is to him I think that the Assembly was indebted for the suggestion which led it, as by a fine but strong cord, through the mazes and contentions and pressing difficulties of the case, and brought it out clear and free from the vast incubus of a bastard Congregationalism, steeped in all the errors and disorders which had so fearfully harassed and beset us. *If, said he, the Plan of Union be unconstitutional, it was from the beginning null and void, because nothing contrary to the fundamental law, which is the Constitution, can have any legal force. But if the Plan of Union never had any legal or binding operation in the Presbyterian Church, then of course the churches formed under it, on it, or by virtue of it, never were in our connexion, and we need only pass a declarative act to that effect.*

We find ourselves, then, arrived at the two great lines of argument by which the resolutions of the Assembly, now printed, are to be defended.

I. THAT THE ASSEMBLY HAD FULL POWER TO DO WHAT IT DID IN THE CASE OF THE FOUR SYNODS IN THE WAY OF DISCIPLINE.

II. THAT IT WAS OBLIGED, BY THE VERY CONSTITUTION OF THE BODY ITSELF, TO DO WHAT IT DID, EVEN IF THE CASE HAD NOT REQUIRED DISCIPLINE AT ALL. These two propositions we shall briefly illustrate and enforce. And in order to simplify the subject we will present in two separate and successive series such arguments and considerations as appear to us perfectly conclusive of the whole subject.

The Argument from the Nature and Duty of Discipline.

I. The right of any person to be a private member, a ruling elder, or a minister in the Presbyterian Church, is by no means a perfect and absolute right. It is, on the other hand, a right qualified by many conditions, and dependent on a variety of con-

tingent facts, principles, and circumstances. So also of the right of churches to be under the watch of our Presbyteries, of the latter to be attached to Synods, and of these to be under the care of the General Assembly. The conditions laid down in our standards are in every case conditions precedent; and the moment these conditions are violated, that moment, in the eye of God, of morality, and of logic, the resulting rights are gone. Thus no man has a right, of any kind or sort, to be a Pelagian and at the same time a Presbyterian minister, nor has any association of Congregational churches any sort of right to call itself a Presbytery and claim the rights of one. As to the methods of proving and determining such questions, that is another matter, which is merely of form and detail, and will be spoken of presently; but the substance of the case is not in the form, nor in the view of reason necessarily dependent on it. Therefore the outcry of the separated Synods about violated rights is mere humbug, for the very question at issue is as to their ever having had any sort of right in the very matter in hand. Nay more, if the conditions on which the resulting rights depend be broken in fact but nominally and formally adhered to, it is a case of gross and deliberate fraud which it is impossible to conceive that a true child of God could commit. And if this fraud be perpetrated under oath, it is premeditated and wicked false swearing in the most awful matters of faith! The whole case is one over which every *pretended* Presbyterian should shudder rather than bawl in popular meetings and roar through party presses about being deprived of sacred rights vested in him by the wicked commission of deliberate wrongs!

II. If it were even admitted that the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church had provided no adequate remedy for the enforcement of commanded duties or the redress of forbidden evils, still nothing is clearer than that in such a case it would be the duty and the right of its constitutional tribunals to create the necessary forms and methods of trial, redress, or cure, as the case might be. This is a principle of universal application in every form of organised society, and is indispensable to the existence of any kind of community, because no human wisdom can foresee or provide for all possible contingencies. *Deficiente remedio justitia defecerit,*

is a maxim of the common law, and the Court of King's Bench in England, the highest source of administrative justice in that country, was always bound to fix a remedy for the enforcement of rights not otherwise sufficiently enforceable. But in our Church this principle is, from the very nature of our Church order, whose model and whole rule of action we assert to be divine, of most peculiar application. And most manifestly, in acting upon it, we should keep in view the general rules already settled; as for example, the application of a sound discipline to purify the Church of intruders being a settled principle, the use of a new remedy, if one were needful in applying such a rule, to purge the Church of forbidden heresies, is a high and most binding duty on every Church court. Therefore the cry of the excluded Synods that even if they were heretical there was no adequate remedy against an unsound Synod, and that the remedy applied was unconstitutional because unprecedented, is mere sophistic ignorance, even if the facts were all true.

III. We go still further. It is absurd to suppose that any system should provide for a case involving its own radical corruption. Every system provides for making its own parts come back into order when disordered, and no more. But if the spreading corruption of the parts has already proceeded so far that cure is no longer possible to them, then the only alternative is to stand by and see the gradual and certain ruin of the system itself, or to fall back on the perfectly clear principles stated in the first head above, and declare and enforce in an extraordinary way those truths and duties which the very existing corruptions render difficult or impossible to be defined and maintained in ordinary ways. The principles on which all constitutions rest, if true, are so before and independently of their creation or existence; and when constitutions are so perverted as to defeat in practice their own ends, then they who enforce the principles of the constitution, even in an extraordinary way, and not they who transgress both those original principles and the positive enactments which define them, are the true friends and conservators of the constitution itself. Such a state of things is extraordinary; but when it really occurs, men faithful to truth, to God, and to his Church,

will never shrink from the duties it imposes upon all who prefer self-preservation in righteousness to self-immolation for the advancement of wicked and deceitful error.

