

**THE SOUTHERN**  
**PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,**

**CONDUCTED BY**

**AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS**

---

**VOLUME XXXV.**

---

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

**1884.**

WISCONSIN  
JANUARY  
1902

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Alphabetical Index to the Titles of Articles in the Southern Presbyterian Review, Vols. I.-XXXIV. By the Rev. James L. Martin, . . . . .	1
Presbyterian Polity and Foreign Missions. By the Rev. J. Leighton Wilson, D. D. . . . .	59
The Presbyterian Cultus, . . . . .	78
The Supremacy of the Ancient Classics. By the Rev. R. C. Reed, . . . . .	97
Christ's Testimony to the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch. Inaugural Address of Professor Charles R. Hemphill, . . . . .	120
Church and State in their Reciprocal Relations and Fundamental Contrast. Inaugural Address of Prof. Wm. E. Boggs, D. D., . . . . .	137
A Brief in the Case of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. By the Rev. Prof. L. G. Barbour, D. D., . . . . .	191
The Sabbath. By the Rev. K. M. McIntyre, . . . . .	215
A Plea for Emphasising the Divine Right of Presbytery. By the Rev. John W. Primrose, . . . . .	231
Caleb, a Bible Study. By Prof. J. T. L. Preston, LL. D., . . . . .	251
Hebrews vi. 1-8, Explained. By the Rev. Samuel T. Lowrie, D. D., . . . . .	265
The Final Perseverance of the Saints <i>versus</i> Carnal Security. By the Rev. James L. Martin, . . . . .	290
Marriage Between Near of Kin. By the Rev. C. W. Humphries, . . . . .	315
Evolution. By the Rev. Prof. James Woodrow, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D., . . . . .	341
The Emotions. By the Rev. Prof. Robert L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., . . . . .	369
The Church One, the Word One, and the Covenant with Abraham Stands. By the Rev. John B. Adger, D. D., . . . . .	401
A Word for the Classics. By Wm. H. Whiting, Jr., . . . . .	415
"Evolutionary Ethics and Christianity." By the Rev. P. P. Flournoy, . . . . .	436
The Christian Pastor, one of Christ's Ascension Gifts. By the late Rev. Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge, . . . . .	449
The Evangelist in Foreign Fields. By the Rev. C. R. Vaughn, D. D., and Col. J. T. L. Preston, . . . . .	500
The Chief Glory of the Nineteenth Century. By the Rev. John B. Adger, D. D., . . . . .	521
The Scriptural Doctrine of Order. By the Rev. James A. Waddell, . . . . .	551
Doctrine of Original Sin. By the Rev. Prof. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., . . . . .	583

#### IV.

Supernatural Revelation. By the Rev. J. William Flinn,	611
The Evangelist and Dr. Wilson's Amendment. By the Rev. Jas. L. Martin,	633
Scotland in the Eighteenth Century. From the <i>Scottish Review</i> ,	660
"The New Testament Plan of Educating Candidates for the Chris- tian Ministry" Re-examined. By the Rev. D. C. Irwin,	695
Some Recent Apocryphal Gospels. By the Rev. Prof. Benjamin B. Warfield, D. D.,	711
An Exposition of Romans vi. 4. By the Rev. Groves H. Cartledge,	759
The Coming of the Lord. By the Rev. John C. Rankin,	771
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	181, 571



145.1 \ 4  
1308

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXXIV.

## ALPHABETICAL INDEX TO THE TITLES OF ARTICLES IN THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, VOLS. I-XXXIV.

### A.

	VOL.	PAGE.
Action and Reaction of Mind and Body, as affecting Insanity. J. McF. Gaston, M. D.,	7.	185
Address of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States to all the Churches, etc. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., LL.D.,	14.	531
Adoption, The Grace of. Rev. T. H. Law,	30.	275
Advent, Scriptural Doctrine of the Second. T. Smyth, D. D.,	17.	509
Africa, Favorable Indications for the Introduction and Spread of Christianity in. Rev. J. Leighton Wilson,	2.	222
Africa, Geographical Discoveries in Equatorial. J. Leighton Wilson, D. D.,	29.	220
Africa, The Modern Condition of Western. Rev. J. Leighton Wilson,	Vol. 1, No. 4.	79
Aggressiveness of Presbyterianism, Inquiry into,	33.	647
“ “ “	34.	196
Agnosticism. H. C. Alexander, D. D.,	32.	399
Alexander, Joseph Addison, Life of. J. R. Wilson, D. D.,	21.	389
Alexander von Humboldt. Prof. C. S. Venable,	11.	153
Ambition Rebuked. John C. Young, D. D.,	8.	580

- Amended Form of Government. Rev. J. A. Smylie, 20. 477
- American Board and the Choctaw Mission. J. B. Adger, D. D.,  
12. 736
- Amusements, Plea for. Col. W. F. Hutson, 2. 550
- Antiquities, Smith's Christian. Dr. E. T. Baird, 32. 423
- Apocalyptic Beasts, The Four. A. W. Pitzer, D. D., 30. 288
- Apocryphal New Testament. Rev. E. O. Frierson, 23. 214
- Apostolical Succession. T. E. Peck, D. D., 23. 353
- Archæology, Failures and Fallacies of Prehistoric. Rev. J. A.  
Waddell, 29. 672
- Archibald Alexander, D. D., Life of. S. K. Talmage, D. D.,  
8. 283
- Arminianism, Restrictive of Divine Free Agency. Rev. S. J.  
Cassells, 5. 366
- Art of Conversation. B. M. Palmer, D. D., 14. 550
- Asceticism. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq., 22. 33; 31. 470
- Asia and Buddhism, Light of. Prof. J. T. L. Preston,  
LL. D., 34. 745
- Assembly, General, of 1847. J. H. Thornwell (see General  
Assembly), Vol. 1, No. 2. 78
- Assembly of 1879, Action of, on Worldly Amusements. T. E.  
Peck, D. D., 31. 218
- Assurance, Witness of the Spirit, and Call to the Ministry.  
Thos. Smyth, D. D., 2. 99
- Assyria, Origin of the Name. Rev. E. F. Rockwell, 3. 630
- A Step in Advance. Dr. J. H. Bocock, 28. 492
- Astronomical Argument against Christianity. Rev. T. A.  
Hoyt, 11. 513
- Atonement, Nature of, why Necessarily Vicarious. W. L. Scott,  
Esq., 21. 381
- Attic Tragedy, Technical Development of. Prof. A. Sachtleben,  
19. 357
- Attitude of the Ancient Mind with respect to Truth, 19. 502
- Authorship at the South. Dr. Bocock, 20. 235
- " Influence of Magazines and Reviews upon. Prof.  
W. J. Rivers, 20. 221
- Autobiography. Rev. T. B. Balch, 21. 541
- Awakening, Religious, of 1858. Rev. J. O. Lindsay, 11. 246

## B.

- Baconianism and the Bible. Rev. B. M. Palmer, 6. 226  
 Baird's Elohim Revealed. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., 13. 159  
 Baltimore Conference, 26. 283  
 Bannerman's Church of Christ. John B. Adger, D. D., 20. 520  
 Baptism by Immersion, Does Christ Require? Rev. Joseph Brown, 16. 55  
 Baptism, Infant. Rev. J. G. Shepperson, 7. 209  
     "        "        the Waldenses, etc. J. L. Kirkpatrick, D. D., 14. 399  
     "        is it Immersion? 20. 329  
     "        is it Invariably Immersion? 20. 1  
     "        of Servants. Dr. George Howe Vol. 1, No. 1. 63  
     "        Symbolical Import. Rev. James Stacy, 12. 663  
     "        Benefit of Infant. C. A. Stillman, D. D., 17. 149  
     "        History of. S. J. Baird, D. D., 21. 303  
     "        Validity of Popish. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., 5. 12, 177, 321  
 Baptized Children, Relation to the Church. A. W. Miller, D. D., 11. 1; 18. 46  
     "        The Living, for the Dead. Rev. J. H. Fowles, 8. 181  
     "        Why was Jesus? Rev. H. H. Hawes, 33. 369  
 Baur Ferdinand Christian, 26. 376  
 Bdellium of the Bible. Rev. E. F. Rockwell, 2. 94  
 Beautiful, The. Rev. J. P. M. Otts, 17. 31  
 Benediction, The, not a Mere Form. Rev. W. H. Adams, 25. 70  
 Benevolence, Our Schemes of, Shall they be Revolutionised? J. Leighton Wilson, D. D., 32. 248.  
 Berkeley and the Philosophy of Idealism. Rev. W. S. Bean, 29. 656  
 Bertrand Du Guesclin, Life and Times of. Rev. A. F. Dickson, 16. 376  
 Bible Society, American, May, 1849. Rev. A. B. Van Zandt, 4. 52  
     "        The. Prof. D. H. Hill, 7. 374  
     "        The, a Divine Revelation. J. A. Quarles, D. D., 34. 30

Bible, Poetical Element of the. Rev. Joseph M. Atkinson,	8.	91
“ Professional Study of,	27.	353
Black Population, Religious Instruction of. Rev. J. B. Adger,	Vol. 1, No. 3.	89
Bledsoe, Philosophy of Dr. R. L. Dabney, D. D.,	27.	631
Bledsoe's Philosophy of Volition. R. L. Dabney, D. D.,	28.	448, 629
“ Theodicy. Rev. John H. Boccock,	8.	516
Book of Discipline, Changes Proposed. R. L. Dabney, D. D.,	12.	36
Breckinridge's Knowledge of God (Subjective). J. H. Thorn-		
well, D. D., LL. D.,	12.	604
Breckinridge's Theology. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., LL. D.,	10.	593
Brethren of our Lord. B. M. Smith, D. D., LL. D.,	30.	437
Broad Churchism,	28.	245
Brother in Black, Our. Rev. D. C. Rankin,	33.	114
Buckle's History of Civilisation, S. J. Barnett, Esq.,	17.	1, 178
Bunsen on the Bible. Geo. Howe, D. D.,	14.	96
Burden of Egypt. J. Wood Davidson, Esq.,	11.	91

## C.

Cain: A Speculation. John W. Pratt, D. D.,	29.	475
Call to the Ministry—its Nature and Evidence. Thomas		
Smyth, D. D.,	2.	157
Call to the Gospel Ministry, What is?	20.	508
“ “ “ “ “ Rev. J. A. Quarles,	21.	338
“ “ “ “ “ A. A. Porter, D. D.,	23.	64
“ “ “ “ “ Some Remarks on the Ques-		
tion of a. John B. Adger, D. D.,	23.	287
Call to the Gospel Ministry. A. A. Porter, D. D.,	24.	90
A few Observations on the Foregoing Article. John B. Adger,		
D. D.,	24.	136
Call to the Ministry. John B. Adger, D. D.,	33.	725

Calvin and Calvinism.	Rev. William Graham,	26.	42
Calvin and Servetus.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	30.	485
Calvin Defended against Drs. Cunningham and Hodge.	Dr. J. B. Adger,	27.	133
Campbell, Alexander, System Examined.	R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.,	31.	375
Canonicity and Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures.	Rev. B. Gildersleeve,	19.	370
Capital and Labor.	G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	28.	722 ; 30. 378
Capital Punishment, Divine Appointment and Obligation of.	Dr. Smyth,	Vol. 1, No. 3.	1
Carstares, William.	Alexander Falconer, Esq.,	26.	547
Cause, First and Final.	Rev. J. A. Quarles,	25.	86
Century of a Presbytery.	Prof. J. T. L. Preston, LL.D.,	32.	665
Chalmers, The late Dr., and the Lessons from his Life, etc.	Dr. Smyth,	Vol. 1, No. 3.	56
Cherubim, What were the?	Rev. R. K. Moseley,	33.	702
Chivalry and Civilisation.	Rev. J. P. Tusten,	5.	207
Christ and the State.	A. W. Miller, D. D.,	21.	233
Christ, Second Coming of.	Rev. E. C. Gordon,	31.	269
“ Life of.	G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	22.	282
“ The, of John.	L. G. Barbour, D. D.,	33.	439
Christianity, a Disciplinary Element in Education.	Rev. J. A. Lyon,	11.	470
Christianity and Greek Philosophy.	Judge Wm. Archer Cocke,	23.	188
Christianity, Liberal.	Rev. E. P. Rogers,	2.	75
Christianity Vindicated from the Charge of Fanaticism.	Rev. B. M. Palmer,	4.	198
Christian Life,		28.	712
Chronology, Ancient and Scripture,		4.	397
Church and Politics.	B. T. W.,	18.	246, 371
“ “ State.	Rev. B. M. Palmer,	3.	210, 573
“ “ “	Rev. T. E. Peck,	16.	121
“ “ Temperance.	Rev. R. C. Reed,	32.	45
“ Presbyterian Clergyman Looking for the.	E. T. Baird, D. D.	26.	674

Church Courts, Deliverances of.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	31.	535
“ Government, Principles of.	Rev. J. B. Hillhouse,		
		14.	431
“ its Relations to Civil Authority.	Rev. James A. Wad-		
dell,		20.	25
Church, Northern and Southern Views of the Province of.	J.		
B. Adger, D. D.,		16.	384
Church Order, Book of,		29.	125
“ Our, its Conditions, Wants, and Prospects,		22.	125
“ “ not Sufficiently Evangelistic. Why?		27.	718
“ Policy, Our, and Dr. Thornwell.	J. A. Quarles, D. D.		
		33.	531
“ “ “ shall it be Progress or Petrification?	Rev.		
J. A. Quarles,		32.	597
Church Power.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	25.	490
“ Report on the State of the.	Rev. A. W. Miller,	15.	405
“ The.	Rev. J. A. Smylie,	22.	111
“ “ and her Presbyters,		21.	211
Comments on the Preceding Article.	John B. Adger, D. D.,		
		21.	226
Church, The, and the World,		22.	255
“ “ a Spiritual Power,		12.	476
“ “ Family Idea of the.	Rev. J. A. Quarles,	24.	432
“ “ Greek Catholic.	Rev. Geo. W. Leyburn,	23.	423
“ “ New,		21.	553
“ “ one Visible, and the Many Denominations.	J. A.		
Quarles,		28.	26
Church, Practical Efficiency of our.	Rev. B. W. Moseley,		
		22.	584
“ “ Reformed in America.	D. D. Demarest, D. D.,		
		24.	254
“ under the Patriarchs and Moses, Bird’s Eye View of,			
		28.	415
“ Union,		26.	254
Coleridge.	Enoch Pond, D. D.,	14.	44
Colored Man in the South.	Prof. J. T. L. Preston, LL. D.,		
		28.	83

- Colored People, Religious Instruction of the. J. L. Wilson, D. D.,  
16. 190
- “ “ Report of a Conference on Organisation, &c.,  
8. 1
- Comments, Editorial, on Art. IV. of Vol. XXI., p. 211, “The  
Church and her Presbyters.” • John B. Adger, D. D.,  
21. 226
- Common Sense Argument. J. S. Grasty, D. D., 32. 30
- Confederate Government, Rise and Fall of the. Dr. Dabney,  
33. 290
- Congregational Temporalities. Rev. W. H. Ruffner, 19. 1
- Conscience. Rev. H. M. Smith, 18. 405
- “ Nature, Office, and Authority. Rev. S. J. Cassells,  
6. 453
- “ to Truth and Falsehood, Relations of. Prof. Charles  
Martin, 23. 105
- Consolation. Rev. A. F. Dickson, 7. 390
- Consolations of Survivors in the Death of the Pious. Rev. J.  
R. Gilland, 6. 186
- Contrary Choice. Rev. J. A. Waddell, 30. 516
- Controversy, Necessity and Importance of. Thomas Smyth,  
D. D., 7. 60
- Coöperation. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq., 20. 194
- Corinthians i. xv. 32. Rev. S. C. Pharr, 4. 99
- Correspondence by J. G. Shepperson, 7. 150
- “ concerning the Palmetto Regiment, 5. 315
- “ ——— Hall County, Ga., 9. 151
- “ touching the Christians, between Pliny and  
Trajan, 21. 195
- Cosmic Vapor. Prof. L. G. Barbour, 32. 511
- Cosmos, The Telluric Portion. Prof. Daniel Kirkwood, 12. 131
- Council of Apostles and Presbyters at Jerusalem. Rev. S. L.  
Morris, 34. 455
- Council, Second General, of the Presbyterian Alliance. Rev.  
Wm. E. Boggs, 32. 282
- Council, Report of Proceedings of Edinburgh. Stuart Robin-  
son, D. D., 29. 333

Covenant, The Abrahamic. Nathan Hoyt, D. D.,	2.	81
“ with Man, God's. Rev. K. M. McIntyre,	34.	521
Creation. Rev. W. H. Darnall,	18.	473
Creeds of Christendom. T. E. Peck, D. D.,	29.	199
Critical Discussion of Causality. Rev. J. A. Waddell,	31.	414
Cuneiform Inscriptions and Biblical History in the Old Testament. B. M. Smith, D. D.,	28.	310; 29. 490

## D.

Dabney's Sensualistic Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	27.	486
Dancing Question, The. Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.,	30.	302
Dancing Question from Another Point of View. J. B. Adger, D. D.,	30.	338
Davidson's Hebrew Grammar. Rev. Alfred Jones,	30.	738
Deacon, Importance of the Office. J. L. Girardeau, D. D.,	32.	1
Deacon's Office in the Church of the New Testament. Rev. W. E. Boggs,	26.	421
Deacon, The Office of. Thomas Smyth, D. D.,	2.	341
Deaconship. Rev. James B. Ramsay,	12.	1
Dead Sea. Rev. J. A. Wallace,	3.	381
“ “ Notice of the,	7.	505
“ Teachings of the. T. Smyth, D. D.,	10.	238
Dealings of Christ with the Chinese Nation. Rev. M. H. Houston.	22.	88
Death, Resurrection, and Intermediate State,	17.	218
Decrees Unconditional. Rev. S. J. Cassells,	6.	22
Degradation of Animals, Evidence of. R. T. Brumby,	5.	417
Delitzsch on Genesis. George Howe, D. D.,	15.	161
Demission of the Ministry,	27.	295
Development of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D.,	2.	311
Diaconate, The. J. L. Girardeau, D. D.,	30. 1; 31.	117
	32.	191
“ “ Again. J. L. Girardeau, D. D., LL. D.,	32. 628; 33.	175



Diaconate of Scripture.	J. A. Lefevre, D. D.,	32.	355
“	“ Again. J. A. Lefevre, D. D.,	33.	343
“	Presbyterian. J. A. Lefevre, D. D.,	32.	359
“	“ Again. J. A. Lefevre, D. D.,	33.	346
Divine Purpose in the Classics.	J. H. Bocock, D. D.,	15.	30
Divinity of Christ.	Rev. J. M. Walker,	8.	461
Doctrine, Plea for, as the Instrument of Sanctification.	Rev. B. M. Palmer,	3.	32
Doctrinal Preaching,		20.	293
“ Standards, The Manner of Altering our.	E. T. Baird, D. D.,	13.	717
Domestic Missions, Some Thoughts and Facts concerning.	Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	21.	37
“ “ True Theory.	Rev. G. C. Gregg,	11.	402
Dort, Synod of.	Enoch Pond, D. D.,	12.	646
Duelling, Wigfall's Sermon upon.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	10.	126
Duties of Masters.	Rev. R. L. Breck,	8.	266
Duty towards his Enemies, Christian's,		17.	492

## E.

Early Conversion of Children.	Prof. E. F. Rockwell,	8.	497
Early Presbyterian Immigration into South Carolina.	Geo. Howe, D. D.,	11.	627
Ecclesiastical Literature, Our.	Rev. John H. Bocock,	6.	410
“ Rulers, Authority of.	Rev. J. G. Shepperson,	8.	112, 231
Eden, The two Trees in.	G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	18.	17
Edmonds, Memoir of Rev. James.	J. R. Witherspoon, M. D.,	8.	134
Educated Ministry.	Rev. Samuel D. Campbell,	12.	468
Educated Ministry, A Thoroughly,		34.	342
“ “ Examined by the Author of “Aggressiveness,”		34.	615
Educating Candidates, New Testament Plan of.	Rev. R. R. Howison,	34.	651

Education.	Thos. Curtis, D. D.,	4.	307
"	Rev. M. J. Wallace,	22.	496
"	and Christianity. Rev. J. A. Quarles,	27.	474
"	" Religion, the Divorce of,	28.	225
"	their Endowment, Schools for Ministerial.	23.	263
"	Collegiate. Hon. A. Bowie,	7.	484
"	Compulsory. Rev. J. G. Hunter,	25.	186
"	Denominational. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D.,	3.	1
"	Female. Prof. Jos. LeConte, M. D.,	14.	60
"	" Rev. Jos. M. Atkinson,	17.	364
"	in the School, the College, the University. Prof. Jos. LeConte, M. D.,	14.	185
"	Principles of a Liberal. Prof. Jos. LeConte,	12.	310
Educational Policy of South Carolina.	S. J. Jones,	4.	76
"	" Our,	23.	50
Edwards and the Theology of New England.	Rev. S. J. Baird,	10.	574
Efficient Ministry, An,		20.	372
Elder Question.	J. H. Thornwell, D. D.,	2.	1
Eldership, Presbyterian Authorities on Theories of the.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	13.	811
"	<i>Princeton Review</i> on Theories of the. J. B. Adger, D. D.,	13.	578
Election.	Rev. J. F. Gibert,	31.	63
Elohim, as a Title of God, and implying Plurality.	T. Smyth, D. D.,	8.	545
Eloquence.	Hon. H. V. Johnson,	8.	261
Endless Punishment.	R. L. Dabney, D. D. LL. D.,	30.	474
English Bible. Standard Edition.	Thos. Curtis, D. D.,	11.	136
"	Language, Formation of,	19.	170
Esther, Mysteries of the Book of.	Rabbi J. L. Leuchf,	34.	588
Ethics of the Fathers.	Alex. Meyrowitz, Ph. D.,	30.	145
Ethnography.	Geo. Howe, D. D.,	3.	233
Eucharist,		26.	748
Evangelical Alliance, Conference of 1873.	Rev. G. W. Leyburn,	25.	195
Evangelist and the Presbytery.	Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	28.	298

Evangelist and Church Work.	Rev. H. H. Hawes,	34.	96
“ The Foreign, as Viewed by one in the Foreign Field.	Rev. John Boyle,	34.	106, 235
“ Report of the last General Assembly on the Office of.	Rev. D. E. Jordan,	33.	333
“ The Jurisdiction of.	J. A. Lefevre, D. D.,	30.	659
	and 34.		277
Evangelisation, City,		31.	244
“ of the Colored People.	Rev. B. W. Moseley,	25.	225
“ The Minister of.	Rev. Jas. L. Martin,	32.	115
Examination of certain Hypotheses, concerning Perception and Sensation.	Rev. J. F. Latimer,	25.	361
Example of Christ.	G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	26.	493
Explanatory Note.	Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	14.	502