IV. The real case that did exist, bad as it was, had, however, sufficient provision made for it. For it is an undisputed and universal principle in the interpretation of all instruments, that they must be so interpreted as to be consistent with themselves, and so as not to defeat the end of their formation. This principle applied to written constitutions, necessarily gives birth to a second, which is itself of universal acceptance, namely, that where a specific power is vested, all powers necessary to enforce that are also vested; and that the right to decide when and to what extent these resulting powers arise must abide in some tribunal created by the instrument itself, if not otherwise expressly provided for. Now, no man in his senses will deny that the standards of the Presbyterian Church had a definite object in view, nor that the errors and disorders alleged, yea, and proved, to be widely disseminated in the four Synods, are totally contrary to that definite object and the whole scope of those standards. Then all powers necessary to expel these errors are by the very force of the proposition vested in the bodies directed to expel them. And as this direction is explicit in regard to every one of our tribunals, every one in its respective sphere would possess all necessary power to do the thing ordered, even in default of specific provisions. And so, as the Assembly is the only tribunal above the Synods, and therefore the only one that can act with authority over them, it follows that the Assembly has power, of whatever spiritual kind may be necessary, to preserve our doctrine and order against corrupt Synods. And in the exercise of this power the Assembly might, if necessity were laid on it, proceed to the excision of an indefinite number of Synods, for the preservation of our standards is the fundamental duty of the Assembly.

V. This is not a new case at all in this particular aspect of it, but, on the contrary, every principle of it here contended for has already and long ago been settled by the General Assembly, and acquiesced in by the whole Church. Early in this century what was called a great revival of religion occurred in portions of Ken-

tucky and Tennessee. False teachers arose, disorders followed, trouble came, and discipline supervened. The Presbytery of Cumberland, belonging to the Synod of Kentucky, became peculiarly obnoxious, and like the New School men of our days, multiplied its ministers and its heresies in equal ratio, until there was much reason to fear that its unsound and incompetent members would treat the Synod just as the Assembly has been in eminent danger of being treated. The Synod took up the case in earnest, and after such an examination of it as satisfied them, declared the Presbytery of Cumberland to be no longer in its communion. After some delay, the Assembly fully approved this act, and even thanked the Synod for its conduct. Now, let any one find any more authority in our standards for a Synod to cut off an unsound Presbytery than for the Assembly to cut off an unsound Synod and he will do a grand service to his New School brethren. Chapter XI. of our Form of Government treats of Synods, Chapter XII. of the General Assembly. Let the reader study them together, and we boldly assert there is just as much power vested by the latter for the Assembly to separate from it a heretical Synod as by the former for a Synod to separate from it an unsound Presbytery. By the one Synods are directed "*to take effectual care that the Presbyteries observe the Constitution of the Church.*" (Chap. XI., Sec. 4.) And on this, which is the largest grant of power in the Chapter, the Synod of Kentucky cut off the Presbytery of Cumberland, which would not "observe the Constitution of the Church;" and all the Church thanked the Synod for it! But by the other the Assembly is declared to possess "*the power of suppressing schismatical contentions and disputations,*" as well as that of "*attempting reformation of manners and the promotion of charity, truth, and holiness*" (Chap. XII., Sec. 5); and upon this grant alone, upon the principles of the former decision, the four contentious, disputatious, schismatical Synods, might righteously have been cut off, and thereby manners would have been and will be reformed, and charity, truth, and holiness promoted; yea, and we doubt not the parallel will be complete in the bestowal of the hearty thanks of the whole true Presbyterian Church in this as in the former case, upon wise, faithful, and consistent

men who have, humanly speaking, saved the body from destruction.

In these cases the parallel in doctrine was as complete as that of the principles involved and the conduct of the respective parties. It has fallen to our lot to know somewhat intimately the material facts and many of the principal actors in both cases, and we think ourselves permitted to devote a paragraph to show that if ever anything was fully established by human testimony, then it is certain that the doctrinal errors of the Cumberland Presbytery and the four Synods are essentially the same. Let us state the nature of the proof.

1. Joshua L. Wilson, D. D., of Ohio, and James Blythe, D. D., of Indiana, were both well acquainted with all the Cumberland controversy and all the steps through which the matter passed. They then stood firm for the truth; they have now again passed through the New School controversy. They both yet live to testify that the doctrinal errors of the two eras and parties are essentially the same. Often have we conversed with the last named of the two, and heard him say these errors of the New School are the very errors which convulsed the Church in Kentucky above thirty years ago. And to the same purport was the open and public testimony of Archibald Cameron, lately fallen asleep in Jesus, and who left behind him but few ministers equal to himself, either in learning, talents, or honesty.

2. The Rev. Robert Marshall had been carried away with the new opinions in his younger days. He was a most powerful speaker and one of the strongest men on that side. In after life he returned to a sound faith and the Presbyterian Church. We heard and saw him in the West Lexington Presbytery at Georgetown in Kentucky, about the year 1831 or 1832, take in his hand the "Faith according to Common Sense," of Frederick A. Ross of Tennessee, then recently published in the *Calvinistic Magazine*, and solemnly warn the churches against its contents and against the New Theology in general, as the very essence of the opinions by which he had fallen and from which by the grace of God he had been restored.

3. The Rev. Barton W. Stone, the founder of the sect which

is called the Christian Body or New Lights, was a Presbyterian minister, embraced the new opinions between 1800 and 1810, and from that time until now, if he still lives, actively as consistently, and we add for the benefit of *our* New Lights, *honestly* advocated them. This Christian Body in Kentucky is now united with the Campbellite Baptists, and we have known ministers of the two sects go down into the water together and alternately dip their converts. This Mr. Stone has publicly declared that many of the opinions of the New School are those for which he has all along contended; and where they differ we believe it is because his opinions are the more reasonable and philosophical of the two.