## F.

Female Education.	Rev. Joseph M. Atkinson,	17.	364
Fictitious Literature—Tancred, etc.	Col. Wm. F. Hutson,		
	Vol. 1, No. 2.		57
Figures, The Numerical, of the Bible,		26.	735
Final Philosophy,		29.	162
Finance, Plans of Church.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	30.	92
Fine Arts, Superiority of the Greeks in Literature, etc.	Prof.		
E. F. Rockwell,		15.	198
Flint's Sermon, Prof., before the General Council at Edinburgh,		30.	672
Footprints of the Creator,	Prof. R. T. Brumby,	5.	111
Foreign Churches, Lectures on.	Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,		
	Vol. 1, No. 4.		1
Foreign Missionaries, Ecclesiastical Status of.	J. Leighton Wil-		
son, D. D.,		27.	382
Foreign Missionary Work, The Church's Method of conducting the.			
J. Leighton Wilson, D. D.,		34.	331
Foreign Missions.	J. Leighton Wilson, D. D.,	20.	555
“ “ Personal Engagement in.	J. Leighton Wil-		
son, D. D.,		15.	1

- Foreign Missions, Philanthropic Argument for. J. L. Girardeau, D. D., 29. 547
- “ “ Presbyterian Church and. Rev. John M. Lowrie, 6. 395
- “ “ Thoughts on. J. Leighton Wilson, D. D., 30. 363
- Form and Spirit. Rev. S. J. P. Anderson, 4. 171
- Form of Government of the Apostolic Church. Rev. R. C. Ketchum, 24. 471
- Fort Sumter, Battle of. T. Smyth, D. D., 14. 365
- Foster, Life and Correspondence of John. Ed. by J. E. Ryland. Rev. J. R. Kendrick, 4. 381
- France, Church of, and the Pastors of the Desert. George Howe, D. D., 13. 441
- Fraternal Relations. B. M. Palmer, D. D., LL. D., 34. 306
- Freedmen, our Ecclesiastical Relations to. J. L. Girardeau, D. D., 18. 1
- Free Grace of God, and Free Will of Man. Rev. E. F. Rockwell, 4. 527
- Freezing Water, Phenomenon of, in the Book of Job. Rev. E. F. Rockwell, 6. 253
- Frontis, Rev. Stephen, Sketch of his Life. Rev. E. F. Rockwell, 19. 87
- Froude's Bunyan. Prof. J. T. L. Preston, 31. 717
- Fulness of Time. S. J. P. Anderson, D. D., 11. 556
- Future of the Freedmen. J. B. Adger, D. D., and G. J. A. Coulson, Esq., 19. 268
- Future Punishment, Doctrine of. Nos. 1 and 2. Rev. C. R. Vaughan, 6. 203, 349

## G.

- Galileo Galilei. Dr. Theo. Schumann, 31. 488
- Gambling. Rev. E. C. Gordon, 29. 523
- General Assembly of 1837, Documentary History of. Robt. J. Breckinridge, D. D. 33. 747
- General Assembly of 1847. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., Vol 1, No. 2. 78

General Assembly of 1854.	Stuart Robinson, D. D.,	8.	411
“ “	1857. J. B. Adger, D. D.,	10.	276
“ “	1858. Geo. Howe, D. D.,	11.	264
“ “	1859. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	12.	513
“ “	1860. Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	13.	352
“ “	1861. Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	14.	296
“ “	at Augusta. Jas. A. Lyon, D. D.,	14.	618
“ “	of 1862. Jos. R. Wilson, D. D.,	15.	52
“ “	1863. J. B. Adger, D. D.,	16.	87
“ “	1865,	17.	67
“ “	Northern (O. S.) of 1866. Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	17.	244
“ “	Memphis, 1866. Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	18.	110
“ “	1867,	19.	98
“ “	Powers of. Rev. I. J. Long,	19.	395
“ “	1868,	19.	430
“ “	1869,	20.	385
“ “	1870,	21.	411
“ “	1871. J. B. Adger, D. D.,	22.	538
“ “	1872. “ “	23.	475
“ “	1873. Rev. R. K. Smoot,	24.	586
“ “	1874,	25.	379
“ “	<i>versus</i> Government. Rev. J. S. Cozby,	25.	459
“ “	and the Columbia Theological Seminary. Rev. J. F. Latimer,	26.	160
“ “	at St. Louis, 1875. Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	26.	605
“ “	Savannah, 1876. Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	27.	539
“ “	New Orleans, 1877. Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	28.	534
“ “	of 1878,	29.	575
“ “	at Louisville, 1879. J. B. Adger, D. D.,	30.	550
“ “	Action of, on Worldly Amusements. T. E. Peck, D. D.,	31.	218

General Assembly of 1880.	W. E. Boggs, D. D.,	31.	503
“ “	1881. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.,	32.	539
“ “	1882. W. E. Boggs, D. D.,	33.	553
“ “	1883. Rev. J. W. Flinn,	34.	787
Genesis (Bacon's) of the New England Churches.	Jno. B. Adger, D. D.,	26.	201
Genuineness of the Pentateuch.	Geo. Howe, D. D.,	4.	256
Geographical Revolutions,		27.	760
Geological Speculation.	Rev. Edwin Cater,	10.	534
Geological Writings of D. N. Lord.	Prof. J. R. Blake,	13.	537
Geology and its Assailants.	Rev. James Woodrow, Ph. D.,	15.	549
“ “ the Bible,		14.	246
German University System—Influence of, on Theological Literature.	R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.,	32.	220
Girondists, History of, etc.	Col. Wm. M. Hutson,	2.	387
Giving an Essential Part of True Piety.	C. A. Stillman, D.D.,	21.	505
Giving, Ordinance of.	Rev. J. O. Lindsay,	23.	412
Giving, Scriptural Doctrine of.	Rev. James L. Martin,	29.	41
Globe, Final Destiny of our.	Rev. E. F. Rockwell,	7.	127
Gnosticism and the Relation of the Church to Heresies.	Rev. E. O. Frierson,	24.	225
God and Moral Obligation.	G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	29.	313
God and the Bible.	Rev. A. F. Dickson,	32.	697
God, A Personal, the Postulate of Reason; Faith, the Principle of Knowledge.	J. V. Logan, D. D.,	34.	163
Godhead, Distinctions in the, Personal, not Nominal.	T. Smyth, D. D.,	12.	289
God in Christ.	Rev. T. E. Peck,	4.	541
God, Knowledge of, as obtained from Scripture and from Nature.	Rev. A. F. Dickson,	13.	337
Godlikeness.	G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	28.	474
God, Method of the Argument for the Existence of.	Rev. J. A. Waddell,	23.	554

- God, Origin of our Ideas concerning. Rev. Samuel Cassells.  
2. 203
- God, Personality of, as affecting Science and Religion. J. H. Thornwell, D. D.,  
14. 450
- God's Rest our Rest. Rev. A. F. Dickson,  
8. 382
- God's Righteousness to be Universally Confessed. Rev. H. B. Pratt,  
32. 171
- God, The Bible and not Reason the Source of our Knowledge of. T. Smyth, D. D.  
7. 325, 461
- Gospel and the Reign of Law. Rev. E. C. Gordon,  
31. 434
- Gospel Ministry, What is a Call to? Rev. J. A. Quarles,  
21. 338, 411
- Gospel, The Hope of the. Rev. H. B. Pratt,  
18. 519
- Gradualness Characteristic of all God's Operations. Prof. R. T. Brumby,  
25. 524
- Great Commission. Rev. John S. Grasty,  
19. 556
- Greek, Pronunciation of. Rev. Elias Riggs,  
5. 495

## H.

- Hall, Rev. Robert,  
6. 219
- Halsey's Literary Attractions of the Bible. J. N. Waddell, D. D.,  
11. 419
- Hamilton, Philosophy of Sir William. Rev. J. G. Shepperson,  
9. 402
- Hamilton's Theory of Causality, Reëxamination of Sir William. Rev. J. A. Waddell,  
18. 286
- Ham, The Mark of Cain and Curse of. Geo. Howe, D. D.,  
3. 415
- Hebrew, A Plea for the Study of. Rev. F. W. Lewis,  
30. 84
- “ History, Import of. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,  
9. 582
- “ Literature, Plea for the Study of. Rev. James Cohen,  
9. 32
- “ Pihel and Latin Perfect. Prof. E. F. Rockwell,  
14. 444
- Hebrews ix. 16, 17, Interpretation of,  
27. 54
- Hell, The Doctrine of. J. R. Wilson, D. D.,  
29. 459
- Higher Life Delusion. Rev. Harvey Glass,  
31. 253
- Historical Christianity. Rev. B. Gildersleeve,  
20. 38

History of Abbeville District, S. C., Contributions to the Ecclesiastical. M. E. D.,	15.	78
History of Presbyterianism in South Carolina, Early. George Howe, D. D.,	8.	393
Hodge on the Atonement. A. A. Porter, D. D.,	19.	313
Hodge's Systematic Theology. R. L. Dabney, D. D.,	24.	167
Holy Ghost, Blasphemy against the. Rev. W. M. Smythe,	2.	239
Holy Scriptures, The. Rev. S. J. Cassells,	6.	259
Howard, John. Rev. J. B. Ross,	4.	560
Human Life, The Problem of, Here and Hereafter. Prof. M. W. Humphreys,	32.	497
Humphreys, Rev. David, Memorial of. Rev. John McLees,	21.	365
Hymn-Book Making. Rev. A. F. Dickson,	15.	61
Hypostatical Union,	12.	336

## I.

Idolatry. Wm. A. Scott, D. D.,	10.	115
Immersion, Remission of Sins in, and the Book of Acts. Wm. Stoddert, D. D.,	32.	706
Immortal, Are the Wicked? Rev. S. C. Pharr,	6.	61
Impeccability of Christ,	28.	128
Imputation, Dr. Dabney on,	24.	30
Imputation, Gratuitous, of Sin. S. J. Baird, D. D.,	27.	318
Imputed Sin, An Inquiry into the Doctrine. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	Vol. 1, No. 4.	97
Inaugural Address, Rev. James Woodrow, Ph. D.,	14.	505
“ Discourse on Church History and Church Polity. J. B. Adger, D. D.,	12.	140
“ of Rev. Dr. Girardeau,	28.	462
Inauguration of Rev. Dr. Plumer,	19.	29
“ Rev. Dr. Wilson,	22.	413
Induction and Analogy, Metaphysical and Theological Applications of. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.,	34.	703
Induction, The Nature of Physical Causes and their. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.,	34.	484



- Inductive Demonstration. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.,  
34. 1
- Infidelity, Modern. Rev. Donald Fraser, 17. 342
- Inspiration, Plenary, of the Scriptures. Rev. J. B. Adger,  
4. 457
- “ “ and Credibility of the Scriptures. Rev. S.  
C. Pharr, 5. 73
- “ *versus* Morell's Theory. Rev. Thos. G. Carver,  
6. 378
- Instruction, Public, in South Carolina. J. H. Thornwell, D. D.,  
7. 403
- “ Religious, of our Colored Population. E. T. Baird,  
D. D., 12. 345
- Instruments, The Use of Mechanical, in the Worship of God.  
T. Smyth, D. D., 19. 517
- Intermediate State. Thomas Curtis, D. D., 7. 547
- “ “ Rev. Jas. A. Wallace, 21. 173
- International Copy-right Law. S. C. Pharr, D. D., 8. 489
- Internationals, The. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq., 25. 145
- Introduction to Paul's Epistles. A. H. Epstein, 9. 134
- Isaiah, Alexander's. Geo. Howe, D. D., Vol. 1, No. 4. 129
- “ 53d Chapter, Vindication of the Messianic Interpretation.  
Rev. Jas. Cohen, 10. 201, 377
- Italy and its Religions, 26. 461

## J.

- James, Major John, Memoir of, 8. 141
- Jean Calais, Martyr of Toulouse. Geo. Howe, D. D., 25. 413
- Jephthah's Vow, A Brief Inquiry into the Nature of. Rev. W.  
M. Smythe, A. M., 2. 68
- Jews, Conversion and Restoration of the. Rev. Edward Martin,  
31. 70
- Jews, The Intellectual and Moral Character of. B. M. Palmer,  
D. D., Vol. 1, No. 3. 30
- Job, The Book of, 9. 390
- John Brown, The Raid of, and the Progress of Abolition. Geo.  
Howe, D. D., 12. 784
- VOL. XXXV., NO. 1—2.

- John, First Epistle, v. 7, 8. Rev. W. M. Smythe, 2. 362  
 John x. 28, 29, Various Readings. Prof. E. F. Rockwell, 9. 364  
 John the Baptist, the Unitarian Jesus. Thomas Curtis, D. D.,  
 2. 250  
 Jones's History of the Church. Geo. Howe, D. D., 19. 68  
 Justice to Benevolence, The Relation of, in the Conduct of So-  
 ciety. Rev. S. J. Cassells, 7. 85

## K.

- Kingdom of Christ, The Future. Rev. Jno. H. Boccock, D. D.,  
 17. 467  
 Knox, John, as the English and the Scottish Reformer. Stuart  
 Robinson, D. D., 27. 440; 28. 1

## L.

- Language, Claims of the English. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,  
 6. 301  
 Languages of Southern Europe. V. H. Manget, 4. 231; 5. 551  
 Language, The Relations of. Rev. R. C. Ketchum, 15. 205  
 " The Study of, as a Training of the Mind. Prof. W.  
 Blair, 17. 162  
 Latest Publications, 27. 803  
 Law-Giving at Jerusalem. Rev. A. W. Clisby, 33. 146  
 Lay Evangelism and Y. M. C. A. B. M. Palmer, D. D., 29. 354  
 Lay Preaching, 27. 228  
 Leckey's History of European Morals. Rev. A. F. Dickson,  
 25. 51  
 " " " " J. M. P. Atkinson, D. D.,  
 31. 191  
 Lecture System: Its Influence upon Young Men. John N.  
 Waddel, D. D., 12. 258  
 Legal Profession, Morality of the. R. L. Dabney, D. D., 11. 571  
 Letter, First Pastoral, of the Synod of the Carolinas. 12. 221  
 (and Appendix to, 12. No. 4.)  
 Letters of Alexander Von Humboldt. A. A. Porter, D. D.,  
 13. 502  
 Letter to the Rev. Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge. John H. Bo-  
 cock, D. D., 15. 372

- Levellers, The Paradise of the. J. H. Bocock, D. D., 19. 48  
*Lex Regit.* Law is King, 26. 475  
 Liberty, The Character and Conditions of. T. Smyth, D. D.,  
 16. 201  
 Life Insurance. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq., 20. 308  
 Life Out of Death. Rev. A. F. Dickson, 9. 379  
 Lindsley, D. D., The Works of Philip. John N. Waddel, D. D.,  
 18. 187  
 Literature, Domestic. Rev. S. J. Cassells. 5. 1  
     " of the South. Rev. T. B. Balch, 21. 273  
     " Periodical, 11. 351, 509, 682; 12. 217, 369, 641  
         840; 13. 221, 436, 643, 899; 14. 178, 361  
 Litigation in Kentucky and Missouri, Church Property, 21. 89  
 Living Writers of the South. Prof. M. LaBorde, 21. 282  
 Logic and the Laws of Thought. Rev. L. G. Barbour, 23. 519  
 Lord Chancellors, The Lives of the. Thomas Curtis, D. D.,  
 3. 54  
 Lord's Day, and not the Jewish Sabbath. Rev. John Beveridge,  
 33. 614; 34. 54  
 Lord's Day, and not the Jewish Sabbath, Reviewed. James  
 Stacy, D. D., 34. 761  
 Lord's Supper. Rev. W. M. Smythe, 3. 410  
     " " The. T. E. Peck, D. D., 30. 623  
 Lot, Is the, an Ordinance of God? Rev. James B. Shearer,  
 25. 168  
 Lotteries and Other Modes of Gambling, Moral and Religious  
 Aspects of. Rev. W. E. Boggs, 24. 501  
 Lunar World. Prof. Daniel Kirkwood, 8. 218

## M.

- Maccabees ii. 12, 39-45; Purgatory, etc., 13. 296  
 McPheeters, D. D., Memoir of Rev. Samuel B., 22. 235  
 Maimonides, Life and Writings of. Rev. Jas. Cohen, 12. 407  
 Maine Law. Cyrus Hamlin, D. D., 29. 449  
 Maine Law at Present in Maine and Vermont. Cyrus Hamlin,  
 D. D., 32. 335  
 Manna of the Israelites. Rev. E. F. Rockwell, 2. 413

Mann, Life of Horace. Prof. J. T. L. Preston,	30.	385
Manse's. Rev. T. B. Balch,	22.	73
Man's Sympathy with Man, and the Means of Grace. F. P. Mullally, D. D.,	33.	519
Marcus Aurelius. Prof. J. T. L. Preston,	28.	340
Marriage Law, A Slave,	16.	145
"    "    God's. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	32.	682
"    The Law of. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	31.	648
"    "    World's, and Deceased Wife's Sister. William Stoddert, D. D.,	32.	469
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. F. Jacobs, D. D.,	34.	683
Martyrs of Scotland and Sir Walter Scott. J. H. Bocock, D. D.,	10.	69
Mathematics, Religion and. Prof. D. H. Hill,	8.	27
Matter, The Ceaseless Activity of. Prof. R. T. Brumby,	6.	37
Matthew xvi. 18, 19, An Exposition of. Vol. 1, No. 1.		103
"    xxii. 29. J. H. Thornwell, D. D.,	4.	498
Mediæval and Modern Mystics. Rev. L. G. Barbour,	30.	219
Melchizedekian Priesthood. Rev. T. B. Balch,	25.	431
Mental Culture, Christian Principle in Relation to. S. C. Pharr, D. D.,	3.	200
Mercantile Morals. Rev. E. P. Rogers,	6.	529
Metaphysical Postulate of Herbert Spencer's First Principles. H. C. Alexander, D. D.,	27.	413
Middle Advent. Rev. H. F. Hoyt,	31.	675
Millennium, The. Rev. E. F. Rockwell,	5.	52
Mind of Man, the Image of God. Prof. J. T. L. Preston,	11.	228
Ministerial Consecration and Ministerial Support. J. L. Girardeau, D. D.,	23.	161
Ministerial Gift. Rev. P. P. Flournoy,	30.	646
"    Training. Rev. B. W. Moseley,	24.	1
Ministers' Widows and Orphans,	21.	153
Ministry and its Duties. Rev. J. M. Atkinson,	20.	105
"    Success in the. Rev. C. A. Stillman,	9.	72
"    The New Theory of the,	33.	313

Minor Prophets, Sketch of the,	26.	716
Miracles. J. H. Thornwell, D. D.,	10.	161
“ of our Lord, Notes on. Rev. S. J. P. Anderson,	4.	580
Miracles, Philosophy and,	29.	678
Missionary, Apostolic, in China. Agnes M. Machar,	33.	601
“ Inquiry—Address,	6.	73
“ Zeal. Rev. J. B. Adger,	3.	637
Missions, Brief Reply to Dr. Wilson on Home. J. B. Adger,		
D. D.,	33.	545
Missions, Christian and African Colonisation. J. B. Adger,		
D. D.,	10.	17
Missions, Home, How shall they be Conducted? J. Leighton		
Wilson, D. D.,	33.	219
Missions to the Oriental Churches. J. Leighton Wilson, D. D.,		
	24.	377
Modern Doubt,	26.	316
“ Scepticism. John B. Adger, D. D.,	26.	268
Moral and Political Economy, The Principles of Paley's. J. H.		
Thornwell, D. D.,	7.	1
Moral Habit, The Power of, as it Affects the Power of Faith.		
Rev. W. E. Scott,	8.	335
Morality of Actions, Volitions, Desires, etc. Rev. L. G. Bar-		
bour,	25.	307
Moral Philosophy. Rev. R. S. Gladney,	9.	113
“ “ and Christianity. Judge W. Archer Cocke,		
	22.	1
“ Social, and Professional Duties of Attorneys and Solicitors.		
Rev. E. P. Rogers,	5.	249
Mormonism. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	6.	559
Morphology and its Connexion with Fine Art. Prof. Joseph		
LeConte, M. D.,	12.	83
Moses. Rev. J. H. Martin,	18.	235
“ and his Dispensation,	12.	681
“ Character of. W. T. Hamilton, D. D.,	5.	504
Motley's Dutch Republic. J. B. Adger, D. D.,	15.	94
Mullally's, Rev. Dr., Reply to Rev. J. A. Quarles. F. P. Mul-		
lally, D. D.,	33.	105

## N.

Napoleon's History of Julius Cæsar.	Prof. W. J. Rivers,	17.	551
National Righteousness.	Thos. Smyth, D. D.,	12.	25
National Sins.	J. H. Thornwell, D. D.,	13.	349
National History, The Study of,		28.	679
Natural Science and Revealed Religion.	Rev. Richard S. Gladney,	12.	443
Nature and Importance of a Christian Profession.	Rev. J. G. Shepperson,	6.	484
Nature and Uses of Art.	Joseph LeConte, M. D.,	15.	311, 515
Necrology: James White Stephenson, D. D., and Thomas Reese, D. D.	By Dr. J. R. Witherspoon,	6.	102, 116
Necrology: Wm. H. Barr, D. D.	By Hon. A. Bowie,	6.	428
Necrology: Rev. John Simpson,		6.	546
"	Rev. James Edmonds and Maj. John James,	8.	134, 141
Negative Tendencies of the Age,		28.	504
New England Churches, Genesis of the.	John B. Adger, D. D.,	26.	201
Nile, The Sources of the,		18.	451
No Priest but Christ.	Rev. J. R. Gilland,	12.	691
North and South.	A. A. Porter, D. D.,	3.	337
Nott's Lectures.	Dr. Howe,	3.	426

## O.

Objections to Science.	Prof. J. R. Blake,	11.	206
Observations on Art. 4 of Vol. 24, On a Call to the Ministry.	John B. Adger, D. D.,	24.	136
Obstacles to Ministerial Piety.	E. P. Rogers, D. D.,	7.	347
Office in the Church, The First and Highest.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	22.	484
Oliver Cromwell, Letters and Speeches of.	Vol. 1, No. 1.		121
Opinions, Responsibility for.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	7.	301
Opium Smoking and the Chinese.	Rev. H. C. DuBose,	25.	339
Oratory, Pulpit,		14.	275

Ordination at Hangchow, The Recent.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	30.	754
Ordination with the Laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	26.	512
Organs.	Rev. John Douglas,	9.	224
Organs in Public Worship, Denial of Divine Right of.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	20.	69
Original Sin, Thoughts on.	Rev. J. M. Walker,	9.	425
“ “ Unthinkable Propositions, etc.,		26.	298
Origin of Man, Recent.	J. C. Southall, Esq.,	28.	102
Orthodoxy in New England.	Rev. E. P. Rogers,	7.	52
Our Problem.	Rev. A. F. Dickson,	10.	451

## P.

Paine, Life of Thomas.	Thos. Curtis, D. D.,	5.	228
Palmer's Life of Thornwell.	W. E. Boggs, D. D.	27.	512
Pan-Hellenism.	Rev. G. L. Leyburn,	29.	236
Pan-Presbyterian Alliance.	R. L. Dabney, D. D.,	27.	76
Pan-Presbyterian Council at Edinburgh, Sermon before, Prof.	Flint, Established Church of Scotland,	30.	672
Parable of the Tares in the Field.	G. D. Armstrong, D. D.,	31.	731
Parochial Schools.	Thos. Smyth, D. D.,	2.	520
Pastoral Relations and Duties.	Rev. John Douglas,	17.	350
Pastoral Relation and the Support of the Ministry.	J. B. Adger, D. D.,	26.	76
Pastors and Evangelists <i>versus</i> Stated Supplies,		22.	341
Pastors, Who shall Vote for.	John B. Adger, D. D.,	28.	689
Pastor, Christian.	J. H. Thornwell, D. D., Vol. 1, No. 3.		127
Paul a Presbyterian.	Rev. T. W. Hooper,	23.	400
Paulicians, The.	T. T. Johnston,	25.	31
Paul's Preaching at Athens.	J. H. Thornwell, D. D.,	2.	463
“ Rebuke of Ananias.	Gen. V. D. V. Jamison,	2.	587
Paul, Church at Rome, and Epistle to the Romans,		22.	141
Pelagian Controversy.	Enoch Pond, D. D.,	3.	20
People and Languages of Western Africa.	J. L. Wilson, D. D.,	15.	349

- Peter, Canonicity of Second. B. B. Warfield, D. D., 33. 45  
 " 1st Epistle iii. 19, Critical Examination of. Rev. W. M. Smythe, A. M., Vol. 1, No. 3. 120
- Peter, Dr. Edwin A. Abbott on the Genuineness of Second. Benj. B. Warfield, D. D., 34. 390
- Philosophy, Calvinism, and the Bible, 29. 252  
 " in the Church. Enoch Pond, D. D., 4. 153  
 " of Life, 7. 74  
 " of Man Impossible without Aid from Revelation. Prof. J. T. L. Preston, 29. 732
- Plumer, Inauguration of Rev. Dr., 19. 29
- Plymouth Brethren, Theology of, 23. 1
- Poetry of the Pentateuch. Vol. 1, No. 1. 117
- Political Religion. Rev. James A. Waddell, 34. 371
- Politics, Drift of American. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq., 32. 317
- Popular Revivals. Rev. John S. Grasty, 19. 153
- Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte. Rev. Matthew B. Grier, 9. 202
- Power of the Pulpit. A. A. Porter, D. D., 2. 270
- Prayer, Answerable without any Violation of Nature, 29. 273  
 " Consistent with Uniform Operation of Natural Law, 21. 1  
 " Question, One Phase of. Prof. L. G. Barbour, 31. 746  
 " Tyndall on the Physical Value of. Rev. W. R. Atkinson, 24. 65
- Preachers to Preach Themselves, In what Sense. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., 25. 350
- Preaching, Concerning the Manner of, 28. 666
- Prelacy a Blunder. R. L. Dabney, D. D., 27. 1
- Prelatic Assumptions. Rev. J. A. Waddell, 33. 126
- Presbyterate, The. Rev. J. A. Smylie, 23. 228
- Presbyterian Church, Constitution of. Rev. S. J. Baird, 10. 1  
 " " Government, The Divine Right of. J. B. Adger, D. D., 13. 122
- Presbyterian Church in South Carolina, 22. 51  
 " Clergyman Looking for the Church, 4. 1  
 " Council at Edinburgh. J. B. Adger, D. D., 28. 742



- Presbyterian Government, not a Hierarchy, but a Commonwealth.  
 R. J. Breckinridge, D. D., LL. D., 33. 258
- Presbyterian Ordination, not a Charm, but an Act of Government. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D., LL. D., 33. 463
- Presbyterian Preaching at the South. Hon. E. A. Nisbet,  
 13. 102
- “ Reunion North. R. L. Dabney, D. D., 22. 379
- Presbyterianism. Rev. D. E. Frierson, 30. 112
- “ in Central New York, 29. 104
- “ its Influence on the Culture of the Human Intellect and the Progress of Piety. Rev. R. B. White,  
 9. 161
- Presbyterianism, the Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. Dr. Smyth, Vol. 1, No. 4. 33
- Presbytery, Annals of English. A. W. Miller, D. D., 23. 584
- Present and Past Physical State of Palestine. Rev. T. R. G. Peck,  
 12. 728
- Priesthood of Christ, Thoughts upon. J. H. Thornwell, D. D.,  
 3. 609
- Princeton Review and Presbyterianism. J. H. Thornwell, D. D.,  
 13. 757
- Principles of Christian Economy. Rev. R. L. Dabney, 6. 157
- Professorship of Natural Science in Connexion with Revealed Religion. J. A. Lyon, D. D., 12. 181
- Proofs of Divine Existence furnished by Natural Religion. Rev. J. H. Martin, 24. 417
- Prophetic Period of 1260 Years. Prof. E. F. Rockwell, 11. 609
- Prophets and Prophecy, 26. 138
- Prophets of the Restoration. S. J. P. Anderson, D. D., 9. 513
- Proposed Presbyterian Council. W. G. Blaikie, D. D., 26. 529
- Providence and Prayer, 21. 348
- “ of God as Related to the Work of Redemption. T. D. Witherspoon, D. D., 21. 487
- Psalmody and the Union. Rev. E. L. Patton, 15. 448
- Pulpit Style, Simplicity of. R. L. Dabney, D. D., 7. 263
- Punishment, Reason and Future. Rev. Jno. M. Lowrie, 6. 120
- Puritanism and Presbyterianism, 16. 309
- Puritans, The. Rev. Jos. M. Atkinson, 15. 230

## R.

- Rationalism False and Unreasonable, 16. 163, 237  
 " and Traditionalism. Rev. T. E. Peck, 7. 240  
 " in the Church, *versus* Rationalism without. Rev. S. M. Smith, 31. 45  
 Reason and Understanding, 28. 71  
 " in regard to Revelation, The Office of. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., Vol. 1, No. 1. 1  
 " Province of, especially in Matters of Religion. T. Smyth, D. D., 7. 274  
 Recent Publications, 28. 185, 404, 621, 796; 29. 187, 399, 804; 30. 206, 423, 615, 794; 31. 178, 362, 604, 782; 32. 158, 388, 584, 797; 33. 209, 428, 591, 781; 34. 224, 445, 605, 819.  
 Redemption. J. S. Grasty, D. D., 31. 455  
 Reese, D. D., Memoir of Rev. Thomas. J. R. Witherspoon, M. D., 6. 116  
 Reflections upon Heaven. Rev. E. P. Rogers, 4. 165  
 Reformation in England. Rev. J. H. Boccock, 7. 161  
 Reformation in the Sixteenth Century. T. E. Peck, D. D., 22. 455  
 Regal Character of Christ. Rev. E. P. Davis, 34. 560  
 Reign of Law. Rev. A. F. Dickson, 21. 520  
 Relation of Pagan Systems to each other, and to the Revealed System of Religion, 26. 239  
 Religion and Politics. Jas. A. Lyon, D. D., 15. 569  
 " The Philosophy of. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., 3. 259, 491  
 Religious Principle the Life of the Nation. Judge Wm. Archer Cocke, 22. 349  
 Renan's Origins of Christianity. Geo. Howe, D. D., 17. 301  
 Report of the Committee of Conference of the General Assembly, and the United Synod. Rev. John Miller, 16. 253  
 Resurrection, 18. 501  
 " Body. Rev. F. R. Goulding, 13. 479  
 " of Jesus. An Anti-Unitarian Argument. Rev. S. C. Pharr, 4. 243  
 " of Jesus Christ, Argument for. T. H. Skinner, D. D., 32. 441

- Retribution : or, Sin must be Punished. J. S. Grasty, D. D.,  
29. 716
- “ The Law of. 29. 140
- Revelation and Inspiration. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., 9. 555
- “ and Natural Science, Harmony of, with especial reference to Geology. L. W. Green, D. D.,  
5. 93, 284, 461
- “ and Sound Learning, The Vital Connexion between. H. M. White, D. D., 34. 540
- “ Chapters iv. and v. Rev. E. F. Rockwell, 2. 505
- “ of a Divine and Incarnate Saviour traced in the History and Rites of Bacchus. T. Smyth, D. D., 3. 658
- Reviewer Reviewed, or, Dr. Ross on Right and Wrong. Jno. B. Adger, D. D., 19. 404
- “ “ Reply to Dr. Wilson on our Schemes of Benevolence. Rev. S. T. Martin, 33. 386
- Revised Book of Church Order. Stuart Robinson, D. D., 30. 120
- “ “ Discipline. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., LL. D.,  
12. 373; 13. 1
- “ Directory for Worship. G. D. Armstrong, D. D.,  
32. 103
- “ Version of the New Testament. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.,  
32. 575
- Revision, Classical, of the Greek New Testament. H. C. Alexander, D. D., 31. 302
- “ Movement. Rev. Richard S. Gladney, 10. 493
- “ of the English Bible. J. B. Adger, D. D., 32. 369
- Revival in Scotland. W. G. Blaikie, D. D., 26. 60
- Revivals, The *Westminster Review* on Christian. J. N. Waddell, D. D., 13. 225.
- Right and Wrong. A Check to Atheism. F. A. Ross, D. D.,  
18. 339; 19. 184
- Righteousness, New Nature, and Faith, 25. 478
- Rights and Duties. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq., 23. 112
- Rights and Slavery, The Christian Doctrine of. Jno. B. Adger, D. D., 2. 569
- Ritualism. B. T. W., 19. 238

Robertson, Frederick W. Rev. Samuel M. Smith,	33.	76
Robinson's Discourses of Redemption,	17.	441
Robinson, Memorial of Rev. Stuart. T. E. Peck, D. D.,	33.	237
Romanism at Home. Prof. D. H. Hill,	9.	128
Romans vi. 4, and Colossians ii. 12, and the Baptist Controversy. Rev. W. R. Atkinson,	23.	539
Romans viii. 19-22, Dissertation on. Rev. James A. Wallace,	2.	368
Romans ix. 1-5. Rev. S. L. Graham, D. D.,	2.	562
Romish Controversy, its Present Aspect, and the Duty of the Church with reference to it. A. B. Van Zandt, D. D.,	8.	355
Ross, Card of Rev. Dr.,	20.	572
Royal Seed. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	27.	249
Ruling Elders, Dr. Thornwell on,	18.	30
“ “ their Pastoral Duties. E. T. Baird, D. D.,	13.	275

## S.

Sabbath Controversy. R. L. Dabney, D. D.,	10.	337
“ Historical Sketch of the Weekly. Enoch Pond, D. D.,	7.	575
“ of the State. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.,	31.	92
“ The,	28.	193
“ The Law of the, in its Bearing upon National Prosper- ity. Rev. Edward Martin,	15.	23
Sacraments of the New Testament. B. M. Smith, D. D., LL. D.,	31.	315
Sacred Scriptures, their Secondary and Collateral Influences. George Howe, D. D.,	7.	103
Sanctification, Perfect,	28.	46
Scepticism, Modern. John B. Adger, D. D.,	26.	268
Science, An Examination of Certain Recent Assaults on Physical. James Woodrow, Ph. D., D. D.,	24.	327
“ A Further Examination of Recent Assaults. James Woodrow, Ph. D., D. D.,	25.	246

- Science, Caution against Anti-Christian, Criticised by Dr. Woodrow. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., 24. 539
- “ Relations of, to the Bible. Prof. R. T. Brumby, 25. 1
- “ The Outlook of Modern. Rev. W. S. Bean, 25. 331
- Scotch-Irish. George Howe, D. D., 14. 472
- Scripturalism and Rationalism. Rev. S. W. Stanfield, 5. 271
- Scripture, The *Ἀγαθόν* of. Rev. S. C. Pharr, 6. 271
- Secession and the South, Vindication of. B. M. Palmer, D. D., 14. 134
- Sermons of the late Rev. Benj. F. Stanton. Jno. G. Shepperson, 5. 390
- Servetus, Michael. Rev. James A. Wallace, 9. 520
- Shakespeare, The Variety of the Works of. Rev. S. J. P. Anderson, 4. 343
- Sin, Responsibility for Adam's. T. C. Howard, Esq., 24. 244
- Sceptic, Reasonable Answer to the. W. C. Dana, D. D., 11. 386
- Sketches of North Carolina. Vol. 1, No. 2. 30
- Slavery, 9. 345
- “ and the Duties growing out of the Relation. J. A. Lyon, D. D., 16. 1
- “ and the Religious Instruction of the Colored Population. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., 4. 105
- “ Report on. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., 5. 380
- Slave Trade, Revival of. J. B. Adger, D. D., 11. 100
- “ “ “ J. L. Wilson, D. D. 12. 491
- Smith, Prof. W. Robertson. R. L. Dabney, D. D., 33. 1
- Social Science under a Christian Aspect, 29. 86
- Society, The Phases of, 8. 193
- Sociology, Relation of Organic Science to. Joseph LeConte, M. D., 13. 39
- Southern Views and Principles not Extinguished by the War. A. W. Miller, D. D., 21. 61
- South Vindicated from the Charge of Treason and Rebellion. W. E. Boggs, D. D., 32. 743
- Spirit, Personality, Deity, and Operations of the Holy, Vol. 1, No. 2. 1
- Spiritism and the Bible. Rev. W. E. Boggs, 23. 611

Spiritualism,	28.	270
Spiritual Beneficence. Enoch Pond, D. D.,	6.	1
Spiritual Kingdom, History of the. James B. Ramsey, D. D.,	19.	465
Spring, Life and Times of Dr. Rev. A. F. Dickson,	17.	53
State and Church, Relation of. R. S. Gladney,	16.	349
State of Man, The Primitive. S. C. Pharr, D. D.,	7.	365
State of the Country. J. H. Thornwell, D. D.,	13.	860
“ “ The <i>Princeton Review</i> on the,	14.	1
Statesman, The. W. C. Moragne, Esq.,	11.	531
Stephenson, D. D., Memoir of Rev. James White. Rev. James A. Wallace,	6.	102
Stimulants, The Influence of, on Manifestation of Mind. J. McF. Gaston, M. D.,	10.	486
Stuart Robinson's Church of God,	11.	480
Success in Study, The Conditions of. Rev. W. T. Hall,	20.	62
Suffering Seaboard of South Carolina. J. L. Girardeau, D. D.,	27.	199
Supernatural in the Scriptures. Rev. T. A. Hoyt,	13.	78
“ Revelation Necessary. Rev. James A. Lyon, D. D.,	13.	324
Support of Superannuated Ministers and the Indigent Families of Deceased Ministers. Rev. J. L. Girardeau,	11.	592
Sustentation. J. Leighton Wilson, D. D.,	22.	524
Symmetry and Beauty of God's Witnessing Church. Rev. S. J. Baird,	12.	357

## T.

Taney, Memoir of Roger B.,	26.	1
Temperance, Bible Principles on. Rev. C. R. Vaughan,	9.	85
Testimony and Faith,	22.	321
“ of the Rocks. Rev. W. D. Moore,	10.	463
Theism,	27.	272
Theology as a Science involving an Infinite Element. Inaugural Address of J. L. Girardeau, D. D.,	27.	462
Theology, Christian, and Current Thought,	24.	393
“ Historical Sketch of Systems of. Enoch Pond, D. D.,	10.	106

- Theology, its Place in the Work and Growth of the Church.  
 Rev. W. R. Smith, 26. 14
- Theology, Modern. Taylor and Bledsoe. Rev. John H. Boccock,  
 9. 492
- “ Natural. Rev. L. G. Barbour, 21. 572
- “ Non-Scholastic, 30. 258
- “ Polemic. Wm. S. Plumer, D. D., 2. 183
- “ Alphabet of Natural. Rev. E. F. Rockwell, 10. 411
- “ Science of Pastoral. J. H. Rice, D. D., 17. 330
- The Three Creeds, 28. 353
- The Throne of God. Rev. J. P. Pressley, 9. 56
- The Tishbite and the Baptist, 18. 388
- Thornwell, D. D., LL.D., Life, Character, and Genius of the  
 late Rev. J. H. B. M. Palmer, D. D., 15. 255
- Thornwell's Memorial on the Recognition of Christianity in the  
 Constitution, 16. 77
- Thornwell's Writings. T. E. Peck, D. D., 29. 413
- Timothy's Office. T. V. Moore, D. D., 14. 569
- Tithe Law, 27. 46
- “ The Law of the, and of the Free Will Offering. A. W.  
 Miller, D. D., 24. 272
- Transcendental Philosophy, Objections to the German. Enoch  
 Pond, D. D., 4. 328
- Transfiguration, The. Rev. W. A. Campbell, 20. 355
- Triads or Trinity; Nature and Origin of Pagan Doctrine. T.  
 Smyth, D. D., 8. 560
- Tribunal of History. B. M. Palmer, D. D., LL. D., 23. 245
- Trinity, Doctrine of, either the Offspring of Reason or of Primi-  
 tive Revelation. T. Smyth, D. D., 9. 246
- Trinity, On the, Thos. Smyth, D. D., 8. 54, 153, 305
- “ Presumptive Arguments for the Doctrine. Thomas  
 Smyth, D. D., 9. 1
- Trinity, Testimony of the Ancient Jews. Thos. Smyth, D. D.,  
 10. 94
- “ Testimony of the Early Fathers. Thos. Smyth, D. D.,  
 9. 313
- “ Testimony of the Reformers. T. Smyth, D. D., 9. 473

Trinity, The Doctrine of the Scriptures. Thos. Smyth, D. D.,	
	11. 68, 175; 14. 92, 227
the Platonic,	2. 215
Truth. Rev. Leander Ker,	18. 483
“ What is? J. S. Grasty, D. D.,	22. 406
Turretin, The Life and Death of Francis. Rev. J. Jones Smyth,	
	4. 26
Types of Mankind,	9. 250

## U.

Ulster. Rev. T. B. Balch,	22. 270
Unbelief, Alternations of. H. C. Alexander, D. D.,	30. 713
Unbelieving World, Private Christians in their Relations to the.	
Rev. J. M. Walker,	12. 712
Unification. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	20. 453
Union, The Downfall of the. Rev. R. S. Gladney,	16. 37
“ the Proposed Plan between the General Assembly and	
the United Synod. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,	16. 264
Uniqueness and Superiority of our Lord's Teaching. W. A.	
Scott, D. D.,	6. 476
Unity and Infallibility of the Church of Rome. Rev. William	
T. Findley,	13. 520
Unity, Christian. Rev. B. W. Moseley,	20. 492
“ of Mankind; Testimony of Modern Science. J. L.	
Cabell, M. D.,	12. 115
Unity of the Church. Rev. J. G. Shepperson,	7. 523
“ The, of the Race. George Howe, D. D.,	3. 124
“ “ “ “ Rev. A. A. Porter,	4. 357
“ “ “ “ Rev. S. J. P. Anderson,	5. 572
University, The Southern Presbyterian. James A. Lyon, D. D.,	
	20. 153
Unjust Steward. Rev. S. A. Stanfield,	8. 18
Unknowable, The Modern Doctrine of the,	27. 662
Unpardonable Sin. Rev. J. B. Ross,	6. 507
Unregeneracy in the Ministry,	6. 332
Upham's Interior Life, and the Doctrine of Holiness. Rev. A. F.	
Dickson,	18. 207
Utility, Philosophy of,	9. 188



## V.

Vagrancy. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	30.	462
Value of the Christian Pulpit. Rev. R. Q. Mallard,	18.	361
Various Readings of the Greek New Testament, The Doctrinal,	22.	191
Vatican Council, History of. Rev. Prof. Witherow,	26.	339
“ Decrees, in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance. W. E. Gladstone,	26.	94
Vatican Dogma,	27.	92
Victory of Manassas Plains. T. Smyth, D. D.,	14.	593
Virgin Mary, The Psalter of. Rev. Elias Riggs, D. D.,	8.	328
Virus, Mental and Moral. G. J. A. Coulson, Esq.,	25.	505
Vision of Victory, St. Paul's. John H. Boccock, D. D.,	16.	326
Vital Force. J. McF. Gaston, M. D.,	18.	689

## W.

Wales,	29.	55
Walnut Street Church Decision in the United States Supreme Court,	29.	1
War, Means of Preventing. Rev. Philip Berry,	3.	169
“ Mexican, Reviewed on Christian Principles. Rev. Philip Berry,	3.	74
War, The, of the South, Vindicated. T. Smyth, D. D.,	15.	479
Wayland on the Limits of Human Responsibility,	11.	194
Westminster Assembly, Recently Discovered Memoranda of. Stuart Robinson, D. D.,	27.	730
Whitefield and his Times. Prof. J. T. L. Preston,	29.	298
Widows and Orphans, A Plea in behalf of Ministers'. Rev. E. Cater,	20.	181
Will and Conduct, Effectual Control of, by the Spirit of God, Compatible with Free Agency and Accountability,	Vol. 1, No. 2.	105
Will in its Theological Relations, The Freedom of the. J. L. Girardeau, D. D., LL. D.,	29.	611, etc.
Will on Theology, Influence of Theories of the,	30.	32
“ Remarks upon the, with some Strictures upon the Opinions of Dr. McCosh. Rev. S. J. Cassells,	5.	535
VOL. XXXV., NO. 1—3.		