4. The present sect of Cumberland Presbyterians was formed some time after the excision of that Presbytery by three members of it, who though not perhaps cordially Presbyterians, were not New Lights in doctrine. We are not intimately acquainted with their present condition, but our impression is that it is a tolerably sound little body, which considers itself standing on the crack between Calvinism and Arminianism. And this we venture to predict will be the precise result with the better sort of half-breeds embraced in the four Synods.

5. The more rampant of the Cumberland heretics ran into Shaking Quakerism, Mr. Macnama and Mr. Dunlevy, who were both Presbyterian preachers, being amongst the founders of that fanatical society in the West. And already multitudes of New School men have become Perfectionists, and even nominal Presbyterian ministers have been found to teach a fanaticism worse than Shakerism.

VI. The only remaining question on this branch of the subject is, Did the *facts of the case* as to the real state of the region embraced in the four Synods justify the Assembly to proceed to extremities, as in a case of discipline? For ourselves we are ready to say that at the time we were called on to decide this question, we not only considered the case fully made out for decisive action, and ourselves shut up to the clear necessity of deciding as we did, but the more we reflect on the whole matter, the more firmly do we remain convinced that what was done was right, and that the

hand of God was most visibly in the whole business, and conducted us to the blessed result to which we came. Here also we will be a little specific.

1. The presumption of reason and law is that the four Synods and the churches composing them are precisely as the Plan of Union on which they are formed would make them. No man's title can be better than his patent. No man's religion is purer than his Bible. Here is the Plan on which these churches are formed; in the absence of all proof we are obliged to believe that the churches are just what they ought to be, taking the Plan as the model. If the model is perverted, so much the worse, as the inference is then still stronger against the churches. But by the model, out of every seven cases provided for, six would be directly at war with the standards of our Church, as any one may see on perusing the Plan of Union. Then, if the preservation of our standards be a good reason for the exercise of discipline, here was an imperative presumption against all these Synods.

2. This presumption of law and reason was rendered a certainty by the records of the Synods and the facts touching these records. In the first place, these records concealed material facts which they ought to have recorded, and which not having recorded, the evident fact and necessary presumption is, would have been against them if recorded. Thus in regard to the proportion of elders and of Congregational churches; in relation to cases of discipline, especially where they embraced doctrinal questions; and generally in all such matters as would, if fully recorded, exhibit the real state of the region, material parts of their records were deficient. But secondly, these records, as far as they went, showed that the Plan of Union was in full and complete operation; that persons not ordained sat in all those Synods as ruling elders; and that the order of our Church was, in many fundamental respects, violated habitually. All this was at the end of a six years' discussion of the questions at issue, and after one of the four Synods (Western Reserve) had been once called to the bar of the Assembly.

3. The *testimony* actually before the Assembly was such as to satisfy every reasonable man that this whole region was deeply

infected with all the errors and disorders which had threatened the ruin of our Church. This testimony is in great part before the public in a multitude of forms, such as books, pamphlets, periodical reviews, newspapers, and controversial tracts. Much of it has been stated from year to year for the last six years on the floor of the General Assembly by persons from the infected region and that round about. Many members personally knew a multitude of facts. Members from the region, and especially from the Western Reserve, stated, in order to defend their conduct, facts which convinced many that things were worse than could as yet be ascertained, while members from the other Synods and other members also were prevented from making more full developments by the cries and uproar for order on the part of the New School party. Many official papers, such as letters from stated clerks of Presbyteries and Synods, were before the Assembly. The past acts of the members from these Synods in the Assembly in former years confirmed all this mass of proof, and showed that really the question had finally become as stated by Dr. Peters in the Assembly of 1836, whether the orthodox should any longer be tolerated. In addition to this, many delegates from the three New York Synods, after seeing the turn matters took in relation to the Western Reserve, refused to testify at all, and remained dumb, when candor and interest both required them to speak; and this they did by concert with their party, as is since fully proved, although they have tried to make the world believe they had a desire to speak fully out and were refused opportunity. The whole case was fully before the Assembly in all its merits, and fully justified the temperate and candid statement contained in the 2nd and 3rd of the series of resolutions in relation to the three New York Synods. But if any portion of the four Synods is indeed sound, ample provision is made in the 4th resolution for its reunion with the Church. And still further, let every Presbytery, according to our Book of Discipline, go over the whole subject with its delegates and make them explain, as the case may require, either why they did or did not vote for the resolutions now under discussion. Truth and orthodoxy have everything to gain by such a course; and we apprehend there are far more who will

find it difficult to excuse themselves for not favoring than for having supported this glorious reform.

The Argument from Constitutional Power and Duty.

I. We have demonstrated in a former paper that the *Plan of Union* was utterly unconstitutional. If so, the necessary result is that it was always absolutely void and without any force whatever. For the Constitution is the fundamental law, and no subsequent resolution of an Assembly can make that inoperative by virtue of which the Assembly itself exists. But if a law be unconstitutional and void, every act performed under it is null, every interest founded on it is void, and everything issuing out of it is as completely inoperative as to any legal validity as if the law itself never had existed. When the competent authority once ascertains the unconstitutionality of the act, the same decision which settles that point draws after it all the consequences stated above. This is the long settled and undeniable law of the case, and all argument is idle on either side as to this point.

II. It is no relief to say that these Synods were formed, not in virtue of the Plan itself fairly understood, but in some other manner consequent on its perversion. Still, the case is harder, for they so perverted it, as has been already shown, as to make it more grossly unconstitutional in its *construed* than in its real character. Nor is it any mitigation to say that the Assembly itself formed the Synod without regard to the Plan. For the Assembly had no shadow of power to form any but *Presbyterian Synods*, and if it attempted to gather Congregational churches and mixed churches into a Synod, the act was as thoroughly illegal as if it had gathered Baptist and Methodist churches into one. Let the thing be done by whom it might, or upon what pretext soever, it was always a gross assumption of power never vested, and the act was utterly void.

III. Some have said that the Assembly could not declare its own past acts unconstitutional, even if they were so. But this is a mere sophism. In every written constitution there must be some tribunal to act as the conservator of the system, or force and revolution must decide everything. In the Presbyterian

Church we profess to believe that no human tribunal has any power to make any *new laws* for God's Church, but only that our tribunals may expound and declare the true intent of the divine laws already promulgated by our Lord, and enforce them by spiritual means only. In this case such a rule as the one stated above would either claim for our Church infallibility, which is Papism, or it would render it impossible for us ever to rectify anything erroneous, which is madness. But what possible difference can it make, in reason, whether there be two or three tribunals, and you call one congress and another a court, or whether you were to unite the powers of all in one and call it Assembly? The New School people may, if they choose, call our Church order *bad*; but it is rather too much to say that it is, as to many indispensable functions, a nonentity. We remember that Col. Jessup, who passes for a good lawyer, took exception to the phraseology of the resolution in the case of the Western Reserve. "*Is, and is hereby declared to be*, no longer a part of the Presbyterian Church," etc., were the words of the resolution. But, said Col. Jessup, this is a falsehood, for *it is now* a part, whatever it may be hereafter. And to our utter amazement a large part of a speech against the resolution was built on this idea, which even more than the one combated above, emasculates the Assembly, by denying it power even to state its propositions before voting on them. We say in a deed "*have bargained and sold, and do by these presents bargain, sell, and convey;*" we say in a law, "*the said act shall be, and hereby is, repealed;*" the like in every paper that was ever artificially drawn. But we apprehend that Col. Jessup takes good care not to expose himself by making such arguments either in a court of law or a legislative chamber.

IV. It is also pretended that the Assembly committed suicide by the declarative resolution against the four Synods, and thereby annihilated itself. If this were true, it is not easy to see what could make the four Synods thenceforward the true and only Presbyterian Church, as some contend, unless on the principle of *lucus a non lucendo*. But if the Assembly ruined itself, how should that impair the right of the Presbyteries to elect a new one? Suppose every member of the body had been swept off in

VOL. XXXIII.; NO. 4—12.

a night, it would only have required another delegation of members from the Presbyteries, and no man in his senses would say the *Church* was dissolved or that the Assembly had ceased to exist. How, then, shall the separation of a comparatively small part of its nominal members from it produce such mighty effects? The case is that of Æsop's fly, who got on the wheel of a coach and exclaimed in ecstasy, What a dust we raise! But if it be indeed true that the Assembly was extinct after the passage of the resolution against the Synod of the Western Reserve, then two insuperable difficulties beset the New School. First, why did they continue to sit and act till the end of the session; and why make such a fuss about the violated rights of the excluded delegates; and why did those delegates behave so outrageously in attempts to force their way into a *dead* body of mere private persons? And secondly, how can any New School Presbytery delegate members to the next Assembly which will meet under the order, by the appointment, and be constituted by commissioners *only* from those Presbyteries of which the dead one was composed after its suicide! It is a sensible maxim of our Indians, *that a man who has two tongues can only speak to one person at a time!*

V. Much commotion is threatened about suits, and notices were given to the Clerk of the Trustees of the General Assembly by the commissioners from all the separated Synods not to pay any funds on any orders from the Assembly after the passage of the resolutions affecting them. If these notices were obeyed, the effect would be only to rob some scores of laborious missionaries of bread, turn some dozens of pious beneficiaries out of our theological seminaries, and reduce our venerable professors to want; and all this by the act of persons and churches who never paid a farthing in the dollar of the funds now claimed, and who have set themselves up, by way of example to all men, as the most active and benevolent of Christians. We say nothing of the spirit of litigiousness thus manifested, for the same sort of people have always shown the very same temper. But what seems to us remarkable is that they should have at once so little delicacy and so much love of money. The orthodox offered the New School *half* the funds of the Church, as far as they had power to give them,

though both parties knew they were on no ground whatever entitled to a tenth. Nay, say the four Synods, we alone, though only a part of a part, and that the part that gave little, must have all!! Well, gentlemen, if you get it, what then? We will tell you what. As to yourselves, it will do you no good, for the curse of fraud, dishonor, and broken vows will be on it. As to us, it will do us no harm, for our churches would, any time these seven years, have given twice as much to be purged of the leaven of your doctrines. But the truth is, that this threat is all an afterthought; it is ridiculous in itself; it will never be carried into execution; and if it should be, will only seal the ruin of the party who, under such circumstances, should make the attempt. Sue indeed! Sue whom? And for what? Shall a man sue a church Session who will not let him come illegally and stay improperly in the communion of a church? Shall a man sue a minister because he objects to his pew, which he rented under pretence of worshipping God, being converted into a cake shop on Sunday? It is all sheer nonsense. There is, we venture to say, nothing to sue about, nobody to sue, no tribunal in which any action can be maintained, nor a party on earth to maintain the suit. Still further, we assert that if these things were otherwise, there can be no question that the particular act of the Assembly now under discussion would be sustained whenever and by whomsoever fairly tested.