- Will, The Freedom of, in its Theological Relations. J. L. Girardeau, D. D., LL. D., 29. 611 ; 30. 51 ; 31. 1, 323, 613 ; 32. 63
- Will, The Freedom of, Dr. Girardeau's Views Reëxamined. Rev. J. A. Waddell, 31. 690
- Wilson's Slave Power in America. R. L. Dabney, D. D., 28. 436
- Wisdom of Man *vs.* the Power of God. T. E. Peck, D. D., 29. 742
- Woman's Place in the Gospel. Rev. S. L. Morris, 32. 210
- Woman, The Power of. F. P. Mullally, D. D., 33. 689
- Women, The Public Preaching of. R. L. Dabney, D.D., LL.D., 30. 689
- Word of God, The, 21. 24
- Work of Christ and the Condition of the Angelic World, The Relation between.. B. M. Palmer, D. D., Vol. 1, No. 1. 34
- World, Conversion of the. Rev. John G. Shepperson, 10. 520  
11. 42, 449
- World's Conversion, Certainty. Rev. J. L. Wilson, 2. 427

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

## VOL. I.

No. 1.—Memoirs and Remains of Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne, 159. The Ruling Eldership, etc. Rev. David King, 161. The Books of Discipline and of Common Order, etc., 162. Epistle to the Romans. Robert Haldane, Esq., 163. Røediger's Gesenius, Translated by Prof. Stuart, 164. Revival Sermons. Rev. Daniel Baker, 165. Christian Unity. Edward Reed, Rector, etc., 166. The Character of the Gentleman. Francis Lieber, 167. The Sacred Mountains. J. T. Headley, 168. The Hand of God Recognised. Rev. George Sheldon, 168. Dr. Hazeliuss's History of the Lutheran Church, 170. The Relations of Christianity to War. Rev. Dr. Smyth, 170.

No. 2.—Napoleon and his Marshals. By J. T. Headley, 133. The Religious Instruction of the Colored Population. Sermon by Rev. J. B. Adger; Notice by Dr. Thornwell, 137. The Conquest of Peru. Wm. H. Prescott, 150.

No. 3.—Notes on the Parables. Richard Chenevix Trench, A. M., 153. History of the Christian Religion and Church. Translated from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. Joseph Torrey, 154. The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit. James Buchanan, 155. Personal Declension and Revival of Religion in the Soul. Rev. Octavius Winslow, 156. The Lands of the Bible. John Wilson, D. D., 158. The Protector: A Vindication. J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, D. D., 159. Life and Opinions of Madame de la Mothe Guyon. Prof. Thos. C. Upham, 161. History of Speculative Philosophy. J. D. Morell, A. M., 162. Christianity and its Relations to Poetry and Philosophy, 163.

No. 4.—Suggestions on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes. Charles Colcock Jones, D. D., 154. A Grammar of the Mpongwe Language, 156. The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. J. H. Melville, 157. The Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, in Greek with English Notes. Rev. J. A. Spencer, A. M., 158. The Glory of Woman. C. C. Jones, D. D., 159.

## VOL. II.

No. 1.—The Work Claiming to be the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, including the Canons, 133. Francis Turretini Opera, 136. Germany, England, and Scotland; or, Recollections of a Swiss Minister, J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, D. D., 138. Christ and Anti-Christ. Rev. S. J. Cassells, 139. The Theses of Erastus touching Excommunication, 141. Thirteenth Annual Report of the Association for the Religious Instruction of Negroes in Liberty County, Ga., 143. Our Saviour's Example. Discourse by Rev. S. K. Talmage, D. D., 144. General History of the Christian Religion and Church. Translated by Rev. Joseph Torrey, 145. The Life of Jesus Christ, in its Historical

Connexion and Development, 147. Thoughts on Family Worship. Rev. James W. Alexander, 148. Now and Then. Samuel Warren, F. R. S., 149. Thoughts on the Religious Instruction of Negroes of this Country. William S. Plumer, 150. Sketches of Protestantism in Italy, Past, Present, etc. Robert Baird, 151. Memoir of Rev. David Abeel, D. D., late Missionary to China. Rev. G. R. Williamson, 152. The Power of the Pulpit. Gardner Spring, 152. Oration by Rev. Wm. T. Hamilton, 153. Letter from Gutzlaff, 154.

No. 2.—Substance of an Argument against the Indiscriminate Incorporation of Churches and Religious Societies. Wm. S. Plumer, 294. Apostolic Confirmations. Rev. James S. Allen, 299. The Czar, his Court and People, etc. John S. Maxwell, 300. Life, Letters, and Remains of Rev. Robert Pollock, D. D. James Scott, D. D., 302. The Mysteries of Godliness. Rev. Samuel L. Southard, A. M., 303. Exposition of Sermon on the Mount. John W. Parker, 304. Differences between Old and New School Presbyterians. Rev. Lewis Cheeseman, 305. Union to Christ and to his Church. Thomas Smyth, D. D., 307. The Agency devolving on White Men in Missions to Western Africa. Rev. J. Leighton Wilson, 307. Addresses at the Inauguration of Rev. R. C. Grier, President of Erskine College, 308. The First Annual Report of the Southern Baptist Publication Society, 309. The Advantages of Sabbath School Instruction. Rev. C. D. Mallory, 309.

No. 3.—Apostolic Confirmation, 442. Oration before the Charleston Library Society. James L. Pettigru, LL. D., 443. Revealed Religion. Samuel Gilman, D. D., 449. Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, 452. A new Translation, etc. Vol. I., Genesis, 455. Elements of Plane and Spherical Trigonometry. Professor Williams, 457. Popery, Alexander T. McGill, D. D., 458. The Women of the American Revolution. Elizabeth F. Ellet, 459. Christian Psalmody. Rev. E. Cater, 459. History of the Jesuits. Andrew Steinmetz, 460. The Family Companion. B. M. Palmer, D. D., 461. The Valiant Man. John C. Lord, D. D., 462.

No. 4.—Greek-English Lexicon, 591. Englishman's Greek Concordance, 594. Discourse (Heb. vi. 4–6.) Rev. C. A. Stillman, 595. Two Discourses on the Popular Objections to the Doctrine of Election. H. A. Boardman, D. D., 596. Biblia Hebraica, 597. Key to the Book of Revelation, 598. University Sermons. Francis Wayland, 598. Phrenology Examined. N. L. Rice, D. D., 607. Nineveh and its Remains. Austin Henry Layard, Esq., D. C. L., 609. A Sermon on the Death of Rev. W. M. Atkinson, D. D. Rev. Beverly T. Lacy, 610. The Mecklenberg Declaration: Supplementary Notice, 611.

### VOL. III.

No. 2.—Loyola and Jesuitism in its Rudiments. Isaac Taylor, 322. An Address, etc. E. D. McMaster, 323. An Inquiry into the Alleged Tendency of the Separation of Convicts one from the other, to produce Disease and Derangement, 324. A Memoir of the Life of James Milnor,

D. D. Rev. Jno. S. Stone, D. D., 325. Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition to the River Jordan, etc., 327. A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. Dr. Jno. C. L. Gieseler, 331. The Progress of Ethnology. Jno. Russell Bartlett, 333. The Preadamite Earth. Jno. Harris, D. D., 333. Man Primeval. The same Author, 333. Two Lectures on the Connexion between the Biblical and Physical History of Man. Josiah C. Nott, M. D., 334.

No. 3.—The Life of Ashbel Green, 559. The present position of the Medical Profession in Society. Paul F. Eve, M. D., 560. Expository Lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians. Rev. Robt. J. McGhee, A. M., 561. The Works of Leonard Woods, D. D., 561. Howard and the Prison—World of Europe, 562. Philosophic Theology. James W. Miles, 564. A Pattern of Mercy and Holiness—Discourse by Thos. Smyth, D. D., 569. The Complaint. Edward Young, LL. D., 570. The Provincial Letters of Blaise Pascal, 570. Domestic Portraiture, 570. Reasons for Public Thanksgiving. S. K. Talmage, D. D., 571.

No. 4.—A History of Colonisation on the Western Coasts of Africa. Archibald Alexander, D. D., 672. Sketches of Virginia, Historical and Biographical. Wm. Henry Foote, D. D., 673. Thoughts on Public Prayer. Samuel Miller, D. D., 674. The Footsteps of Messiah. Rev. W. Lease, 675. A Treatise on Justification. Geo. Junkin, D. D., 677. Thoughts on Sacramental Occasions, 677. The Blood of the Cross. Rev. Horatius Bonar, 680. The Present Earth, the Remains of a Former World. Robt. W. Gibbes, M. D., 682. An Address on the Sphere, Interest, and Importance of Geology. R. T. Brumby, M. A., 682. Cardiphonia; or, the Utterance of the Heart. Rev. John Newton, 685. The Christian's Daily Walk. Henry Scudder, 686. Converse with God in Desertion and Solitude. Richard Baxter, 687. Is Christianity from God? Jno. Cumming, D. D., 687. Plain Thoughts about Great and Good Things, 688. Conversations of a Father with his Children, 688. Madagascar and its Martyrs, 689. The Little Italian Boy, 689. The Bedfordshire Tinker, 690. The Doctrine of the Unity of the Human Race examined on the Principles of Science. Jno. Bachman, D. D., 690.

#### VOL. IV.

No. 1.—The Fathers and the Children. Sermons by Rev. W. W. Eells, 142. Pious Meditations and Devout Breathings. Jos. Hall, D. D., 148. The Kingdom of God. Rev. Chas. K. Imbrie, 149. Memories of the Life and Writings of Thos. Chalmers, D. D., LL. D. Rev. Wm. Hanna, LL. D., 150. Practical Sermons. Archibald Alexander, D. D., 151. Daily Bible Illustrations. John Kitto, D. D., F. S. A., 152.

No. 2.—A Sermon on Election. Rev. Francis Bowman, 294. The Doctrine of Election. Rev. E. P. Rogers, 294. God Sovereign and Man Free. N. L. Rice, D. D., 296. Letters of the Rev. Samuel Rutherford, etc., Rev. A. A. Bonar, 298.—Annual (1850) Report of Board of Missions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church

in the United States of America, 300. Thirty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education, 300. The Psalms Translated and Explained. J. A. Alexander, 301. The Life of Luther, etc. Barnas Sears, D. D., 302. Prejudice and its Antidote. W. T. Hamilton, D. D., 302. The Testimony of Science to the Truth of the Bible. Rev. B. M. Smith, 303. Conscience and the Constitution. Moses Stuart, 303.

No. 3.—Blunt's Coincidences, and Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, 426. The Spiritual Garden, 427. Bethany; or, the Sickness, Death, and Resurrection of Lazarus. Rev. R. M. McCheyne, 427. The Redeemer's Legacy. Rev. W. J. McCord, 427. A Dialogue between a Presbyterian and a "Friend," 428. Prize Essays on the Temporal Advantages of the Sabbath, 428. Memories of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers, D. D., LL. D., 429. The Death and Funeral Ceremonies of John Caldwell Calhoun, 430. Two Years in Upper India. John C. Lowrie, 431. The Soldier of the Cross; Practical Exposition of Ephesians vi. 10–18. John Leyburn, D. D., 431. Daily Bible Illustrations. John Kitto, D. D., F. S. A., Vol. 2d. 432. A Brief Treatise on the Canon and Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. Alex. McClelland, 432. The Parables of Jesus. Frederic Gustav Lisca, 433. The Principles of Geology explained and viewed in their relations to Revealed and Natural Religion. Rev. David King, LL. D., 433. The Method of the Divine Government. Jas. McCosh, A. M., 434. Evils of Disunion. Robert Davidson, D. D., 443. The American Union. H. A. Boardman, D. D., 443. The American Citizen, J. M. Krebs, D. D., 443. The Higher Law. John C. Lord, D. D., 444. A Sermon on the Duty of Citizens with respect to the Slave Law. G. F. Kittrell, 444. America Discovered. A Poem, 452.

No. 4.—Home Influence. Grace Aguilar, 590. The Mother's Recompence. Grace Aguilar, 590. Responses from the Sacred Oracles. Richard W. Dickinson, D. D., 591. An Earnest Search for Truth. L. A. Lowry, 592. The Foot-Prints of the Creator. H. Miller, 592.

#### VOL. V.

No. 1.—Report of a General Plan for the Promotion of Public and Personal Health, 144. Lectures on Theology. John Dick, D. D., 156. Crumbs from the Land of Cakes. John Knox, 158. The Authority of God; or, the True Barrier against Romish and Infidel Aggression. J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, 159. Midnight Harmonies. Octavius Winslow, M. A., 160. Brown's Expository Discourses on First Peter, 161. African Slavery consistent with the Moral and Physical Progress of a Nation. C. G. Memminger, 163. Christ's Second Coming. Rev. David Brown, A. M., 167. Henry's Life and Times of Calvin, 168. Truth and Error. Rev. H. Bonar, 169. Lays of the Kirk and Covenant. Mrs. A. S. Monteath, 169. The Broken Bud, 170. Letters to my Pupils. Mrs. L. H. Sigourney, 170. The Believer's Daily Remembrancer. Rev. James Smith, 170. Addresses of Rev. S. L. Graham, D. D., and of Rev. F. S. Sampson, D. D., at their Inauguration,

171. The Committing of our Cause to God. Rev. Ferdinand Jacobs, 171. Fugitive Slave Law. Ichabod S. Spencer, D. D., 171. A Discourse. Rev. W. W. Eells, 171. The Citizen and the Commonwealth. J. T. Tucker, 171. Plea for the Old against the New in Education. Rev. A. A. Porter, 171. Religion in Schools Vindicated. Rev. Jas. Hoyt, 171. A Tribute of Filial Affection. Samuel B. How, D. D., 171. Retribution provided for in the Laws of Nature. W. T. Hamilton, 171.

No. 2.—The British Squadron on the Coast of Africa. J. Leighton Wilson, D. D., 318.

No. 3.—Living or Dead. Rev. J. C. Ryle, B. A., 444. Henry's Life and Times of John Calvin, 445. Fairbairn's Typology of Scripture, 446. Bonar's Commentary on Leviticus, 446. Memoir of Rev. W. H. Hewitson. Rev. John Baillie, 447. Earnest Words to Young Men. E. P. Rogers, 449. The Dead of the Synod of Alabama. R. Nall, 451. Man his Brother's Keeper. S. K. Talmage, D. D., 451. Responsibilities of American Youth. W. T. Hamilton, 451. Necessity of continued Self-Education. Francis Lieber, 453. Smithsonian Reports, C. C. Jewitt, 453. Minutes of the Presbytery of Harmony, Minutes of the Presbytery of South Carolina, 455. Guicciardini and the Popes, 455. The Claims of Science. W. C. Richards, A. M., 455. Inaugural of Rev. E. F. Rockwell, 456. Hints on Female Education. Elias Marks, M. D., 456. Commentary on Ecclesiastes. Moses Stuart, 457. Hamilton's Royal Preacher, 457. Kitto's Daily Bible Illustrations, 458. Geology of the Bass Rock. H. Miller, 459.

No. 4.—Hanna's Memoirs of Dr. Thomas Chalmers, 601. Edgar's Variations of Popery, 602. Bible Dictionary (P. B. P.), 604. Presbyterian Tracts, 604. The Canon of the Old and New Testaments ascertained. Archibald Alexander, D. D., 605. Moriah; or, Sketches of the Sacred Rites of Ancient Israel. Rev. Robt. W. Fraser, M. A., 606. Ears of the Spiritual Harvest, 606. Life of a Vagrant, 606. Roger Miller; or, Heroism in Humble Life. Geo. Orme, 606. Life of Col. James Gardiner. P. Doddridge, D. D., 606. Charity and its Fruits. Jonathan Edwards, 607. The Christian Philosopher triumphing over Death. Newman Hall, B. A., 608. Songs in the House of my Pilgrimage, 609. Green Pastures. Rev. James Smith, 609. Still Waters. Rev. James Smith, 609. Sacramental Meditations. Rev. John Willison, 609. The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax. Richard Sibbes, D. D., 609. Lessons of Life and Death, 610. Memoir of Mrs. Agnes Andrew, of Paisley, 610. The Cripple, 610. Still Happy, 610. The Ragged Scholars, 610. Visit to the Holy Land, 610. The Laborer's Daughter, 610. Man: his Religion and his World, 610. My Father's God, 610. Three Last Things: Death, Judgment, Eternity. Rev. John Hambleton, 610. Light of the Dark Valley. Daniel Baker, D. D., 610. Address to Brothers. Same Author, 610. Decision. Grace Aguilar, 611. The Converted Unitarian, 611. Universalism False and Unscriptural, 611. Confessions of a Convert from Baptism in Water to Baptism with Water, 611. It is I. Newman Hall, B. A.,

612. Come to Jesus. Same Author, 612. Considerations for Days of Adversity, 612. The Brazen Serpent. J. H. Jones. D. D., 612. Sermons to Young Children, 612. My Own Book, 612. The Child's Poetical Keepsake, 612. The Alphabet of Birds, 612. The Works of Creation, 612.

## VOL. VI.

No. 1.—Testimony and Practice of the Presbyterian Church in reference to American Slavery. Rev. John Robinson, 138. Wesley and Methodism. Isaac Taylor, 141. Salander and the Dragon. Frederic Wm. Shelton, M. A., 142. Romanism at Home. Kirwan, 142. The Ruling Eldership. Rev. David King, LL. D., 143. Evidences of Christianity. University of Virginia Lectures, 1850–1, 143. The Bible in the Family, 144. Kitto's Daily Bible Illustrations, 145. The Lost Senses: Deafness and Blindness, 145. Wheat or Chaff? J. C. Ryle, 146. An Analysis and Summary of Thucydides, 146. An Analysis and Summary of Old Testament History, 147. The Heavenly Recognition. Rev. H. Harbaugh, 147. Dill's Miseries of Ireland, 148. Brett's Indian Tribes of Guiana, 149. God in Disease. James F. Duncan, M. D., 149. The Friend of Moses. W. T. Hamilton, D. D., 150. Christ our Example. Caroline Fry, 152. The Holy Testament, Translated from the Syriac Peshito Version. James Murdoch, D. D., 152. Historical Commentaries of the State of Christianity during the first 325 years. J. L. Mosheim, D. D., 153. The Revelation of St. John, E. W. Hengstenberg, 153.

No. 2.—Exploration and Survey of the Valley of the Great Salt Lake of Utah. Howard Stanislaus, 289. The Constitution of the United States. W. Hickey, 291. Discussions on Philosophy. Wm. Hamilton, 292. The Epistle of James. Dr. Augustus Neander, 293. The Works of John Owen (Goold), 294. A Digest of the Supreme Judiciary of the Presbyterian Church, 294. Counsels of the Aged to the Young. A. Alexander, D. D., 295. Early Religious History of John Barr, 295. An Affectionate Address to Fathers. D. Baker, D. D., 295. The Flower Transplanted, 295. Polyglot Bible, 296. The Presbyterian Psalmodist, 297. The Catechism of Scripture Doctrine and Practice. C. C. Jones, 298. On the Study of Words. R. C. Trench, B. D., 299. A Discourse on Domestic Missions. J. Leighton Wilson, D. D., 300.

No. 3.—The Scots Worthies. John Howie, 442. Daughters of China. Eliza J. G. Bridgman, 443. The Spring Time of Life. David Magie, D. D., 443. Daily Commentary, 444. Ancient Christianity Exemplified. Lyman Coleman, 445. The Bible the Book of the Lord, 447. Daily Readings. Caroline Fry, 448. Manual on the Christian Sabbath. J. Holmes Agnew, 448. Evidences for Heaven. Mrs. Thomasen Head (1650), 449. Memoirs of the Lives of Robert Haldane and James Alexander Haldane. By Alexander Haldane, Esq., 449. The Well-Watered Plains. H. M. Brinsmeade, D. D., 450. Romanism



as it is. John Cumming, D. D., 450. The True Source of National Happiness. Rev. H. B. Cunningham, 451. The Young Marooners. F. R. Goulding, 451. Pictorial Scenes; My Own Hymn Book; Grandmother's Parable; A Forest Flower; The Youth's Gleaner, 452.

No. 4.—Pastoral Theology. A. Vinet, 590. Female Piety. J. A. James, 591. The Diplomacy of the Revolution. W. H. Trescott, 592. Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Prof. Shedd, 593. On Lessons in Proverbs. R. C. Trench, B. D., 594. A Stranger Here. Rev. H. Bonar, 595. Letters on Clerical Manners and Habits. Samuel Miller, D. D., 595. Letters from a Father to his Sons in College. Samuel Miller, D. D., 595. Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Bonaparte, 596.

## VOL. VII.

No. 1.—D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation, 154. Boardman's Bible in the Counting House, 155. Plumer's Grace of Christ; Wood's Old and New Theology; Presbyterian Tracts; Letters to a Recent Convert; Bible Rhymes; The Short Prayer; Child's Catechism of Scripture History; Plain and Scriptural View of Baptism. D. Baker D. D., 156. The Old and New Schools, 158. Question Book on the Shorter Catechism. A. R. Baker, 159. The Translators Revived. A. W. McClure, 159. A Commentary on the Song of Solomon. Rev. Geo. Burrowes, 160.

No. 2.—Discoveries among the Ruins of Nineveh. Austin H. Layard, M. P., 293. The Parables of Spring, by Gausson, 295. The Defence of Luther and the Reformation. John Bachman, D. D., LL. D., 296. The Student of Philology. Rev. J. W. Miles, 298. A Letter to the Rev. Daniel Dana, D. D., on Prof. Parks' Theology of New England. Nathan Lord, 299. The Value and Sacredness of Divine Truth. Edwin Hall, 299. A Tract for the Times. S. J. Schmucker, D. D., 299. Spiritual Religion and Ceremonial Contrasted. Rev. J. H. Boccock, 299. The Christian Traveller. Rev. E. P. Rogers, 300.

No. 3.—Consolation. James W. Alexander, D. D., 447. Thoughts on the Death of Little Children. S. I. Prime, 447. Infidelity: Aspects, Causes, Agencies. Rev. T. Pearson, 449. *Septem Contra Thebas*. A. Sachtleben, 450. *De Porphyrii Studiis Homericis Capitulum Trias*. B. L. Gildersleeve, 450. The Christian Father's Present to his Children. J. A. James, 452. Jacqueline Pascal, 453. History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Rev. W. M. Hetherington, 453. A Complete Analysis of the Holy Bible. N. West, D. D., 454. The Law and the Testimony, 454. Scotia's Bards, 455. Abbeokuta. Miss Tucker, 456. Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians. John Brown, D. D., 456. The Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah. John Brown, D. D., 456. English Grammar. Rev. R. W. Bailey, A. M., 457. Water from the Well Spring. E. H. Bickersteth, 458. Powers of the World to Come. G. B. Cheever, D. D., 458. A Discourse on Church Extension in Cities. Wm. E. Schenck, 458. The Infant

Reader, 459. Inaugural Address. Rev. L. Eichelberger, 459. Colportage in Virginia and North Carolina, 459. Baccalaureate Address. George Junkin, D. D., 459. The Importance of Knowledge to the Soul of Man. R. H. Chapman, A. M., 459. Christian Patriotism. R. H. Chapman, A. M., 459. A Tract on the Best Mode of Evangelising the Slaves of the South, 459. Discourse on the Life and Character of Daniel Webster. H. A. Boardman, D. D., 460. Eulogy on Daniel Webster. Rev. C. Van Rensselaer, 460. History of the Cedar Grove Presbyterian Church. Rev. John Leaman, M. D., 460. Thanksgiving Discourse. S. K. Talmage, D. D., 460. The Two Plans. Rev. John G. Shepperson, 460. A Proper Early Training. S. K. Talmage, D. D., 460. A Discourse upon Government, Divine and Human. Rev. J. C. Coit, 460. The Incomprehensibility of God's Nature and Ways. W. S. Plumer, D. D., 460. The Low Value set upon Human Life in the United States. H. A. Boardman, D. D., 460. The Claims of Medicine to be regarded a Science. Paul F. Eve, M. D., 460.