We have protracted this discussion to so considerable a length that we omit much that we had intended to say, and close the article with a single reflection, which seems to us very important. No one can now entertain the least hope of any future union of the two parties in the Presbyterian Church. If the next Assembly were to undo all the important acts of the last, and amongst other things restore the four separated Synods, no one can doubt but that a violent rupture of the Church would immediately ensue. What, then, is to be gained by such an issue? Or why should men, pretending to the least particle of orthodoxy, countenance operations which must end in their own defeat or in the ruin of the cause they profess to love? For ourselves, we consider the time for parley as well as that for neutrality entirely passed;

and we are fully convinced that every man who will not cordially sustain the acts of the last Assembly ought to be considered an enemy to the Presbyterian Church and a New School man in disguise. A little firmness will now put this hated controversy at rest, during this generation at least; and therefore all who love God in our Church should put themselves at once in the forefront of a contest which cannot be lost without deep injury and lasting dishonor, and which may be won by one vigorous and well concerted effort. Blessed be God, we hope in the future with the same confidence that we rejoice in the past.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Cremer's *Lexicon*¹ is not an ordinary dictionary. Only a limited number of words are discussed, but these are discussed with an exhaustive thoroughness. The method is at once linguistic and historical. The particular word is traced through all the stages of its progress, and exhibited in all the successive phases of its shifting meaning. Another marked feature, and one which is somewhat peculiar to this *Lexicon*, is that the end had in view in all this elaborate research is not so much philological as theological and ethical. The views inculcated are, we think, for the most part sound. Gebhardt's *Greek Testament*² is the most convenient embodiment of the latest critical text in its three principal forms. The type is good, but the press work might be improved in some respects. We could wish that Lachmann's reading had been also given, but that would have made the book, already awkward in its shape, quite ungainly, or else would have increased its size unduly.

Dr. Upham's book on the origin of the Gospels³ is said to be a capital one. This we cannot endorse as from our own knowledge, but we know nothing to the contrary, and such is the judgment of wise and pious men. The number of brand-new commentaries is almost enough to take away the breath of an old-fashioned,

¹Biblico-Theological *Lexicon* of New Testament Greek. By Professor Hermann Cremer, of Greifswald. Translated from the German of the second edition, with additional matter and corrections by the author. By William Urwick, M. A. Express charges must be added to the price, \$6.50. Quarto. A. D. F. Randolph & Co., New York.

²*Novum Testamentum Graecae: recensio[n]is Tischendorfianae ultimae textum cum Tregellesiano et Westcottio-Hortiano contulit, etc.* Oscar de Gebhardt. *Editio stereotypa*. 8vo, pp. xii., 492. Ex officina Bernardi Tauchnitz, Lipsiae, 1881. B. Westermann & Co., New York.

³*Thoughts on the Holy Gospels; How they came to be in manner and form as they are.* By Francis W. Upham, LL.D. 12mo, 378 pages, \$1.25. Phillips & Hunt, New York.

slow-paced reader. The one now claiming our notice¹ is regarded by at least one intelligent minister as a valuable aid to the preacher, and we do not doubt it. We distrust, however, all these modern recipes for the old course of labor; and believe that the best commentary for the scholar is also the best commentary for the preacher. There are better guides, too, in exegesis than either Farrar or Tulloch. Delitzsch is a celebrated German scholar and commentator of the evangelical but *new* Lutheran school. This able and impressive writer is in his chosen field, and puts out his greatest strength when engaged on the topic which is the theme of the present volume.²

Dr. Monro Gibson's return to the old country, which was formerly (as it is now) his home, does not seem to have checked his literary activity. "The Ages before Moses" is likely, from the subject as well as the freshness of treatment, to remain his most popular book. "The Mosaic Era"³ may, however, be strongly commended. Professor Redford of London has made a useful and striking addition,⁴ it seems, to the already voluminous mass of contemporary apologetics. We have an almost extravagant liking for "the Angelical Doctor,"⁵ who may well be styled the Aristotle of the Middle Ages. He resembles the Stagyrite, too,

¹The Pulpit Commentary. Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M. A., and the Rev. Joseph S. Exell, editor of *The Homiletic Quarterly*. With Introductions by Canon Farrar, the Right Rev. Bishop of Edinburgh, Principal Tulloch, and Professor A. Plummer, M. A., and Homilies and Expositions by upwards of seventy contributors. A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

²Old Testament History of Redemption. Lectures by Franz Delitzsch. Translated from manuscript notes by Samuel Ives Curtiss, Professor in Chicago Seminary. Edinburgh. 16mo, pp. 213. 1881.

³The Mosaic Era: A Series of Lectures on Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. By John Monro Gibson, M. A., D. D. A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

⁴The Christian's Plea against Modern Unbelief: A Handbook of Christian Evidence. By R. A. Redford, M. A., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics, New College, London. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 27 Paternoster Row. 1881.

⁵Divi Thomæ Aquinatis Excerpta Philosophica. P. Carbonel. 3 vol. Svo, 21 fr. Seguin Frères, Avignon.