No. 4.—Notes on the Gospels. M. W. Jacobus, 593. The Mission of the Comforter. J. C. Hare, M. A., 594. Noah and his Times. Rev. J. M. Olmstead, M. A., 595. History of the Apostolic Church. Philip Schaff, 596. Life and Labors of St. Augustine. Philip Schaff, 596. Emblems, Divine and Moral. Francis Quarles, 598. Genius and, Faith. Wm. C. Scott, 599. Homiletics. A. Vinet, D. D., 600. Connexion of Sacred and Profane History. D. Davidson, 601. Daily Bible Illustrations, 601. History of the French Protestant Refugees, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to Our Own Days. M. Charles Weiss, 602. Lectures on Female Scripture Characters. Wm. Jay, 603. Morning and Evening Exercises. Wm. Jay, 604. Right of the Bible in our Public Schools. George B. Cheever, D. D., 604. Rome against the Bible, and the Bible against Rome. Wm. S. Plumer, D. D., 604.

#### VOL. VIII.

No. 1.—Views of the Holy Trinity, 150. Premium Essay on the Characteristics and Laws of Prophetic Symbols. Rev. Edward Winthrop, A. M., 152.

No. 2.—Types of Mankind. J. C. Nott and G. R. Gleddon, 300. Daniel. W. A. Scott, D. D., 302. Ministering Children, 303. A Manual of Missions. John C. Lowrie, 303. A Notice of the Types of Mankind. John Bachman, D. D., 304.

3. Life and Epistles of St. Paul. Conybeare & Howson, 454. A South-Side View of Slavery. Neh. Adams, D. D., 455. Synonyms of the New Testament. R. C. Trench, 457. The Faithful Mother's Reward, 457. The Youth's Visitor, 457. Primary English Grammar. R. W. Bailey, A. M., 458. Lessons of the Madiai, and Visits to their Prisons, 458. The Captives of Abb's Valley, 458. The Justified Believer: His Security, etc. W. B. Mackenzie, A. M., 458. Memoir of Rev. Jos. W. Barr. E. P. Swift, D. D., 458. The History of Peter Thomson, 458. The Baby. Charlotte Elizabeth, 458. Anne Bell.

Charlotte Elizabeth, 458. The Pictorial Second Book, 458. Scripture Natural History, 459. Witnesses for Christ, 459. Why Will Ye Die? Rev. W. J. McCord, 459. The Story of Nineveh, 459. J. H. and his Nurse, and the Child's Prayer, 459. Devotional Poetry, 459. Thoughts on the Resurrection of the Body, 459. The Waldenses, 460. Defence of Denominational Education. R. C. Smith, 460. Reviews of the Doctrines of the Board of Education, etc., upon the Relations of the Church to the General Interests of Education. C. R. Vaughan, 460. The Influence of Missions on People and Nations. Rev. Wm. H. Mitchell, 460. Study, the only Sure Means of Ultimate Success. Hon. William H. Stiles, 460.

No. 4.—True Practice of Religion. Rev. Ewaldus Kiest, D. D., 598. Bronchitis and Kindred Diseases. W. W. Hall, 599. The Characteristics and Laws of Figurative Language. Dav. W. Lord, 600. The World in the Middle Ages. A. L. Koeppen, 601. An Historical Text Book and Atlas of Biblical Geography. Lyman Coleman, 602. Manual of Sacred History. J. H. Kurtz, D. D., 602. History of French Literature in the 18th Century. Alex. Vinet, 603. First Lines of Christian Theology. John Pye Smith, D. D., 604. Leila Ada, the Jewish Convert. O. W. T. Heighway, 605. What is Calvinism. W. D. Smith, D. D., 605. South-Side View of Slavery. Neh. Adams, D. D., 606. English Past and Present. R. C. Trench, B. D., 607. The Remains of the Rev. Richard Cecil, 607. The Faithful Mother's Reward, 607. Moral and Religious Anecdotes. John Whitecross, 608. Devotional Poetry, 608. Sabbath-Day Readings, 608. The Youth's Visitor, 608. The Blind Man and the Pedlar, 608. White Lies and Little Oaths, 608. The Rosebud and Other Stories, 608. The Words of Jesus, 609. Presbyterian Tracts, 609. Paul's Argument for Home Missions, G. Spring, D. D., 609. The Rights of the Pulpit and Perils of Freedom. E. B. Foster, 609. A Letter of Inquiry to Ministers of the Gospel of all Denominations, on Slavery. Nathan Lord, D. D., 610. God's Way in the Deep. C. Van Rensselaer, D. D., 610. A Sermon before the Brainard Evangelical Society, 611. Thanksgiving Discourse. Rev. P. J. Tinslow, 611. Attainments of Man in Secular and Religious Knowledge Contrasted. Rev. Jos. H. Jones, 611. Fifty Years a Pastor. John McDowell, D. D., 611. Proceedings of the Union Missionary Convention and the Address of Rev. Dr. Duff, 611. Continuation of the Review of "Nott & Gliddon's Types of Mankind." J. Bachman, D. D., 611. Patience Essential to Success. S. K. Talmage, D. D., 612. The Shadow and Sorrow of Savannah, 612. Inauguration of Rev. John McLean, D. D., 612. Our Slaves should have the Bible. R. A. Fair, Esq., 612. Report of Hon. James Meacham on the Distribution of the Income of the Smithsonian Fund, 612. Civil and Religious Toleration. Wm. S. Barry, 612. The Temporal Power of the Pope, Dangerous to the Religious and Civil Liberties of the American Republic. R. C. Grundy, D. D., 612. Address to the Ministers, Elders, and People connected with the Presbytery of Baltimore, upon the subject of Systematic Beneficence, 612. Semi-Centennial Celebration of the South Carolina College, 612.

## VOL. IX.

No. 1.—College Discipline. D. H. Hill, 154. Monumental History of Egypt. Wm. Osborne, R. S. L., 156. Uhleman's Syriac Grammar. Enoch Hutchinson, 157. Miscellaneous Works of Matthew Henry, 159. Minutes of General Assembly, 1821-35, 159. Memoirs of Walter M. Lowrie, 159. Monitory Letters to Church Members, 159. Sketches of the Presbyterian Church, 159. The Book of Popery. Ingraham Cobbin, M. A., 160. Bohemian Martyrs, 160. The Perseverance of the Saints, 160. The Youth's Casket of Gems and Pearls, 160. Lily among Thorns, and Old Gabriel, 160. The Boat and the Drowned Officer, 160. Fear not a Rest in Christ, 160. Adam and Christ. E. C. Wines, D. D., 160. Mary Searching for Jesus. James Drummond, 160. Warning Cry from Niagara, 160. Child's Catechism of Scripture History, 160.

No. 2.—Ridgely's Body of Divinity, 300. Which? The Right or the Left? 301. Christian Theism. R. A. Thompson, 302. Theism. Rev. John Tulloch, D. D., 302. Alleghan. N. M. Gordon, 303. Select Works of Rev. Thomas Boston, 303. The Acts and Monuments of the Church, 304. Russia as it is. Count A. DeGarowski, 305. The Southern Cross and Southern Crown. Miss Jackson, 305. Sermons and Essays by the Tennents and their Contemporaries, 306. Church Music, 306. Memoirs, etc., of John Urquhart, Wm. Orme, 307. The Footsteps of St. Paul, 308. A Memorial of F. S. Sampson, D. D., 308. Learning to Converse, 309. The Christ of History. John Young, M. A., 309. Of Temptation. John Owen, D. D., 310. Introduction to Physiology. M. LaBorde, M. D., 310. The Acts of the Apostles. M. Baumgarten, 311. Stier's Words of Jesus, 312. Reformers before the Reformation. Dr. C. Ullman, 312. Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy. Patrick Fairbairn. D. D., 312.

No. 3.—A Collection of the Acts, etc., of the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church, 462. The Sceptical Era in Modern History. T. M. Post, 463. Modern Pilgrims. George Wood, 464. Suggestions on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes. C. C. Jones, D. D., 465. The Priest, the Puritan, and the Preacher. Rev. J. C. Ryle, 466. Union Bible Dictionary, 466. Old and New Theology. James Wood, D. D., 467. India, Ancient and Modern. D. O. Allen, D. D., 467. Documentary History of the American Revolution. R. W. Gibbes, M. D., 468. Glances over the Field of Faith and Reason. Rev. R. K. Ashley, 470. The Presbyterian Family Almanac, 470. Slaveholding not Sinful. Samuel How, D. D., 471. An Historical Address. Rev. S. C. Alexander, 471. A Dedication Sermon. Rev. John Douglas, 472. Our Obligations to God. Sermon by Rev. E. P. Rogers, 472. The Glory of Woman is the Fear of the Lord, 472. The Exigencies of the Church, 472. Campbellism. J. L. Rice, D. D., 472.

## VOL. X.

No. 1.—What is Free Masonry? T. S. Gourdin, 137. History and

Repository of Pulpit Eloquence. H. C. Fish, 139. The Constitution of the Human Soul. Richard S. Storrs, Jr., D. D., 141. Central Africa. T. J. Bowen, 144. Westward Empire, the Great Drama of Human Progress. E. L. Magoon, 149. Biographical Dictionary. John L. Blake, D. D., 150. The Doctrine of Baptisms. George D. Armstrong, D. D., 151. Plantation Sermons. Rev. A. F. Dickson, 152. Hazael: Know Thyself. Rev. A. F. Dickson, 152. Sinai and Palestine. A. P. Stanley, M. A., 153. Villas and Cottages. Calvert Vaux, 153. Jehovah's Gracious Appeal to the Young. J. N. Waddell, D. D., 154. Logic: (1.) Elements. Henry P. Tappan; (2.) Elementary Treatise. W. D. Wilson, D. D.; (3.) Science of Logic. Rev. Asa Mahan, 154. Early History of the University of Virginia, 154. Why Do I Live? T. Smyth, D. D., 155. The Well in the Valley. T. Smyth, D. D., 155. By Whom is the World to be Converted? T. Smyth, D. D., 155. A List of 44 Books from the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 156.

No. 2.—Annals of the American Pulpit. W. B. Sprague, D. D., 334. The American Sunday-school and its Adjuncts. James Alexander, D. D., 335.

No. 3.—The Reviewer Reviewed. Reply to a Critique. T. S. Gourdin, 473. Inaugural Address of Rev. Lewis W. Green, D. D., 473. Constitution of the Society for the Relief of Indigent and Superannuated Ministers of the Presbyterian Church and their Families, 474. Certainty of the Final Triumph of the Gospel. J. A. Lyon, D. D., 475. Inaugural Address. Rev. Jas. P. Boyce, 475. Sermon on the Equality of Ministers of the Gospel. H. Mandeville, D. D., 476. Exposition of Epistle of Paul to the Phillippians. Rev. Jean Daille, 476. Daughters at School. Rev. Rufus W. Bailey, 477. Elect Lady. A. B. Van Zandt, D. D., 477. Thoughts on Prayer. Jonathan Greenleaf, 477. The Refuge, 477. Lucy Dunlevy. S. S. Egliseau, 477. Our Friends in Heaven. Rev. M. Killen, M. D., 477. Holy Life, etc., of Mr. John Janeway, 477. A List of 19 Books. Presbyterian Board of Publication, 478. Christian Missions in their Principles. Edw. P. Humphrey, 479. The Knowledge of God Objectively Considered. R. J. Breckinridge, D. D., LL. D., 481. Analytical Exposition of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. J. Brown, D. D., 482. Tholuck on the Psalms, 485. Memories of Bethany, 485. The City: its Sins and Sorrows, 485. Faithful Promises and Altar Stones, 486. Flavel's Exposition of the Shorter Catechism, 486. Elements of Algebra. Maj. D. H. Hill, 486. History of Williamsburgh Church, 487.

No. 4.—Sermons by Spurgeon, 1st, 2d, and 3d Series, 623. Saint and his Saviour. Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, 623. Memoir of Rev. John Brown. W. Brown, M. D., 625. List of 8 Juvenile Publications of Presbyterian Board of Publication, 626. Bourdon's Arithmetic, 627. Marrow of Modern Divinity. Edw. Fisher, 627. Autobiographical Sketches. Theo. Clapp, 628. History of the Presbyterian Church in America, from its Origin to 1760. Rev. Richard Webster, 630. The Technobaptist. R. B. Mayes, 631. Travels and Discoveries in North

and Central Africa. H. Barth, Ph. D., 632. *Missionary Travels in South Africa*. David Livingstone, LL. D., 636. *Mormonism—its Leaders and Designs*. John Hyde, Jr., 643.

## VOL. XI.

No. 1.—*Annals of the American Pulpit*. W. B. Sprague, D. D., 145. *A Manual of the Chaldee Language*. Elias Riggs, D. D., 146. *The Gospels in the Negro Patois of English*, by a Mandingo Slave, 148. *Slavery and the Remedy*. Samuel Nott, 150. *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of Kentucky*, 150. *Introduction to the Study of Logic*. E. V. Gerhardt, D. D., 151. *The City of the Great King*. J. T. Barclay, M. D., 152.

No. 2.—*Sermons of Rev. C. H. Spurgeon*, 344. *The New York Pulpit in the Revival of 1858*, 344. *List of 15 Books*, Presbyterian Board of Publication, 346. *List of 5 Books*. R. Carter & Bros., 348. *Select Discourses*. Monod, Krummacher, Tholuck, and Müller, 349. *The Reason Why*, 351. *The Church of God*. Stuart Robinson, D. D., 351.

No. 3.—*Notice of the Rev. J. B. Adger's Article on the Slave Trade*, 500. *Religion and the State*. Discourse by Rev. D. H. Porter, 502. *Religious Poems*. Mrs. M. Martin, 503. *Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians*. Rev. Jean Daille, 506. *The Divine Life*. Rev. John Kennedy. M. A., 506. *The Coming Reign of Christ*. David N. Lord, 506. *Sketches for You*, 507. *Ragged Tommy*, 507. *Bridget Sullivan*, 507. *How to Die Happy*, 507. *A Consideration of the Sermon on the Mount*. Maj. D. H. Hill, 508. *The Model Merchant*. *Memoirs of Samuel Budgett*, 508.

No. 4.—*The Acts of the Apostles Explained*, by J. A. Alexander, 665. *The Gospel according to Mark*. J. A. Alexander, 665. *The Power of Prayer*. S. I. Prime, 667. *Discourses on the Common Topics of Christian Faith and Practice*. Jas. W. Alexander, D. D., 668. *Sermons on the New Life*. Horace Bushnell, 668. *The Children of the Church, and Sealing Ordinances*, 670. *The Last Days of Jesus*. T. V. Moore, D. D., 672. *Annandale*, 672. *The Widow's Sixpence*. Josephine Nott, 672. *Plea for the Higher Culture of Woman*. Rev. T. A. Hoyt, 673. *Music and Woman*. Gustavus Jaeger, 673. *The Sheepfold and the Common*, 675. *List of 5 Books*, from Robert Carter & Bros., 675. *Nature and the Supernatural*. Horace Bushnell, 675. *Progress of Philosophy in the Past and in the Future*. Samuel Tyler, 676. *The Theology of Christian Experience*. George D. Armstrong, D. D., 676. *Christian Education in its Principles*. John N. Waddel, D. D., 678. *The Great, the Beautiful, and the Good*. Rev. W. A. McSwain, 679. *Darkness in the Flowery Land*. Rev. M. S. Culbertson, 679. *History of the Christian Church*. Philip Schaff, 679. *The Giant Judge*. W. A. Scott, D. D., 681. *List of 3 Books from the Presbyterian Board of Publication*, 682. *Revelation of John the Divine*. S. S. Ralston, 682. *An Inquiry into the Law of Negro Slavery in the United States*. T. R. R. Cobb, 682.

## VOL. XII.

No. 1.—Baird's Digest, 196. Presbyterian Historical Almanac. Joseph M. Wilson, 197. Memorial of the Futtehghur Mission. J. J. Walsh, 198. Message to Ruling Elders, 199. Our Historic Mission. B. M. Palmer, D. D., 203. The Pious Physician. B. M. Palmer, D. D., 203. What Think Ye? Parlor Preacher; Gospel Fountain. Presbyterian Board of Publication, 206. Life of Daniel Baker, D. D. Rev. Wm. M. Baker, 207. The Revelation of John the Divine. S. S. Ralston, 209. The Accepted Time. Rev. L. H. Chapman, 210. List of 6 Books from Presbyterian Board of Publication, 211. Hermeneutical Manual. P. Fairbairn, D. D., 211. An Inquiry into the Law of Negro Slavery in the United States. T. R. R. Cobb, 212. Centenary Sermon. Neil McKay; Centennial Historical Address. James Banks, Esq., 214. Remains of a Very Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, hitherto unknown in Europe. Wm. Cureton, D. D., 215.

No. 2.—Grammar of the New Testament Diction. Dr. G. B. Winer, 362. Commentary on the Gospel of John. Dr. Aug. Tholuck, 363. Sacred Lyrics from the German, 364. List of 14 Books from the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 365. A Consideration of the Sermon on the Mount. D. H. Hill, 366. A Life Devoted to Christ. Rev. John S. Harris, 366. Memoir, etc., of Edward Payson, D. D. Rev. Asa Cummings, 367. Commentaries on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews. E. C. Wines, D. D., 368. The Duties of the Eldership. Rev. R. K. Porter, 369.

No. 3.—History of the South Carolina College. M. LaBorde, M. D., 624. The Typology of Scripture. Patrick Fairbairn, D. D., 634. The Art of Extempore Speaking. M. Bautain, 634. Science and Art of Chess. J. Monroe, 634. The Pasha Papers, 635. Funeral Discourse on the Death of the Rev. Reuben Post, D. D. J. L. Kirkpatrick, D. D., 635. Funeral Sermon. Death of Mrs. Ann F. McClure. Rev. John Douglas, 635. The Living Epistle. Rev. Cornelius Tyree, 635. The Confession of Faith, 635. The Life of Gen. H. Havelock, K. C. B. J. T. Headley, 635. Blind Bartimeus. Rev. Wm. J. Hoge, 636. Sight and Hearing: How Preserved and how Lost. J. H. Clark, M. D., 636. Hours with my Pupils. Mrs. Lincoln Phelps, 637. Scenes in the Indian Country, 638. The Child a Hundred Years Old, 638. The Presbyterian Family Almanac, 638. Mosaics, 639. The Convalescent. N. Parker Willis, 640. List of nine Books from the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 640.

No. 4.—Grammar of the New Testament Diction. Dr. G. B. Winer, 816. Circumcision and Baptism. Rev. F. K. Nash, 817. Dick and his Friend Fidus. 819. No Lie Thrives, 819. List of ten Books from the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 820. Presbyterian Historical Almanac, 821. The English Bible. Rev. F. T. Brown, 822. Baird's Elohim Revealed, 824. Letters of John Calvin. Dr. Jules Bonnot, 824. Words of the Lord Jesus. Rudolph Stier, 826. Rambles among Words. Wm. Swinton, 827. Letters on Psalmody. Wm. Annan, 827. The Ancient Church. W. D. Killen, D. D., 828. His-

tory of the Church of Christ in Chronological Tables. H. B. Smith, D. D., 829. Lectures on the First Two Visions of the Book of Daniel. Wm. Newton, 831. The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. Robert Jamieson, D. D., 832. Parochial Lectures on the Psalms. David Caldwell, A. M., 832. Willie and Nellie, 833. Jesus Only, 833. List of eight Books from Presbyterian Board of Publication, 833. History of Upper South Carolina. John H. Logan, A. M., 834. Bench and Bar of South Carolina. John Belton O'Neill, LL. D., 835. The Greek Testament. Henry Alford, B. D., 837. Duty and Reward. Rev. W. Baird, 838. Memorial Sermon on the Death of Rev. Pierpont E. Bishop. Rev. J. H. Saye, 838.

## VOL. XIII.

No. 1.—Commentary on the Pentateuch. Otto von Gerlach, 211. Observations on Malarial Fever. Jos. Jones, M. D., 212. Stier's Words of Jesus; Stier's Words of the Risen Saviour, 213. Minutes of the Synod of South Carolina, 1859, 214. The Revival in Ireland, 214. Grace and Glory. James Wood, D. D., 215. Lectures on Thessalonians. John Lillie, D. D., 215. The Divine Human in Scripture. Tayler Lewis, 216. Lectures on the Book of Revelation. C. M. Butler, D. D., 216. The Historical Books of the Holy Scriptures. Robert Jamieson, D. D., 217. Benoni. Rev. Dr. Barth, 217. Books of Presbyterian Board of Publication, 217. Catalogues of the Princeton, Allegheny, Union, Columbia, Danville, and Northwestern Seminaries, 218.

No. 2.—Lessons about Salvation. Rev. A. F. Dickson, 418. Sermons. Jos. A. Alexander, D. D., 422. Forty Years' Familiar Letters of Jas. W. Alexander, D. D., 423. The Christian Ethics of Eating and Drinking. Rev. W. T. Findley, 424. Esther and her Times, 425. The Words of the Lord Jesus. Rudolph Stier, 425. The Perils of Licentiousness, 426. The Peaks of Otter, 426. Man, Moral and Physical. J. H. Jones, D. D., 426. Right at Last, and other Tales, 428. The Three Clerks. Anthony Trollope, 428. The West Indies, and the Spanish Main. Same Author, 428. A Mother's Trials, 429. Cicero on Oratory and Orators. J. S. Watson, 429. Natural History, 429. A Smaller History of Greece, from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest. Wm. Smith, LL. D., 429. History of Genghis Khan. Jacob Abbott, 429. The Stars and the Angels, 430. The Titles of our Lord, adopted by Himself. Rev. J. M. Randall, 430. Science in Theology. Rev. A. S. Farrar, 431. List of Books from Presbyterian Board of Publication, 431. The Status of the Baptized Children. Rev. A. W. Miller, 432. The Nahash Origin of the Black and Mixed Races. C. B. Thompson, 433. The Biblical Reason Why, 434. Memorial of J. A. Alexander, D. D., 435. A List of nine Books from the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 435.