(and Bacon) in this, that you find in his writings (notably the "Summa") the germs of important theories and systems of later days. I may instance Malebranche's Philosophy. Dr. Dühring of Leipzig¹ is the author of the "Philosophy of Reality." To all intents and purposes he is an atheist, being of the school of Feuerbach. He is very much of a pessimist, too, though not after the fashion of Hartmann and Schopenhauer. He is blind, or nearly so, and soured against the whole world. This is his farewell. Canon Westcott has surpassed even himself in his pre-eminently charming and edifying work entitled "The Revelation of the Risen Lord."² With sundry differences, he and Bishop Lightfoot agree in this (as in some other things) that they unite great modesty and temperate statement with vast stores of reading, exquisite scholarship, cogent reasoning, apologetic acuteness, and a sound and wholesome type of Church of England piety. Dr. Patterson's book is a feast of good things, but one or two of the dishes will hardly prove easy of digestion.³ The Right Reverend Dr. Williams has made the Christian community his debtor by this fine treatise on the World's Witness.⁴

We think we have said before that Pastor Bersier is the most distinguished (and perhaps the most eloquent) preacher that Protestant France can point to and claim as its own since Adolphe Monod. His special training for his work was of a varied sort that singularly fitted him for his present duties and that lends an unexpected interest to the story of his life. These and the other sermons of M. Bersier⁵ are, speaking generally, models of excel-

¹Sache, Leben, und Feinde. Von Dr. E. Dühring. Leipzig. 1882. Pp. 434.

²The Revelation of the Risen Lord. By Brooke Foss Westcott, D. D. London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 12mo, pp. 199.

³Visions of Heaven. For the Life 'on Earth. By Robert M. Patterson. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 1,334 Chestnut St.

⁴The World's Witness to Jesus Christ. The Bedell Lecture for 1881. By the Right Rev. John Williams, D. D., Bishop of Connecticut. Square 12mo, pp. 79. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1882.

⁵St. Paul's Vision, and other Sermons. By the Rev. Eugene Bersier, Pastor of l'Eglise de l'Etoile, Paris. Translated by Marie Stewart. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 1882.

lence. The last remark may be repeated of the sermons of a gifted Scotchman who preaches in London, and whose volume is the next on our catalogue.¹ One ought, however, to hear them to rate them as they deserve. Professor Hoppin showed us of what stuff he is made in his book on "The Cathedral Towns of England." He is now somewhat unfortunate in having to follow Professor Phelps on the subject of sacred rhetoric.² The Yale Professor has brought out a work of great erudition and very considerable value. "Men and Books"³ is a sort of aftermath of Dr. Phelps's more systematic treatise on Homiletics, or perhaps (as the title would seem to import) should come *first* and be regarded as a preliminary and very partial, as well as somewhat hap-hazard, cutting of the golden grain fully harvested by the other and more comprehensive work. Being more free and easy in its method, this, of the two books, is the one that is suited to the tastes of the general reader.

Professor Bowne's work on "Metaphysics"⁴ is one of great individuality and ability, though far from uninfluenced by particular currents of thinking in Germany and England. His desire and aim is to establish ontology and theism on a sure basis, but at the sacrifice of all substances (and even all entities) except those of the spiritual and personal Creator and the created personal spirits. Naturally Realism (to use Sir Wm. Hamilton's phrase) is, we need hardly go on to say, the only rational scheme that is in full accord with the common sense of the race.⁵ Schopenhauer may have been not far wrong when he said that Emanuel Kant

¹Sermons. By J. Oswald Dykes, M. A., D. D. New York: Carter & Brothers.

²Homiletics. By James M. Hoppin, Professor in Yale College. Dodd, Mead & Co.

³Men and Books; or Studies in Homiletics. Lectures Introductory to the theory of Preaching. By Austin Phelps, D. D., late Bartlett Professor of Sacred Rhetoric in Andover Theological Seminary. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1882.

⁴Metaphysics. A Study in First Principles. By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University. Pp. 534. Harper & Bros., New York. 1882.

⁵Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. By G. S. Morris, Ph.-D. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1882.

had the best head that was ever set on human shoulders. There is something very interesting in what is denominated "the Kant Revival."¹²³⁴ The only life that Hegelianism now has is on the banks of the Mississippi. Since "The Secret of Hegel" was told on the shores of England, probably the most authoritative expounder of the system is Professor Harris. In Germany, under the guidance of such diverse and mutually repugnant teachings as those of Trendelenburg, Schopenhauer, and Lotze, the march of thought has latterly been away from Hegel and all his disciples and interpreters, away from Schelling, away from Fichte, and "back to Kant." Madame de Stael (in her *L'Allemande*) says, with rare insight and cleverness, that Kant, in his speculative *Kritik*, though he often "darkens counsel," commonly obscures what is plain and illuminates what is difficult. She compares him to the column which journeyed before the camp of Israel, and which was a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. Kant is nevertheless Cimmerian darkness from beginning to end, without an interpreter; and every one of the books recently offered to English and American readers, and professing to expound Kant, has its merits. Not a single one of these books, indeed, meets the demand adequately, and no single book can. Mr. Andrew Seth's "From Kant to Hegel" is pronounced a masterly little treatise. The two poles are Kant and Hume, and yet there is "an indifference-point" between them where both are sceptical. Kant's scepticism is, however, purely speculative, not "practical," and was to a great extent due to the looseness of his statement rather than the expression of a conscious theory. Kant's scepti-

¹Kant. By William Wallace. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1882.

²Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. Translated by F. Max Müller. With an Historical Introduction by Ludwig Noire. 2 vols., 8vo (uniform with above), \$9. Macmillan & Co., London and New York.