No. 3.—The Land and the Book. W. M. Thomson, D. D., 624. The Eldership. Rev. J. O. Lindsay, 625. Catechism for the Oral Instruction of Colored Persons. Rev. J. L. Girardeau, 626. The Chris-



tian Law of Marriage. R. Dunning, 628. The Sunday Question. Charles D. Drake, 629. An Historical Discourse. John C. Backus, 630. Conscience and Civil Government. Rev. J. L. Girardeau, 632. Historical Sketch of the First Presbyterian Church, Fort Wayne, Indiana. J. L. Williams, 632. Rejoinder to the *Princeton Review* upon the Elohim Revealed. S. J. Baird, 632. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Rev. S. D. Alexander, 633. Euripides. Frederic A. Paley, 633. Services on the Occasion of the Ordination of the Rev. F. P. Mullally, and the installation of Rev. J. H. Thornwell, D. D., and Rev. F. P. Mullally as co-pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Columbia, S. C., 634. A Brief Treatise on Canon and Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. Alex. McClelland, 634. An Address on Commencement Day of Laurensville Female College. Prof. Jos. LeConte, 635. The Divine Purpose Explained. Rev. Geo. Morton, 635. Five Years in China. Charles Taylor, M. D., 636. Castle Richmond. Anthony Trollope, 636. Chapters on Wives. Mrs. Ellis, 637. The Woman in White. Wilkie Collins, 637. Outlines of Theology. Rev. A. A. Hodge, 638. Rosa; or, The Parisian Girl, 638. List of five Books from the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 639. Ladies' Southern Florist. Mrs. Mary C. Rion, 639. The Kingdom of God. D. X. Junkin, D. D., 640. Italy in Transition. Wm. Arthur, A. M., 640. List of four Books, 641. Text Book of Church History. J. H. Kurtz, 641.

No. 4.—Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. Dr. A. Tholuck, 890. Studies in Animal Life. Geo. H. Lewes, 890. Work and Conflict. Rev. John Kennedy, 891. The Rock of Ages, etc. Edward H. Bickersteth, M. A., 891. Words of Wisdom, 891. Palissy, the Huguenot Potter. C. L. Brightwell, 892. The Church—its Constitution and Government. Rev. Stuart Mitchell, 893. Am I a Christian? And how am I to know it? 893. The Life of Rev. Richard Knill, of St Petersburg. Rev. C. M. Birrell, 893. The Young Hop Pickers, 893. The Lake Regions of Central Africa. Richard F. Burton, 893. Travels in the Regions of the Upper and Lower Amoor, etc. T. W. Atkinson, 894. My Novel. Pisistratus Caxton, 894. Tom Brown at Oxford, 894. The Queens of Society, 895. The Four Georges, 895. Wheat and Tares, 895. Our Year, 895. Faraday's Lectures on the Various Forces of Matter, 895. The Five Senses. Geo. Wilson, M. D., 896. Sketch of the Life, etc., of Phillip Lindsley, D. D. L. J. Halsey, D. D., 896. Life Pictures from the Bible. Same Author, 896. The Beautiful City and the King of Glory. Woodbury Davis, 897. Analysis of the Cartoons of Raphael. C. B. Norton, 897. First Report of the Cotton Planters' Convention of Georgia. Jos. Jones, M. D., 898. Agricultural Resources of Georgia. Same Author, 898. Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman. J. F. H. Claiborne, 898. Odd People. Mayne Reid, 899.

#### VOL. XIV.

No. 2.—Commentary on the Epistles of St. John. Dr. J. H. A.

VOL. XXXV., NO. 1—4.

Ebrard, 349. Calendar of State Papers. W. Noel Sainbury, Esq., 351. A New Digest of the General Assembly. Wm. E. Moore, 352. Commentary on Ecclesiastes, &c. E. W. Hengstenburg, D. D., 353. The Beauty of Immanuel. L. J. Halsey, D. D., 354. Words of Wisdom Illustrated and Applied, 355. Cares and Comforts, 355. The Child's Mission, 355. Remarkable Escapes from Peril, 355. A Mother's Prayers Answered, 355. Marion Leslie, 355. Mackerel Will, 356. The New Parasol, 356. Blind Bartimæas. W. J. Hoge, D. D., 356. Marcia and Ellen, the Drunkard's Children, 357. The Flower Boy of the Prairie, 357. Sketches from the History of Jericho, 357. The Rocket, 358. The Jail Bird, 358. May Coverly, 358. Coins, Medals, and Seals, Ancient and Modern. W. C. Prime, 358. Children's Picture Book of Quadrupeds and Other Mammalia, 359. Children's Bible Picture Book, 359. Stories of Rainbow and Lucky. Jacob Abbott, 360.

## VOL. XVII.

No. 1.—D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation in the Times of Calvin, 112. Commentary on Second Epistle of Peter. J. T. Demarest, D. D., 117. Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, 121. Ecce Homo, 124. Ticknor's Life of William Hickling Prescott, 130. The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell, afterwards Mrs. Milton. Miss Maunings, 133. The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua. Bishop Colenso, 138. A Critical History of Free Thought in Reference to the Christian Religion. Adam Story Farrar, A. M., 143.

No. 2.—A List of Thirteen Books by Mrs. Charles, 285. How to Study the New Testament. H. Alford, D. D., 290. The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation. W. Cunningham, D. D., 294.

No. 3.—D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation, &c., 378. A Plea for the King's English. H. Alford, D. D., 387. Nicodemus with Jesus. Rev. J. M. P. Otts, 391. Historical Theology. Wm. Cunningham, D. D., 396. Studies in the Book of Psalms. W. S. Plumer, D. D. LL.D., 415. The Law of God. W. S. Plumer, D. D., LL.D., 422. Passages in the Life of the Faire Gospeller, Mistress Annie Askew, 423. Discussions on Church Principles. Wm. Cunningham, D. D., 429.

## VOL. XVIII.

No. 1.—The Poetical Books of the Holy Scriptures. Fausset & Smith, 167. Classic Baptism. Rev. James W. Dale, 169. The Life of Daniel Dana, D. D., 175. Hunting a Home in Brazil. J. McF. Gaston, M. D., 176. Cyclopædia, Biblical, Theological, Ecclesiastical, 179. New America. W. H. Dixon, 182.

No. 2.—Christocracy. Demarest & Gordon, 301. Ecce Deus, 313. The Giant Cities of Bashan. Rev. J. L. Porter, 315. Shaw's Manual of English Literature, 323. Campaigns of the Army of the Potomac. Wm. Swinton, 328.

No. 3.—Studies in the Gospels. R. C. Trench, D. D., 433. The Christ of the Apostles' Creed. W. A. Scott, D. D., 440. Homiletics and Pastoral Theology. W. G. T. Shedd, D. D., 442.

No. 4.—The Rock of Our Salvation. W. S. Plumer, D. D., LL. D., 566. The Household of Sir Thomas More, 568. Jacques Barneval, or the Days of the Dragonnades, 576. The Negro. Ariel, 579. Nojoque. H. R. Helper, 579. A Defence of Virginia. R. L. Dabney, D. D., 589.

## VOL. XIX.

No. 1.—The Person of Christ. Philip Schaff, D. D., 134. Natural History. Sanborn Tenney, A. M., 139. Elements of Political Economy. A. L. Perry, 142. On Both Sides of the Sea, 148.

No. 2.—Ecce Ecclesia, 295. The Book of Praise. Roundell Palmer, 298. The Christian Ministry. Rev. Charles Bridges, 300. Ecce Deus-Homo, 302. Memories of Olivet. J. R. Macduff, D. D., 303. An Apology for African Methodism. B. T. Tanner, 305.

No. 3.—Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Wm. Lindsay, D. D., 449. Spiritual Progress, 450. The Old Roman World. John Lord, LL. D., 453. Stephens's Constitutional View of the Late War, 458. The Life of Jefferson Davis. F. H. Alfriend, 461.

No. 4.—Smyth's Ecclesiastical Catechism, 588. Centurions of the Gospel. W. A. Scott, D. D., 595. In the School-Room. J. S. Hart, LL. D., 598. Keith's Lectures on Calvinistic Doctrines, 601. Light and Truth. H. Bonar, D. D., 604. A History of the New School. S. J. Baird, D. D., 605.

## VOL. XX.

No. 1.—Ewer's Protestantism a Failure, 121. Ten years on the Euphrates. Rev. C. H. Wheeler, 427. The Negro at Home. Lindley Spring, 131. James's Earnest Ministry, 137. Greater Britain. C. W. Dilke, 141. Day's Art of Composition, Art of Discourse, and Elements of Logic, 147.

No. 2.—Smyth's Ecclesiastical Catechism, Our Form of Government, and the Committee of Publication, 262. Barnes on the Psalms, 269. Bunting's Manual of the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn., 272. Moral Uses of Dark Things. H. Bushnell, 273. The Greek Testament with Notes. Chr. Woodsworth, D. D., 277. The Greek Testament with Notes. H. Alford, D. D., 277. Modern Representations of the Life of Jesus. Dr. G. Uhlhorn, 280. Seekers after God. Rev. F. W. Farrar, 284. Anti-Nicene Christian Library. Drs. Roberts and Donaldson, 286. Yesterday, To-day, and Forever. H. Bickersteth, M. A., 287.

No. 3.—The Life of Samuel Miller, D. D., LL. D., 419. Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit, 424. A Defence of Presbyterian Baptism. Rev. H. B. Pratt, 426. Hades and Heaven. Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, M. A., 427. The Christian Sabbath Vindicated. Ignotus, 432. Ecce

Cœlum : Parish Astronomy, 436. Baptism *versus* Immersion. George B. Jewett, 439. A Letter to the Bible Union, etc. Same Author, 439. Bungere's Life of Calvin, 443.

No. 4.—Tischendorf's New Testament, 575. The Theory of the Eldership. P. C. Campbell, D. D., 578. Schele De Vere's Studies in English, 582. Conybeare and Howson's Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 586. Powers' Pivot Words of Scripture, 588. Gibson's Public Worship of God, 592. Barnes's Notes on the Psalms, 596. DeFonville's Thunder and Lightning, 598. Marion's Wonders of Optics, 600.

#### VOL. XXI.

No. 1.—Credo, 135. Hood's Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets, 140. Plumer's Earnest Hours, 142. Smith's Students' Scripture History, 143. Guizot's Great Christians of France, Calvin and St. Louis, 144. No. 2.—Dale's Judaic Baptism, 294. Reynolds' Pictorial Readers, 300.

No. 3.—DePressensé's Religion and Reign of Terror, 459. Washburn's Reminiscences of the Indians, 471. Innes' Laws of Creeds in Scotland, 473. Moncreiff's Creeds and Churches in Scotland, 473. Inglis's Bible Text Cyclopædia, 475. Sorrow. Rev. John Reid, 476. Stephens's Constitutional View of the Late War. Vol. II., 479.

No. 4.—D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation in Time of Calvin, 593. Broadus's Preparation and Delivery of Sermons, 614. Goulburn's Pursuit of Holiness, 615.

#### VOL. XXII.

No. 1.—Dabney's Sacred Rhetoric, 173. Doedes' Manual of Hermeneutics, 175. Freese's Old World, 177. Hudson's Greek and English Concordance of the New Testament, 178. Hart's Manual of Composition, 181. Zincke's Extemporary Preaching, 181. Searing's Æneid, 182. Mrs. Preston's Old Song and New, 182. Grasty's Faith's Battles and Victories, 186.

No. 2.—Parker's *Ad Clerum*. Advices to Young Preacher, 311. Anderson's History of the Evangelisation of the Sandwich Islands, 312. Plumer's Short Sermons for the People, 316. Gilfillan's Martyrs, Heroes, and Bards of the Scotch Covenant, 318. Epistle to the Hebrews compared with the Old Testament, 319.

No. 3.—Martin on the Atonement, 429. Quirinus's Letters on the Council, 434. Anderson on Regeneration, 440. Barnes's Prayers for Families, 445. Geer's Conversion of St. Paul, 448. Life of the Rev. Dr. George Junkin, 449.

No. 4.—Questions of Modern Thought: or, Lectures on the Bible, 600. The Divine Human; or, Some Remarks on Inspiration and Atonement, 603. Among my Books, 609.

#### VOL. XXIII.

No. 1.—Dorner's History of Protestant Theology, 129. Comedy of

Convocation, 135. Milner's Religious Demonstrations, 141. Dale's Johannic Baptism, 145. Hefele's History of Christian Councils, 147. Memminger's What is Religion? 149.

No. 2.—Mrs. Preston's Works, 335. Church's Seed Truths, 345. Lord's Prophetic Imperialism, 348.

No. 3.—Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek. Frederick Gardner, D. D., 460. The Government of the Kingdom of Christ. Rev. J. M. Porteus, 463. Life in the Exode. A. D. Pollock, 466. Princeton College during the Eighteenth Century. Samuel Davies Alexander, 469. A Commentary on the Old and New Testament. Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, 470. Neither Rome nor Judah, etc., 472. The Reviewers Reviewed. A. H. Stephens, 473.

No. 4.—Killen's Old Catholic Church, 655. Bartle's Scripture Doctrine of Hades, 656. Duke of Somerset's Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism, 657.

#### VOL. XXIV.

No. 1.—Memminger's Present Issues, 164. Dr. Plumer on the Hebrews, 166.

No. 2.—Discourses at the Inauguration of Rev. A. B. Van Zandt, D. D., 317. Gough's New Testament Quotations, 322. Somers's Southern States since the War, 323.

No. 3.—Reason and Redemption. R. B. White, 458. Proceedings connected with Dr. Hodge's Semi-Centennial, 461. Theology and Theologians of Scotland. James Walker, D. D., 464. The Tercentenary Book, 466. Presbyterianism Three Hundred Years Ago. W. P. Breed, D. D., 466.

No. 4.—The Adoption of Sons, etc. Thomas Houston, D. D., 615. Hart's Manual of English Literature, 617. The Laws of the Kingdom. J. O. Dykes, 619. Suggested Emendations of the Authorised English Version of the Old Testament. Elias Riggs, 621.

#### VOL. XXV.

No. 1.—Ramsey's Spiritual Kingdom, 133. Maury's Physical Geography, 135. Jessup's Women of the Arabs, 136. The Principles of the Westminster Standards Persecuting, 139. The Gospel Self-supporting. A. L. Hogshead, 142. Hints and Helps in Pastoral Theology. W. S. Plumer, D. D., LL. D., 143.

No. 2.—Three Lectures on Scotland, 292. The Words of the New Testament, as altered by Transmission and ascertained by Modern Criticism, 298. Bissell's Historic Origin of the Bible, 300. The Structure of the Old Testament. Rev. S. Leathes, 301. Heart and Voice. Jas. Glasgow, D. D., 303.

No. 3.—Strauss as a Philosophical Thinker, 425. Truths for To-day. David Irving, 428.

No. 4.—The Expanse of Heaven. R. A. Proctor, 556. Shepherd's

History of the English Language, 558. Paradise. Robert M. Patterson, 560. Edwards's Christian Life as manifested in the Heart and Life, 561. The History of John Dwight of Dedham, Mass. B. W. Dwight, 566. Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. Theodore Christlieb, D. D., 570.

## VOL. XXVI.

No. 1.—Bacon's Genesis of the New England Churches, 181. Meyer's Critical and Exegetical Commentaries on the New Testament, 188. Shearer's Combination Speller, 190. Rainy's Delivery and Development of Christian Doctrine, 191. Public Worship, Partly Responsive. Daniel March, D. D., 195. The Genius of the Gospel, Commentary on Matthew. David Thomas, D. D., 196. Solar Hieroglyphics, 198. Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. George Junkin, D. D., LL. D., 199.

No. 2.—Dale's Christic and Patristic Baptism, 392. Livingstone's Last Journals, 396. The Paraclete, by Dr. Parker, 403. Farrar's Life of Christ, 406. LaBorde's History of South Carolina College, 409. Motley's Barneveld, 412. Nordhoff's Communistic Societies, 414. Timrod's Poems, 419.

No. 3.—Christian Ethics. D. S. Gregory, D. D., 581. Apologetic Lectures on Fundamental Truths of Christianity, 589. An Expositor's Note Book, 590. God's Rule for Christian Giving, 592. Johannis Buxtorfi Lexicon Chaldaicum Talmudicum, etc., 594. Assyrian Discoveries, 595. The Odd Trump, 596. Home Sketches in France, and Other Papers, 598. All about Jesus, 599. Sports that Kill, 600. The American Evangelists, Moody and Sankey, in Great Britain and Ireland, 601.

No. 4.—History and Significance of the Tabernacle, 789. Four Years in Ashantee, 791. Conditions of Success in Preaching without Notes, 793. The Case of Tilton vs. Beecher, 800. Douglass Series of Christian Greek and Latin Writers, 801. Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly, 802.

## VOL. XXVII.

No. 1.—McCosh's Scottish Philosophy, 167. D'Aubigné's Reformation in Time of Calvin, 170. Forty Years in the Turkish Empire, 173. Mitchell's Jonah, 174. God's Word through Preaching, by Dr. Hall, 175. The Vedder Lectures for 1874 and 1875, 180. Memoirs of Gen. W. T. Sherman, 187. Dr. Palmer's Sermons, 193.

No. 2.—Memoirs of Rev. Charles G. Finney, 394. Spurgeon's Lectures to My Students, 397. Motley's John of Barneveld, 402. Ellis's Quantitative Pronunciation of Latin, 407. Plumer's Truths for the People, 409. Palmer's Life of Thornwell, 411. Dabney's Sensualistic Philosophy of the 19th Century, 411.

No. 3.—Goodwin's Christ and Humanity, 607. Plumer's Person and Sinlessness of Christ, 612. Straffen's Hulsean Lectures, 617.

Palmer's *Essay on the Family*, in Civil and Churchly Aspects, 620. Van Lennep's *Bible Lands*, 624. Smoot's *Parliamentary Principles*, 625. Jones's *Medical and Surgical Memoirs*, 628.

No. 4.—Van Santfoord's *Memoirs of Eliphalet Nott*, 792. Mell's *Doctrine of Prayer*, 794. Trevelyan's *Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, 796. Hopkins's *Puritans and Queen Elizabeth*, 800.

#### VOL. XXVIII.

No. 1.—*Religion, as affected by Modern Materialism*, 143. *Cartoons*. Margaret J. Preston, 148. *Memoir of Norman Macleod*, D. D., 152. *History of the Reformation in the time of Calvin*, 156. *The Development Hypothesis*. James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., 158. *Presbyterians and the Revolution*. Wm. P. Breed, D. D., 161. *Christ the Teacher of Men*. Rev. A. W. Pitzer, 164. *The Ministry of the Word*. W. M. Taylor, D. D., 169. *Elijah the Prophet*. W. M. Taylor, D. D., 172. *Lectures on the Books of the Bible*. D. Fraser, D. D., 173. *Memories of Familiar Books*. Hon. Wm. B. Reed, 175. *Lectures on the Gospels*. Jos. A. Seiss, D. D., 178. *Revelation Explained*. Rev. J. M. Connelly, 183.

No. 2.—*The Life, Letters, and Journals of George Ticknor*, 385. *Life of the Prince Consort*. Theo. Martin, 387. *The Complaint of Dr. Skinner against the Presbytery of Cincinnati*, 390. *Addresses: Inauguration of S. S. Laws, LL. D., President University of Missouri*, 394. *Centennial Historical Discourses, Presbyterian Church*, 399. *Centennial Discourses, General Synod Reformed Dutch*, 400. *Commenting and Commentaries*. C. H. Spurgeon, 401. *Rays from the Sun of Righteousness*. R. Newton, D. D., 401. *Principia; or, Basis of Social Science*. R. J. Wright, 401.

No. 3.—*Dr. Hurst's Theological Century*, 591. *Freeman's Turks in Europe*, 592. *Bugbee's Eastern Question*, 592. *White's Warfare of Science*, 595. *Tait's Recent Advance in Physical Science*, 601. *Questions Raised by the Study of the Bible*. John Miller, D. D., 604. *The Cruise of the Challenger*. W. J. J. Spry, 609. *Through Persia by Caravan*. Arthur Arnold, 611. *Harriet Martineau's Autobiography*, 613. *Bickell's Outlines of Hebrew Grammar*, 617. *The Psalter a Witness to the Divine Origin of the Bible*, 619.

No. 4.—*Crisman's Origin and Doctrines of Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, 769. *The Higher Life Doctrine of Sanctification*, 777. *A Word to Christian Teachers and Students of the Ministry*. Samuel B. Schieffelin, 780. *He Will Come*. Stephen H. Tyng, Jr., D. D., 781. *Memoirs of Philip P. Bliss*, 784. *William the Baptist*. Rev. James M. Chaney, 785. *Witherspoon: Proceedings, etc., at the Unveiling, etc.*, 787. *History of the College of New Jersey*. John Maclean, 788. *Village Improvements, etc.* George E. Waring, Jr., 791. *Poems of Places*. H. W. Longfellow, 793.

#### VOL. XXIX.

No. 1.—*Schaff's Creeds of Christendom*, 169. *Hamlin's Among the*

Turks, 171. Thompson's *The Papacy and the Civil Power*, 175. Dawson's *Origin of the World, according to Revelation and Science*, 180. Oehler's *Theology of the Old Testament*, 182. *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*. C. F. Keil, D. D., 184.

No. 2.—Reason and Redemption. R. B. White, D. D., 378. Faith and Philosophy. H. B. Smith, D. D., LL. D., 378. *The Natural History of Atheism*. J. S. Blackie, 383. *Forty Years in the Turkish Empire*, 384. *Boston Monday Lectures*. Joseph Cook, 388. *Murphy's Pastoral Theology*, 392. A. B. C. of Finance. Simon Newcomb, LL. D., 394. *The Mikado's Empire*. W. E. Griffis, 395. *The Power of Spirit Manifest in Jesus of Nazareth*. W. H. Furnes, 397. *A Summer Vacation*. James B. Converse, 397. *The Conversion of Children*. E. P. Hammond, 398.

No. 4.—Jesus. Charles F. Deems, 770. *The Revision of the English Version of the New Testament*, 772. *The Revision of the English Version of the Holy Scriptures*, 772. *The Bible Doctrine of the Soul*, 776. *The Theological Trilemma*, 776. *The Faith of our Fathers*. James Gibbons, D. D., 780. *All Saints Day, etc.* Charles Kingsley, M. A., 782. *Visions of Heaven for the Life on Earth*. Robert M. Patterson, 784. *Weights and Wings*. C. F. Deems, LL. D., 785. *Reflections of a Recluse*. Rev. R. W. Memminger, 786. *Concessions of Liberalists to Orthodoxy*. D. Dorchester, D. D., 792. *Journals of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, 795. *The Science of Revealed Truth Impregnable*. W. R. Gordon, 799.

#### VOL. XXX.

No. 1.—Dabney's *Lectures on Theology*, 179. *Discussions in Church Polity*. C. Hodge, D. D., 187. *Some Elements of Religion*. H. P. Liddon, D. D., 191. *Huxleyism Analysed and Criticised*. Thomas Morrow, 196. *Popular Commentary on the New Testament*, 201. *The Christian*. Wm. S. Plumer, D. D., 203. *An Examination of the Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible*. John W. Haley, M. A., 204.

No. 2.—D'Aubigné's *History of the Reformation*, 401. *The Reign of God, Not the Reign of Law*. T. S. Bacon, 403. *The Light: Is it Waning? Why? How much? etc.*, Rev. A. F. Dickson, 409. *Short Method with the Dipping Anti-Pedo-Baptists*. Rev. Thomas Gallaher, 412. *St. Paul at Athens*. Rev. Chas. Shakspeare, 414. *Voices from Babylon*. Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., 416. *Eventide at Bethel*. J. R. Macduff, D. D., 419. *Wells of Baca*. Same Author, 419. *The Widow's Trust*. Mrs. Martha Tyler Gale, 419. *Feeding on Christ*. W. P. Breed, D. D., 420. *Pointed Papers*. T. L. Cuyler, 420.

No. 3.—Dr. Hodge's *Conference Papers*, 606. *Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical*. Wm. Archer Butler, 609.

No. 4.—Ford's *Studies on the Baptismal Question*, 771. *Cæsar: A Sketch*. James Anthony Froude, 778. *Moses the Lawgiver*. Wm. M. Taylor, D. D., 781. *Principles of New Testament Quotation*. Jas. Scott, 783. *The Old Preacher's Story*. Rev. L. P. Bowen, 790. *Walks to Emmaus*. Nehemiah Adams, D. D., 790. *Prophecy*. Rev.



A. P. Foreman, 791. Difficulties of the Immersion Theory. Rev. S. E. Axson, 792.

## VOL. XXXI.

No. 1.—Critical and Doctrinal Commentary on Romans. W. G. T. Shedd, D. D., 161. Evenings with the Doctrines. Nehemiah Adams, D. D., 168. Commentary on the Catholic Epistles. J. T. Demarest, D. D., 170. Life of Albert Sidney Johnston. By his Son, W. P. Johnston, 171. A Voice from South Carolina. J. A. Leland, Ph. D., 176. The Familiar Correspondence of Charles Dickens, 176.

No. 2.—The Holy Bible with Explanatory and Critical Commentary, 351. The Emotions. James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., 354. Socialism. Roswell D. Hitchcock, D. D., 359. The Mohammedan Missionary Problem. H. H. Jessup, D. D., 360. Metaphysics: A Lecture. By S. S. Laws, D. D., 360.

No. 4.—Lectures on the Origin and Growth of the Psalms. T. C. Murray, 767. Faith and Character. Marvin R. Vincent, D. D., 772. Home Worship. James Weir, 776. Selection of Spiritual Songs, with Music. C. S. Robinson, D. D., 777. A True Republic. Albert Stickney, 779.

## VOL. XXXII.

No. 1.—The Life of Charles Hodge, D. D., LL. D., 134. Jehovah-Jesus. The Oneness of God the true Trinity. R. D. Weeks, 143. Certain Dangerous Tendencies in American Life, and Other Papers, 146. Observations concerning the Trinity and the Covenant of Redemption, 150. The Life and Work of Wm. Augustus Muhlenberg, 151. Popular Commentary on the New Testament, 154. The Faith of our Forefathers. E. J. Stearns, D. D., 155. The Report, Letters, and Acts of Pilate. W. O. Clough, B. A., 156.

No. 2.—The Great Baptizer. S. J. Baird, D. D., 413. The Truth at Last. G. W. Brown, M. D., 415. A History of Presbyterianism in New England. Alex. Blaikie, D. D., 419. Infant Baptism in a Nutshell. E. B. Crisman, D. D., 422. Reply to Lectures of W. Robertson Smith. Robert Watts, D. D., 423. Bible Terminology relative to the Future Life. J. H. Pettingell, A. M., 424. The Priest, the Woman, and the Confessional. Father Chiniquy, 425. Rumpel's History of Rowan County, North Carolina, 426. The Parables of Jesus. Alfred Nevin, D. D., LL. D., 426. Mottoes for the New Year. H. A. Boardman, D. D., 427.

JAMES L. MARTIN.



## ARTICLE II.

## PRESBYTERIAN POLITY AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.

No subject has called out more discussion in the Presbyterian Church for some years past, or led to the expression of more divergent views, than the one as to the more scriptural mode of conducting the work of Foreign Missions. Almost every branch of the Presbyterian Church, both in this country and Europe, has been less or more agitated by the discussion, without any two of them, so far as is known to the writer, having reached views that are entirely coincident. Nor is it surprising that such should be the case. The subject is encompassed with real difficulties, which none but the closest and most patient study can solve.

It need scarcely be said that Presbyterian Church Polity has been profoundly studied for generations past, especially in this country and Scotland, and that a system of Church government has been evolved which is now very generally accepted as both wise and scriptural. But in the application of its principles there is an almost endless diversity of views, so that one who is a frequent attendant upon our church courts is almost tempted to doubt whether there can ever be unanimity of views. Now if such variety of views prevail in this country and Scotland, where Presbyterianism has so long been established, and where Church polity has been so frequently and so thoroughly discussed, what might naturally be expected, when the Church takes up her march for the conquest of the great outlying unevangelised world? Here she enters upon new and untrodden ground, encounters difficulties and emergencies that were scarcely known to exist, and shoulders responsibilities that nothing less than the arm of Almighty power can enable her to sustain. The difference between her position now and what it was before she left the home field is most marked. It may be compared to a great army quietly engaged in consolidating victories already achieved, and the same army on the march with the view of making more extended conquests. The army is the same, the object aimed at is the same, the laws by which it is governed are the same in all important

respects; but there must be some variation in the application of those laws, growing out of the altered condition of that army in different circumstances. So in relation to the Church of Christ. The fundamental principles of her Church polity being based upon the word of God are fixed and unalterable. The government of the Church by elders or Presbyteries is the corner-stone of that system, and the number and order of her church officers are also fixed and cannot be changed. But in relation to many of the minor details necessarily growing out of this general system, there may be diversity of administration. These details cannot always be enforced with the same regularity in the foreign field, where Christianity is to be established for the first time, as in the home field where it has had a long standing.

These general principles being conceded, we are prepared to show that our Church, with a few slight modifications of her newly adopted Book of Church Order, is better equipped by her Constitution for carrying on the work of Foreign Missions than any other branch of the evangelical Church.

In entering upon the general discussion, our first remark is, that each one of our four church courts comprises in itself all the essential elements of Presbyterian Church government, and under proper circumstances each one might exercise all the powers and functions pertaining to it, these powers and functions having been conferred by the great Head of the Church. But the growth and spread of Presbyterian Christianity necessitates the multiplication of church courts. If individual churches were multiplied indefinitely, without any connecting link or any general superintending control of the whole, it would be Congregationalism or Independency, but not Presbyterianism. Wherever a separate church is formed under the government of elders, we have the germ of a Presbyterian Church. When two, three, or four such churches are brought together under such a government, we have a classical Presbytery. But as the multiplication of church courts in the same field, all having the same powers and all exercising the same functions, would necessarily lead to conflict and confusion, it becomes necessary that these courts be graded and the powers belonging to the whole be so distributed

as to prevent discord and promote harmony. The law by which these powers are regulated is our Book of Church Order, or, as it is frequently denominated, the Constitution of the Church. This Book of Church Order has been formulated by human wisdom, but, as we all believe, under the promised guidance of the Holy Ghost, and is at the same time in strict accordance with the principles of Church government as enunciated in the word of God. It has also been adopted as a covenant among the people of God, by which they are to be guided in all the affairs relating to the government and welfare of the Church.

Now, if these brief and important statements are correct—and we do not suppose that they will be questioned—then it necessarily follows that whilst all these courts have naturally and inherently the full powers of Presbyterian government, nevertheless by the adoption of the Constitution they have solemnly agreed to such distribution of those powers as are embodied in that code. To the church Session has been conceded the power to govern the individual church, to ordain ruling elders and deacons, and to send one of their ruling elders as a commissioner to the Presbytery. To the Presbytery is granted the power, in a certain district, of reviewing and supervising the affairs of the churches, of authorising the organisation of other churches, of ordaining ministers, and other duties of a similar nature. She may follow with her jurisdiction one of her ministers who goes beyond her proper boundary, provided he retains his connexion with that Presbytery. But the Presbytery may not undertake to discharge any of the functions which have been definitely assigned to the church Session, to the Synod, or to the General Assembly. So every other court is under similar restrictions. Matters may, of course, go up from a lower to a higher court by way of appeal, complaint, review, or reference, but in no other way can one court interfere with the proper duties of another. A Synod or an Assembly, for example, cannot, within the bounds of the acknowledged and settled church, ordain a minister of the gospel, that being a function that has been assigned exclusively to Presbytery. But we need not enlarge upon these general principles which are well known, and which, perhaps, will be universally

conceded. But it is important to the argument we have in hand, that our readers keep distinctly in mind these principles, though they are so well known and so generally admitted.

Now the question arises, To what particular court does the Constitution of the Church commit the work of Foreign Missions? It is freely admitted that any one of them has all the natural and inherent powers to engage in the work. But if all of them, without any concert of action, were to engage in it, there would result the same conflict and confusion that would exist in the home field under similar circumstances. Hence the necessity of acting through one court, not, however, that the one court, as such, is to have complete and irresponsible power over the whole work, irrespective of the other courts. In other words, the General Assembly is the only Presbytery that is common to the whole Church, and is therefore the Church's natural agent for the conduct of all matters that are common to the whole Church. The Assembly, the highest of our courts, is undoubtedly the one to which the Constitution assigns the duty of evangelising the benighted nations of the earth. She is, according to the Constitution, "to superintend the affairs of the whole Church." She is "to institute and superintend the agencies necessary in the general work of evangelisation; to appoint ministers to such labors as fall under its jurisdiction." Again, "The General Assembly shall have power to commit the various interests pertaining to the general work of evangelisation to one or more commissions," those commissions being, of course, evangelical commissions. Here, then, is a work, the great work of Foreign Missions, that is especially assigned to the General Assembly. Whatever inherent rights other courts may have, none of them can engage directly in this without violating the constitutional compact.<sup>1</sup>

In other words, the Church, as a whole, has agreed to work through the General Assembly, her highest court. Furthermore,

---

<sup>1</sup> The Presbytery is the only one of the courts that can obtrude itself in the foreign field, and she can do this, not to interfere with the work there, but to maintain her jurisdiction over the ministerial character of the missionary, who of necessity maintains his connexion with the home Presbytery. On this particular point we frankly confess to some modification of previous views.

when the Assembly goes beyond the bounds of the settled Church and commences a work among the benighted nations of the earth, she is not restricted by any of those constitutional laws or limitations that govern in the home field. All of her natural and inherent powers come into full play here. She can exercise, in the first instance, all the powers and functions which have been distributed among the four courts at home. Especially can she act as any single Presbytery would act, *i. e.*, she can organise churches, can ordain ruling elders, deacons, and ministers of the gospel, and can perform any function whatever that belongs to any one of the four courts. In the prosecution of the work, however, let it be observed, she is to adopt no measures inconsistent with the teachings of God's word, and at the same time all of her plans shall be so ordered as to bring about in the foreign field a Church that, in all important respects, shall be a counterpart of the home Church.

Furthermore, let it be distinctly understood that the exercise of these enlarged and extraordinary powers is only temporary. They are necessary, but only necessary in the formative condition of the native Church. As soon as one native church is fully and completely established, the Assembly must surrender to it all the rights and functions that belong to the individual church in the home field. The Assembly cannot afterwards interfere in the internal affairs of that church, except in such cases as the Presbytery might interfere in the settled church. The same course must be pursued when a native Presbytery is formed. The Assembly must yield up to it all the functions which belong to Presbytery at home. Thus step by step she surrenders all these extraordinary powers until she actually retires herself from the field altogether, but leaves behind a full grown daughter, the exact image and counterpart of the mother. This is no fancy picture, but is the natural outworking of our Presbyterian system, evincing most clearly that it was devised by infinite wisdom.

In the next place, the inquiry naturally arises, in what way or by what means is the General Assembly to carry on the work of evangelisation in the foreign field? In general, it may be replied, that this is to be done just in the way and by the agency prescribed by the Lord Jesus Christ himself.

To the disciples was committed the work of teaching all the nations, of organising believers into churches, and of instructing such churches more fully in relation to all that he had made known to them. So the Assembly can operate upon the heathen world only through the agency of commissioners. Every minister she sends forth is commissioned to preach the everlasting gospel. These commissioners may act separately, or they may be combined into ecclesiastical commissions for the purpose of executing such functions as require joint action. The Executive Committee of Foreign Missions is, according to the new Book, an ecclesiastical commission, acting under the appointment and direction of the General Assembly. The Assembly of course is dependent upon the Presbyteries for their coöperation. The Presbyteries must furnish the agents and confer upon them the necessary powers to execute the work. By the act of ordination, or by setting apart for the Foreign missionary work one already ordained to the work of the ministry, she confers upon him—the foreign missionary—all the powers necessary to establish the Church of Christ in a land where it has not before existed, or only in a corrupt form. She can say to the missionary candidate, We authorise and empower you in going to Africa or China to preach the gospel and to administer the sacraments; and we delegate to you the power also to organise churches, to ordain ruling elders and deacons, and, in *extraordinary cases*, to ordain ministers, whether they are to act as pastors of native churches or are to act as native evangelists. We think there is no doubt that the Presbytery has the power to do as much as this, it being understood that the missionary alone is never to ordain a minister except under extraordinary circumstances; *i. e.*, when there is no other evangelist on the ground to take part in the act of ordination.

Now the missionary thus empowered is turned over to the Assembly to act as its agent, and when the number of such is sufficient, the Assembly, in virtue of the power vested in it by the Constitution, forms these missionaries into an ecclesiastical commission, which is authorised, and which is fully competent, to perform ordination in all of its grades. Here, then, is the gen-



eral process of ordination which we advocate in the foreign field. It is not done in the first instance by a Presbytery, for there is none on the ground; it is not done by a court of evangelists, for there is no room for such a court in the Presbyterian system, but it is done by a regularly authorised *evangelical commission*. This, then, is the ground upon which we stand in relation to the matter of ordination. It not only accords with common usage in the settled Church, but is at the same time free from all taint of Prelacy.

Furthermore, the arrangement for ordination by ecclesiastical courts is only temporary. As soon as a native Presbytery is formed, the whole matter of ordination falls into its hands, and the foreign missionary has no more to do with it. We shall have something more to say on this subject in the progress of this article.

The Assembly, so far as ecclesiastical matters are concerned, operates mainly through the evangelist, who maintains his ministerial connexion with the home Church. If he becomes the permanent pastor of a native church and of a native Presbytery as soon as one is formed, he not only terminates his connexion with the home Church, but he ceases to be an evangelist, though he may still derive his support, in part or whole, from the home Church. He may be afterwards appointed an evangelist by the native Presbytery, but he cannot be an evangelist of the native Presbytery and of a home Presbytery at the same time.

An incidental question presents itself at this stage of our argument, which must be noticed. It was stated above that the Assembly, working through the Constitution, was fully qualified to conduct the native church through all the stages of its development, even to the highest court. But as other branches of the Presbyterian Church will probably be at work in the same field and at the same time, and as arrangements will be in progress to unite these different elements into one general organisation, the question arises as to the particular point at which the oversight of the foreign evangelist should be withdrawn. By some it is maintained that the control of the evangelist ought to cease just as soon as one native church is fully organised. By such persons

it is contended that one church contains the germ of the whole Church in its perfected form, and that it ought to be left to develop itself according to its own inherent powers, without any further interference on the part of the foreign evangelist. Others hold that the superintending control of the evangelist should not be withdrawn until a native Presbytery is formed. Either of these courses, we think, is consistent with the general principles of Scripture and abstract Presbyterianism. The writer adopts the view that the care of the evangelist cannot be wisely or safely withdrawn until a Presbytery is formed. In the home field, no one church is ever set off by itself, with the expectation that it will create other churches to be associated with it in forming a new Presbytery. This is not the process by which the boundaries of the home Church are enlarged.

If separation becomes necessary, Synod sets off a number of churches and constitutes them a Presbytery. As an evangelist or a body of evangelists stand in the same relationship to a newly formed church in the heathen world, that a Presbytery does to one newly formed in the home field, his presence cannot be safely dispensed with until a native Presbytery is formed to take his place. It would be a dangerous experiment to set off one church to itself anywhere, but would be particularly so if that church was composed wholly of persons that have just emerged from the darkness of heathenism. A church in such circumstances would soon find itself encompassed with difficulties which it could not surmount. If, for example, the pastor of that church became guilty of heresy or flagrant immorality, by whom could he be tried and disciplined, except by the ruling elders of that church who are not his peers, and which would not only be contrary to Presbyterian usage, but would be a most unfortunate precedent to set before a church just struggling into existence? Other difficulties might arise. This church might be rent and distracted by its internal dissensions, just as was the case with the church at Corinth. Nobody can tell what would have been the fate of that church if the apostolic authority had not been at hand to heal its dissensions. Difficulties, it is true, might arise after a Presbytery was formed, but they would not be near so likely to occur,

and could be much more readily healed under the control of a Presbytery.

The next point claiming attention is the evangelist or foreign missionary, his office, his functions, and the powers that are intrusted to him. Clear views in relation to this particular matter will go far to clear up the obscurities that have gathered around this whole subject. We remark, then, that the foreign evangelist or foreign missionary is nothing less or more than an ordinary minister, ordained by his Presbytery, or set apart after he is ordained, to preach the gospel to the benighted nations of the earth. It is contrary alike to the Scriptures and to the Book of Church Order, to suppose that he belongs to a different class or order from the ordinary minister or preacher of the gospel. The great commission is to teach, to preach, and to evangelise the nations of the earth. At the same time, our Form of Government acknowledges only three classes of officers as belonging to the Church, viz, the minister, the ruling elder, and the deacon. To contend that the evangelist forms a fourth class, is not only contrary to Scripture, but it is to go back upon the Book itself. Any minister may be set apart, or any candidate may be ordained by his Presbytery to the work of an evangelist, if his Presbytery is pleased to confer upon him all the powers necessary to the discharge of that office. At the same time it should be kept in mind that the evangelist is not the only minister upon whom special powers are conferred. The minister is always one and the same, but the positions he may be called to occupy in the Church are different, and the powers necessary to be conferred upon him vary accordingly. If he is ordained or set apart as a pastor of a particular church, he is empowered to exercise all the functions of the pastoral office. If he is set apart as a home missionary or home evangelist, he is vested with all the powers necessary to perform the duties of that position. If he is sent abroad as a foreign missionary, he is clothed with all the powers necessary to plant the Church of Christ in a land where it has not before existed. This power, whatever it may be, does not become an inseparable personal attribute of the evangelist himself. Should he at any time retire from the work and return home, he would fall

back into the common ministerial ranks and be commissioned for any other ministerial work that might be assigned him. But the main question is, What are the nature and extent of the powers conferred upon the evangelist, first by his Presbytery, which sets him apart for the work, and secondly by the General Assembly, which controls and directs him in the prosecution of that work, and determines the extent of his jurisdiction? The Presbytery, by the act of ordination, confers upon him all the power necessary for the work, and then, by common consent, turns him over to the General Assembly, which is the whole Church in action, to control and direct him in all the details of work.<sup>1</sup> The transfer in this case does not differ from a transfer to a coördinate Presbytery in certain circumstances. For example, when one Presbytery consents to have one of its members labor temporarily in the bounds of another Presbytery, his work is carried on under the direction of that Presbytery where he labors, but jurisdiction over his moral and ministerial character is retained by the Presbytery where he is enrolled as a member. Another illustration of the same principle is to be found in the case of a Secretary of one of our benevolent schemes. He retains his connexion with his Presbytery, and is amenable to its jurisdiction as far as his ministerial character is concerned, while his general work is controlled and overlooked by the Assembly. The Assembly may approve or censure him so far as his work is concerned, but has not jurisdiction in the first instance over his ministerial character. This moral oversight on the part of the Presbytery and general direction of his work by the General Assembly, lead to no confusion or conflict whatever. The Assembly may dismiss a missionary from its service for incompetency, for disobedience of orders, etc., but it cannot, in the first instance certainly, try or depose him from the ministry. His ministerial character remains in the keeping of his Presbytery.

Now as to the *powers* of an evangelist. According to the Book he is to preach the gospel, to organise churches, to ordain

<sup>1</sup> All that is here said is limited to the power of jurisdiction, and does not pertain to the power of order, which is the same in all ministers, in all times and places.

ruling elders and deacons, but is not empowered to go any further. But the Book here is evidently defective ; and if we were to stand squarely upon it in carrying on the missionary work, which has never been the case, it would be utterly impossible to establish a perfected Presbyterian church in any part of the heathen world. The progress of the missionary work therefore renders it absolutely necessary that there be some modification or addition to the Constitution.