³The Life of Immanuel Kant. By J. H. W. Stuckenburg, D. D., late Professor in Wittenberg College, Ohio. 1 vol., 8vo, with portrait, \$4. *Ibid.*

⁴From Kant to Hegel. With Chapters on the Philosophy of Religion. By Andrew Seth, M. A., Assistant to the Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. London: Williams & Norgate. 1882. Pp. 170.

cism was afterwards corrected in Scotland and is no longer very dangerous. Kant's analysis of the categories of thought, and his overthrow of Hume (and thus, unavoidably, of the whole fabric of agnostic empiricism) will stand the test of time. On the whole, the tendency to revert from the crazy idealists of the past and the dogmatic materialists of the present back to the crabbed old critic of Königsberg, we regard as not altogether a bad one.

Mr. Hawley writes forcibly, and thinks he has himself discovered a new law in political economy.¹ Mr. Jevons's recent death by a lamented accident doubles the interest of his last work² on a kindred subject, of which he was an acknowledged master. Professor Skeat³ and Edouard Müller are the two acknowledged masters of English etymology so far as it has its roots in the so-called Anglo-Saxon. The Dictionary of Professor Skeat, of the University of Cambridge, is we believe, without a successful rival in English. It is the unabridged work that is here offered, which is, of course, the most extended, and in that sense the most complete. The same work, skilfully condensed, with the author's latest improvements, and published by the Harpers, is, however, not only the most compact and convenient form in which the book is presented, but also the one best adapted, we should imagine, to the wants of the ordinary reader. Bosworth's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary⁴ has been for many years a recognised authority. Professor Toller, of Manchester, has no doubt in this edition given it the benefit of all the new lights. Gustave Masson's adaptation

¹Capital and Population: A Study of the Economic Effects of their Relation to each other. By Frederick B. Hawley. D. Appleton & Co. 1882. 8vo, pp. 267.

²The State in Relation to Labor. By W. Stanley Jevons, LL.D., F. R. S., author of the "Principles of Science," etc. 12mo, \$1. *Ibid.*

³Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. By the Rev. Walter W. Skeat, M. A., Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Cambridge. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan & Co.

⁴An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. Based on the Manuscript Collections of the late Joseph Bosworth, D. D., F. R. S., Rawlinsonian Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford. Edited and enlarged by T. Northcote Toller, M. A., Smith Professor of English in the Owens College, Manchester. Parts I. and II. now ready. 4to, paper, each \$3.75, *Ibid.*

of Elwall's French Dictionary¹ is at once compendious, and, so far as the limits would admit, copious.

In order to frame an opinion of Professor James A. Harrison's new book on French Syntax² in advance of reading it, one has only to heed the high encomiums of such scholars as Professor Whitney, Professor Price, and Professor Schel  de Vere. Professor Whitney does not hesitate to say that nothing equal to it in the same line has yet appeared in this country. It is gratifying to note the frank acknowledgment of so great an expert that *all* the learning and scholarship of this broad land are not confined to the region lying about Boston Common. Professor Harrison's European education, extensive travels, and exceptional mastery of several of the Romance and Teutonic languages, together with his astonishing facility in acquiring any spoken tongue, and his correct literary taste and practised literary aptitude, have given him rare advantages as a teacher of certain of the living dialects. Mr. Hodgson, of Edinburgh, had the same name with the learned founder of the public library in Savannah, who was also an accomplished linguist. The Scotch Professor's new work, on Errors in our English,³ has received discriminating praise from a high source. So has Mr. Halsey's classic "Etymology."⁴ As to the "Future of Islam,"⁵ Mr. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt sees everything *couleur de rose*. We dare say that the usual amount of exaggeration is to be allowed for in the almost uniformly bad accounts

¹A Compendious Dictionary of the French Language. French-English; English-French. Adapted from the Dictionaries of Professor Alfred Elwall. Followed by a list of the principal diverging derivations, and preceded by Chronological and Historical Tables. By Gustave Masson. New and cheaper edition. 1 vol., 12mo, strongly bound in cloth, \$1. *Ibid.*

²French Syntax, on the Basis of Edouard M tzn r. By Professor Jas. A. Harrison. 12mo, cloth, \$2.50. John E. Potter & Co., Philadelphia.

³Errors in the Use of English. By the late Wm. B. Hodgson, LL.D., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh. 12mo, cloth, \$1.50. D. Appleton & Co., New York.

⁴An Etymology of Greek and Latin. By S. C. Halsey. Boston: Ginn & Heath. 1882.

⁵The Future of Islam. By Wilfrid Scawen Blunt. London: Kegan Paul, French & Co. 1882.

that come to us from historians and travellers of the Moslem world. The denial *in toto* of the truth of these representations would be a sure mark of ignorance or "enthusiasm." Mr. Blunt is neither a fool nor a fanatic, but he is in a manner *color-blind*, and is too much disposed to "prophesy smooth things" of a system that is fated to experience the roughest fortunes.

Herr Ruge's recapitulation of the events of our own time¹ is a satisfactory statement of his own peculiar, revolutionary, Pantheistic views. His philosophy of history is a curious relic of German Hegelianism in its later form. He is very coarse and rampant in his infidelity. His Chronicle will pass muster fairly well on some accounts, and shows the research without which few German authors have the audacity to go to press. As Mr. Lecky proceeds in his entertaining history of the last century² it becomes more and more evident that his special gifts are those of the pamphleteer and review-writer rather than those of the historian. He excels in the parts, but is deficient in his treatment of the whole. This work is far less objectionable and far more lively, though, it may be, less able than the author's "History of Rationalism." The influence of America on France³ just before the French Revolution was too marked and obvious to have escaped the attention of previous writers. It is the merit of Mr. Lewis Rosenthal to have shown that that influence was greater even than was supposed. It is still open to question, perhaps, whether the direct effect of the triumph of the united colonies over Great Britain was not more potent than that of any man or men in Paris. The influence of Jefferson, however, and above all that of Franklin, was extraordinary. Jefferson, by-the-bye, gave a capital reply when asked if he had not come to "replace" Franklin.

¹Geschichte unsrer Zeit, von den Freiheitskriegen bis zum Ausbruche des deutsch-franzoesischen Krieges. Von Arnold Ruge. Leipzig and Heidelberg.

²A History of England in the Eighteenth Century. By William Edward Hartpole Lecky. Vols. III. and IV. London: Longmans; New York: Appletons. 1882.

³America and France: The Influence of the United States on France in the Eighteenth Century. By Lewis Rosenthal. Henry Holt & Co. 12mo.

"No," said he, "to *succeed* him: no man can *replace* Franklin." The Red King was one of the worst of men, but had a few good points, and certainly has the merit of having made history. Unquestionably he has made the history contained in these two octavo volumes¹ of Mr. Freeman. Mrs. Oliphant is a captivating writer. It would hardly be the thing to say that she writes too much; it is true, however, that she has not increased the general stock of knowledge much by her recent chronicle of English letters.² Prescott's Philip II.³ has long been a classic history, and a justly admired one at that. Personally we relish Motley's impetuous advocacy more than we do Prescott's judicial indifference. Prescott, too, affects an impartiality between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, that is unnatural and impossible. The measured tone of the book, nevertheless, gives it a certain weight which a book written in a heated style cannot possess. Prescott's later works derive a special and affecting interest from his heroic blindness. Prescott's edition of Robertson's Charles V., in the same series, with the large additions by the editor,⁴ is the best edition of that work for historical purposes. Mr. David A. Wells is one of the most noted and competent writers on economical subjects. Who but he should tell us all about our merchant marine?⁵ The reminiscences of a great criminal lawyer are sure to be worth reading. This is undoubtedly true of the "Experiences"⁶ of Mr. Serjeant Ballantyne. The adroitness of some of his methods at

¹The Reign of William Rufus and the Accession of Henry the First. By Edward A. Freeman. 2 vols. octavo, pp. 624 and 732. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1882.

²The Literary History of England. By Mrs. Oliphant. 3 vols., 12mo, cloth, \$3. Macmillan.

³The Reign of Philip II. 3 vols. Prescott's Works, new popular edition. Printed from plates of the new revised edition, with the author's latest corrections and additions. Edited by J. Foster Kirk. Cloth, \$1.50 each. Lippincott.

⁴The Reign of Charles V. 3 vols. Prescott's Works, new popular edition. Edited by J. Foster Kirk. Cloth, \$1.50 each. *Ibid.*

⁵Our Merchant Marine. By David A. Wells. 16mo, cloth, 225 pp., \$1. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

⁶Some Experiences of a Barrister's Life. By Mr. Serjeant Ballantyne. Henry Holt & Co. 1882.

the trial-table was especially remarkable. Mr. Fuller's "Résumé"¹ of certain French cases seems to be a mere compilation, but is also by a professional lawyer. Since Mr. Emerson's death Emerson and Carlyle are all the rage.² Carlyle's Irish jaunt may be compared with Johnson's journey to the Hebrides.

Great men may be ever so much spoken about and written about, but as in the case of great natural objects there is always something more to set down. Mr. Ward tells us little that is new about Dickens, but has made a readable book³ that is perhaps worthy of a place on the miscellaneous shelf of the library. If Mr. G. Washington Moon is as remorseless in his treatment of the Revisers' as he was of "*The Dean's English*,"⁴ we pity the men of Canterbury. Yet Mr Moon does not leave them without a court of appeal. We were much struck with Dr. Hugh Blair Grigsby's remark once in conversation that Dean Alford in "*The Queen's English*" wrote as a classic scholar, Mr. Moon in his terrible rejoinder as a merely English scholar. It is not to be denied, however, that the Dean's English was sometimes very slovenly, and that the Revisers' English is too often painfully bald and awkwardly literal. General di Cesnola's Museum is chiefly valued because of its incomparable Cypriote collection.⁵ "*Waterton's Travels*"⁶ (as they used to be called), which were laughed into notice by Sidney Smith, are again placed before us, this time under so grave a *chaperon* as Mr. J. G. Wood, the Biblical naturalist.

¹Impostors and Adventurers. A Résumé of Important French Trials. By Horace W. Fuller, of the Boston Bar. Cloth or cartridge paper, \$1 net. Soule & Bugbee, Boston.

²Reminiscences of My Irish Journey. By Thomas Carlyle. 16mo, cloth, \$1; 4to, paper, 10c. Harper & Brothers, New York.

³Dickens. By A. W. Ward. (English Men of Letters Series.) 12mo, cloth, 75c. *Ibid.*

⁴The Revisers' English. By G. Washington Moon. 12mo, cloth, 75c.; paper, 20c. Funk & Wagnalls, New York.

⁵The Metropolitan Museum of Art: An illustrated folio containing Views of the Interior and Numerous Groups of Objects. Edited by General L. P. di Cesnola. Illustrated by George Gibson. Imperial, 4to, 50c. Appleton.

⁶Waterton's Wanderings in South America, the Northwest of the United States, and the Antilles. New edition. Edited by the Rev. J. G. Wood. 4to, paper, illustrated, 20c. Macmillan.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW

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

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

☞ All business communications should be addressed to the Proprietor, JAMES WOODROW, Columbia, S. C. No subscription discontinued until a special order is given, and all arrearages are paid, or after the first number of volume is published.

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

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

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

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

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