But before proceeding further in this discussion, we deem it necessary to guard against a serious misapprehension. We hold most decidedly that one evangelist cannot ordain a pastor over a native church, or an evangelist to labor in more distant regions, *except in extraordinary cases* ; and we hold further, that ordination in either case ought to be the joint act of all the evangelists on the ground, these evangelists acting under the Assembly and as an ecclesiastical commission under its appointment. It would not do to take the ground that one missionary should never, under any circumstances, ordain a native pastor or native evangelist. This would be equivalent to admitting that the Presbyterian Church, in certain circumstances which might frequently occur, was incapable of self-propagation. The writer was in circumstances once where he was compelled to ordain a pastor, or allow a body of believers who seemed to have been brought together by the Holy Ghost, and who were ripe for church organisation, to be scattered and lost to the general Church. He would not have done this, of course, if there had been any other evangelist on the ground to take part with him. But in Western Africa, where this event occurred, there was not, so far as can be remembered, another Presbyterian evangelist in the whole field. The act was made known in this country at the time, and so far as is known, met with universal approval. Rev. Messrs. Graybill and Hall, some eighteen months ago, ordained two native evangelists, Messrs. Leandro and Carrero, and sent them forth to gather the whitening harvest. The consequence is that two churches, embracing thirty or forty members each, have been organised, and before the close of the present year there will be a fully organised Presbytery in that part of Mexico. But while we defend the

right and propriety of one missionary's performing the act of ordination alone under certain circumstances, we are equally opposed, if not more so, to the evangelist's performing the act alone when there are others on the ground. The memorial which the writer laid before the Assembly at Staunton, Va., was especially intended to prevent the exercise of such authority by one missionary, whilst that laid before the Atlanta Assembly by certain Brazilian missionaries was intended to justify the opposite course. The same views were boldly set forth in an article in the *SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW*, and were still more openly avowed by one of their number on the floor of the Assembly in Lexington, Ky., last spring. It was maintained that ordination was joint power belonging to the individual missionary, and that he had a right to ordain in virtue thereof, whether other evangelists were present or not. The readers of the *REVIEW* need not be told that this is Prelacy and not Presbyterianism. The right view of the matter is that all the evangelists are to take part in the ordination of every minister, not as a Presbytery, not as a court of evangelists, but simply as an ecclesiastical commission of the General Assembly appointed to perform this as well as all other ecclesiastical functions necessary to bring the native Church into the exercise of its full powers as a Church of Jesus Christ; when that is done, all such powers on the part of the commission cease, and the commission has nothing to do but report to the Assembly accordingly.<sup>1</sup>

Before passing from this particular subject, it is necessary to refer to a misapprehension which prevails in relation to this matter. It is objected to ordination by evangelists, whether severally or collectively, that it creates a class of native evangelists different from those sent out by the Church, and that these native evangelists, without experience or practical wisdom, may ordain other native evangelists indefinitely, and thus bring the whole matter into contempt. But this is a mistake in both particulars.

---

<sup>1</sup> These principles are not distinctly enunciated in the Book of Church Order, but they are clearly and undoubtedly implied there, and they ought to be distinctly formulated so as to prevent all misunderstanding in relation to these matters.

Only one class of evangelists exists, but the powers belonging to them are different. A foreign evangelist, in virtue of power delegated to him by his Presbytery, may ordain a native evangelist and empower him to perform certain functions necessary to his work, but he cannot delegate to him the power that has been delegated to himself.

The maxim *potestas delegata non potest delegari* is just as true in ecclesiastical as in civil matters. Any number of illustrations might be adduced in proof of this. Any Presbytery may ordain a home missionary or a home evangelist to labor within its own bounds, and besides the authority to preach and administer the sacraments which is conveyed by the act of ordination, it may delegate to him the power to organise churches, ordain ruling elders and deacons, but no one would think that he could delegate these powers to any one else. So in relation to the foreign missionary. Besides being empowered to preach the gospel and administer the sacraments, the authority may be delegated to him to organise churches, ordain elders and deacons, and, in extraordinary cases, native evangelists also. But he has no more authority to delegate these powers, especially in the ordination of an evangelist, than the home missionary has to delegate any of the special powers that have been conferred upon him. No native evangelist, therefore, can ordain another native evangelist until the power to do this has been conferred upon him by a regularly organised native Presbytery, or by the order of the General Assembly in the exercise of its essential and inherent powers.

To the "ecclesiastical commission," to which the power of ordination in the foreign field is given, it may be objected that there are conditions that cannot be complied with : 1st. That the examination of the candidate must be in the presence of the Presbytery before he can be ordained by a commission. Now this in the foreign field is a simple impossibility. If the requisition is pressed with unrelenting severity, then a fully organised Presbytery must be transferred bodily to Africa or China, or the native candidate, speaking an unknown tongue, and at an expense of a thousand dollars perhaps, must be brought to this country before a native pastor or native evangelist could be ordained for either

of those countries. Here is one of those cases in which home usage, in the first stages of the work at least, cannot be enforced in the foreign field. We are not required, either by Scripture or common sense, to place ourselves in any such dilemma. 2d. The other requisition is, that the ecclesiastical commission must be a *quorum* of the appointing body. We suppose that this, though not so stated in the Book, has more special reference to judicial cases, and not to what may be called the mere executive acts of the body. Certainly the Assembly has been construing the matter in this light. None of her Executive Committees, which are virtual ecclesiastic commissions, constitutes a *quorum* of the body itself. There are two things which present themselves at this stage of the argument, however, which we think fully settle this whole matter: 1st. The Assembly, in entering upon the work of foreign missions, brings into exercise all her inherent powers as a court of Jesus Christ, and she is not bound to enforce in the foreign field every detail that is practised in the home Church, for the reason, as has already been shown, that some of them are impracticable. 2d. In the second place, she is fully authorised by the Constitution "to institute and superintend the agencies necessary in the general work of evangelisation." She can then, without transcending the powers that have been assigned her by the constitution, without violating any of the well-established principles of true Presbyterian polity, appoint any two, four, or ten foreign evangelists in the same field as an ecclesiastical commission, not only to ordain native pastors and evangelists, but to perform all other ecclesiastical acts necessary to the complete establishment of the native Church. We have only in this connexion, and in the conclusion of this part of our article, to state that the General Assembly is not independent or irresponsible in the prosecution of this great work, because all of her native and inherent powers are brought into requisition, or because she is the only one of the four courts that the Constitution authorises to engage in the work. The Assembly itself is made up of commissioners from the Presbyteries, by whom her acts are controlled. She is not separate from or independent of the Presbyteries, but is herself the Presbyteries in action. The



control of the Presbyteries over the missionary work is very nearly as direct as if they acted through commissions of their own appointment.

It may be incidentally mentioned here that there is no incompatibility between the "ecclesiastical commission" and the "mission" (technically so called) acting harmoniously in the same field. The ecclesiastical commission embraces all those, but only those, who are qualified to exercise the functions of government. The "mission," on the other hand, comprises all the male missionaries, whether lay or ministerial. Its duties are purely financial or advisory. As an organised body it can exercise no ecclesiastical functions whatever, but can render important services to the Executive Committee at home which cannot conveniently be dispensed with.

Before bringing our article to a conclusion, it is necessary to notice, but in a very brief manner, some of the other schemes adopted for carrying on the work by other bodies of the Presbyterian Church. One of these is, that the foreign missionary should incorporate himself into the native church that he may gather, as its pastor; that he should connect himself with the native Presbytery as soon as one could be formed; and that he should continue to derive his support from the home Church, though he should have no ecclesiastical connexion with it. This scheme has some excellences, and is entirely consistent with our general ideas of Church polity. It aims to establish, as speedily as possible, an independent Presbyterian Church in the foreign field, of which we heartily approve. At the same time, a native church with a foreign evangelist as its pastor, would be a much more suitable and competent body to ordain native ministers or evangelists than a church Session made up wholly of natives. To this plan, however, there are two objections, one of which, at least, is very weighty. One of these is, that the home Church may feel an objection to contributing to the support of a minister over whom it can exercise no ecclesiastical jurisdiction whatever. The other and more weighty objection is, that the foreign missionary must divest himself of his office as an evangelist before he can assume that of a pastor of a single church. He cannot occupy

both at the same time as a permanent arrangement. The objection to this is twofold: 1st. The pastoral office is occupied by a foreigner when it ought to be filled by a native as soon as practicable; 2d. This plan makes it necessary to fill every native pulpit with a foreign minister, which is utterly incompatible with the grand idea of spreading the knowledge of the gospel throughout the world. This great object, if ever fully attained, must be achieved mainly by a native agency. Foreign missionaries can never be more than pioneers in the work. The work of a foreign evangelist should not therefore, except under extraordinary circumstances and for a brief period, be confined to the care of a single church. Unless engaged in the work of translation or education, he ought constantly to be advancing, making new conquests and extending the kingdom of Christ into regions beyond.

Another scheme, and one which has been urged with great boldness of late, is, that the work of Foreign Missions ought to be conducted, not by the Assembly, but by the different Presbyteries. No one will question the inherent power of Presbytery to do this, and in some cases it might be done with great efficiency. But constituted as the Church is, no Presbytery can enter upon the foreign missionary work without violating the constitutional compact. The Book of Church Order not only defines the powers and functions of a Presbytery, but it defines and limits the district or territory also within which those functions and powers are to be exercised. It cannot transcend those limits either in the home or foreign field without introducing confusion into the general Church work. Besides this, it would be easy to show that the resources of the whole Church would be greatly wasted, if each of our sixty-six Presbyteries were to enter separately into the work. At the same time, it is a wrong view of the matter, as has already been intimated, to say that the work belongs exclusively to the Assembly and that the Presbyteries have nothing to do with it. The Presbyteries work through the Assembly; they have a voice in the appointment of its committees and its officers; it is by their authority (as the case now in hand shows) that rules and regulations are adopted for its government; and in fact the control of the Presbyteries is almost as

direct as it would be if each of them had an executive committee of its own.

The third mode of conducting the work, the one practised by the Northern Presbyterian General Assembly, is to form in the foreign field what are called *mixed* Presbyteries. The missionaries, on their arrival in the field, if we understand their more modern plans aright, organise themselves into a Presbytery, with or without ruling elders as the case may be, into which are incorporated native ministers as fast as they are ordained, the foreign missionaries being regular members of the *mixed* Presbytery, whilst retaining their connexion with their home Presbyteries at the same time. Now this scheme, as it appears to the writer, is objectionable on a number of grounds. It is certainly contrary to Presbyterian usage for a man to be a member of two Presbyteries at the same time. In case of trial for immoral conduct or heresy, he might be condemned in one and be acquitted by the other, making it difficult to tell what would be his real *status* under such circumstances. In having the right to appeal from one Presbytery to another, it gives him an advantage over his co-presbyters that would be fatal to the great and fundamental law of ministerial parity. More than this, the missionary, being a member of the native Presbytery and of the home Presbytery at the same time, becomes an inseparable link between the home and the foreign Church, making the latter a part of the former, which is contrary to the avowed policy of our Church. There is a further difficulty connected with this arrangement. Very few missionaries would be willing to regard native ministers, just emerged from the darkness of heathenism and without the practical wisdom of experienced church officers, as their equals and peers, or would be willing to have such incompetent judges pass upon their moral or ministerial character.

A case has recently occurred in India, which shows the danger of being a member of one of those mixed Presbyteries. One of these was composed of two foreign missionaries and three native preachers, and perhaps of native elders. The two foreign missionaries disagreed, and one, by uniting the three native preachers with himself, deposed his colleague from the ministry. This

colleague, contrary to Presbyterian usage, was restored by a neighboring Presbytery, in which the American element was predominant.

A fourth, but purely theoretical, scheme, one to which allusion has already been made, is, that the local Session of the first church established on heathen ground ought to ordain pastors and evangelists when necessary.

But how is the pastor of this first church to be ordained, if not by the evangelist who first called it into being? There might be circumstances, it is true, when a church Session could with propriety ordain a minister; but this would be contrary to established Presbyterian usage; and why set the native Church on the wrong track at the very beginning of things? What might be right and justifiable in extraordinary circumstances, would not be so under the regular working of an established Church. At the same time it is obvious to common sense that a church just emerging into the twilight of Christianity ought not, except under extraordinary circumstances, to be called upon to perform the highest ecclesiastical functions known to the Church. It was not thus with the churches that were gathered by the apostles. Evangelists, such as Timothy and Titus, were sent to ordain elders over them. The arm of the fostering Church ought not to be withdrawn from the infant churches until they were able to stand upon their own feet, much less should they be called in the times of their ignorance and weakness to perform the highest functions known to the established Church.

Now, as to the particular matter referred to the Presbyteries by the last General Assembly. It is proposed by the Assembly that the following change be made: Chap. V., Section 2d, paragraph 6th, that after "ordain," it shall read, "to all the offices required to make them complete, and also with the view of the extension of the Church, that he have power in foreign fields to ordain other evangelists." To this we propose to affix the additional and qualifying clause, viz., "with the understanding (1) that in all ordinations the act shall always be performed by the body of evangelists on the ground; and (2) that the pas-

tors and evangelists thus ordained shall have no other powers than those which the Constitution gives to pastors and evangelists at home." The amendment would then read: "and to him may be intrusted power to organise churches and to ordain to all the offices necessary to make them complete; and also with the view of the extension of the Church, that he have power in the foreign field to ordain other evangelists, it being understood that in all ordination of pastors and evangelists, the act should be done by the body of evangelists on the ground, and that the pastors and evangelists thus ordained shall have no other powers than those which the Constitution gives to pastors and evangelists at home." More than this is unnecessary, less is insufficient.

It is necessary to add a word or two of explanation. When it is stated that the evangelist has power to ordain to all the offices necessary to make the church complete, it includes among those offices, of course, the pastor of the church; for no church has a complete organisation without a pastor. To deny the power of the evangelist or evangelists to ordain pastors over the churches they may gather, would be nothing less or more than an estoppel of the Foreign Missionary work. Surely the Church will place herself in no such position as this. But if the evangelist or evangelists have power to ordain a minister to be the pastor of a church, it is no stretch of that power to set him apart to the work of an evangelist, or to ordain him in the first instance as an evangelist, having regard to the true position of the native evangelist, as set forth in a previous part of this article. Now the clauses we propose to append will effectually prevent any abuse of the power by any one evangelist. It estops him from performing the act of ordination alone, except in extraordinary cases, by making it necessary for all the evangelists on the ground to take part; these evangelists being regarded as an ecclesiastical commission appointed by the Assembly. The act performed in this way is strictly Presbyterian, gives no countenance either to Prelacy or Independency, and places the native Church at the very beginning on a solid Presbyterian foundation.

J. LEIGHTON WILSON.

## ARTICLE III.

## THE PRESBYTERIAN CULTUS.

Suggested by the publication of "*A General Liturgy and Book of Common Prayer, prepared by Prof. HOPKINS, Auburn Theological Seminary, etc.* A. S. Barnes & Co.: New York and Chicago. 1883."

This coming event cast its shadow before in an article contributed by its author to the *Presbyterian Review* for January, 1882. Our purpose at this time is not to discuss its merits, but the rather to make its publication the occasion for some examination into the alleged need it is intended to supply, and a few criticisms on the elaborate argument advanced by its author for its adoption and use; not that we consider this argument in itself worthy of refutation, for it is intrinsically weak; its essential weakness, however, is, to some extent, redeemed by the accidents of its distinguished origin and influential medium of publication; but for these circumstances, the article would have entered the world *still-born*, and, so far as we are concerned, should most assuredly have been unwept, unhonored, and unsung. Its paternity and its sponsorship, together with the efforts of sporadic sympathisers in its author's own communion and the comments of the Episcopal press, served to galvanise the discussion into the semblance of a transient vitality.

The article gave us both pain and pleasure: pain, that such an article should have been written by a Professor in a Presbyterian Theological Seminary, and published in a Presbyterian Review; pleasure, that if such an article is to be written under such auspices, it should be just exactly such as it is.

The writer proceeds apparently upon the Newtonian principle, that every hypothesis must have its basis in demonstrable fact. The basis in this instance is the character of the present Presbyterian Cultus, the great and growing dissatisfaction therewith pervading the Church itself, and the consequent superior growth of the Episcopal Church, at the expense of the Presbyterian. His readers were doubtless surprised at his "certain freedom of

remark on the ordinary Presbyterian Cultus," which, however, he says, "is designed in no irreverent or disrespectful spirit, nor carried further than the necessities of a contrasted portraiture demand." This last statement they will receive *with salt*, and a good deal of it too. We think that the necessities of his contrasted portraiture have led him into gross exaggeration. He dips his brush in shadow only for the Presbyterian part of the picture, and in light alone for the Episcopal part. What do our readers think of the following picture of Presbyterian prayer :

"But this orderly progression is now seldom observed ; the prayer in the pulpit is sometimes only a long drawn-out prayer-meeting prayer. With no logical sequence of topics, with no real progress of thought, with no devotional climax, it meanders along in a hap-hazard kind of way, returns upon itself, reiterates its phrases, and finally winds up for no other particular reason except that the ten or fifteen minutes during which the patience of 'the audience' can be expected to hold out have elapsed. Often, indeed, the audience have lost all patience, long before that ; . . . but if the testimony of many not irreverent persons may be trusted, the 'hearer,' having nothing else to do with the prayer, resigns himself with a sigh of submission to the inevitable, tries to follow for a while the sentiments of devotion, wanders off in thought, moves uneasily about as the long-continued sameness of posture becomes painful, occasionally says to himself, '*Is he never going to stop ?*' and finally, at the grateful 'amen,' straightens himself up with another sign of relief, and a more or less conscious codicil to the prayer, viz., 'Well, thank God, we're through with that.' " P. 41.

Contrasted with this sorry performance, the Prayer-Book gives us "prayers which have come down to us over the waste of a thousand centuries" (! !), and "have a fragrance (?) of the martyr's funeral pyre."

We have a photograph of the prayer at funerals :

"Compare the prayer on a funeral occasion, including the detailed enumeration of all the classes of mourners—the wife or husband, the children, the sisters, the cousins, and their aunts, together with the circumstances of their affliction—well adapted, if not expressly designed, to start the fountain of sympathetic tears ; a method which, in the rural districts, answers nearly the place of the tragic drama, and is resorted to for a pleasing stimulus to the sensibilities. Compare this with the simple, scriptural, impersonal services of the Prayer-Book," etc. P. 50.

Pretty severe this, and particularly upon Presbyterians in "the

rural districts," but even this turning of the funeral into a pleasingly horrible drama is not quite the climax of indecorum in Presbyterian worship :

"Perhaps this abuse of the exercise of public prayer, by which complimentary remarks are offered under the pretext of worship, reaches its climax of indecorum when two ministers are found together in the pulpit, the pastor and some stranger who is officiating for him. How the latter, in the prayer before sermon, refers to the pastor's long and faithful service, to the love of his dear people for him, to his influence in the church, to his beloved family, etc. ; and how the pastor, in the prayer after sermon, compliments our dear brother for the words of truth and earnestness he has spoken, informs the congregation delicately where he came from, and the important position he occupies in the Church, and prays the Lord to reward him abundantly for his labor of love on the present occasion ; a gentle intimation that he is to expect nothing else," etc. P. 50.

Our people are taught "to go to church not to worship God, but to hear the sermon. The influence of this upon the minister himself is most unfortunate." Our worship is a "thread-bare garment," with here and there "*purpurei panni*" sewed on in the shape of phrases from the Prayer-Book ; "a plain diet of bread and water," while the Episcopalians have "French dishes," though "we are quite willing to 'convey' scraps and even whole pieces from the better furnished tables of our neighbors," which our author says "is hardly of the highest order of ecclesiastical integrity;" and yet he endeavors to persuade us to "convey" the whole bill of fare ! "The matured taste, indeed, is as often offended by the Presbyterian services, as the younger mind is disgusted." "There is more of Christ in the *Te Deum* and the *Litany* alone than is commonly found in two entire Presbyterian services."

As a result of this state of affairs, our people "are tired of being forever the '*dummet*' of God's dumb people." "Many of the cultivated and tasteful of our members have sought a more cheerful, more varied, more sympathetic service in another communion." "The Episcopal Church has been largely recruited from our ranks. There are many thousands in that Church at present who have been drawn away merely by the superior attractions of its cultus." They "have been repelled by the tediousness of the Presbyterian, and attracted by the variety and



restfulness of the Episcopal service," and "the tracks are all one way." He then goes on to add:

"It is very largely due to this fact, that of all the sects in the United States, the Episcopal is growing the most rapidly at the present time. It is forming new congregations and organising new dioceses with extraordinary rapidity. On the other hand, the Presbyterian Church is almost stationary. It requires a close calculation to show that she is even holding her own." P. 49.

We then have the following warning and advice:

"We can stick to the short prayer and the long prayer and the dumb weariness of the silent 'audience,' and see our congregation gradually melt away, the grey heads becoming more numerous, and the young faces fewer, or we can infuse a new life into our services, give our children something to do in the public worship of God, and by the charm of a new and attractive cultus corroborate our doctrinal and homiletical superiority." P. 50.

Reserving, for the present, comment on the fidelity of this "contrasted portraiture," we examine the result predicated of it. Granting for the *nonce* the fact so confidently stated, does the author's inference necessarily follow? Are we driven to the "cultus" as the explanation of the extraordinary increase? Might it not with some show of reason be attributed in part to other causes? *E. g.*—

1. The notorious exclusiveness of the claims of this Church. It exalts all distinctive differences into fundamental importance; it unchurches all other denominations, branding them as mere voluntary religious societies without a ministry and without sacraments, creating a schism in the body of Christ, and walking disorderly. It relegates the membership thereof to the precarious grounds of "uncovenanted mercy," and teaches its adherents by both precept and example to withhold all recognition, countenance, and encouragement from them. Hear the great Dr. Morgan Dix in his *Manual of the Christian Life*:

"Go not at all, neither to hear preaching out of curiosity nor to oblige friends. Keep to the Church alone. You have naught to do with those without the Church, but to pray for them and treat them with kindness."

Reared and trained under an ecclesiastical banner with this strange device, *aut Cæsar aut nullus*, the inevitable result is,  
VOL. XXXV., NO. 1—6.

that in cases of intermarriage and the like, if any concession to the interests of religious unity in the family is made, "conscientious conviction" on the part of the Episcopal side of the house, male or female, exacts the sacrifice in favor of that Church.

2. Its easy terms of communion. It holds to no conversion, requires no examination upon religious experience from applicants for membership. Any subscriber to its doctrine, admirer of its cultus, and upholder of its exclusiveness, if living an outwardly decent, moral, reputable life, is welcomed, and sometimes urged to "confirmation." Churchliness among them takes the place of piety among "the sects."

We remember hearing it said by an Episcopalian as a consolation in the sudden death of an attractive young woman, "Well, she was an ardent church-woman." The young woman was a stranger to us, but we supposed of course the description meant devoted piety. A ruling elder, however, standing by, who knew the character of the deceased, remarked, upon our expressing afterwards gratification at her preparation for death, that she was as utterly godless as any one he ever saw; that the phrase "ardent church-woman" meant only a strong Episcopalian in sentiment, and a thorough and consistent subscriber to the exclusiveness of that Church.

If such a standard of piety obtained among us, what Presbyterian pastor is there who could not at once largely recruit his membership from his general congregation?

3. The Episcopal Church is notoriously lax in its discipline and mild in its condemnation of worldliness. It requires less self-denial to maintain a reputable Christian profession in this Church than in any other branch of the great ecclesiastical family. *E. g.*, we know of an instance in which the most prominent member of his church, the "Senior Warden," as thorough, exclusive, bigoted a "Churchman" as we ever knew, was regularly published as the "floor manager" of the balls in the town!

4. Another means of grace not infrequently used by the adherents of this Church is the plea of social position. Professing Christians are inconsistent enough to present church membership in "*the Church*" as a stepping-stone to worldly recognition; and

•

there are plenty of people sufficiently silly and wicked to use the Church as an introduction to "the best society"; i. e., as an *open sesame* to balls, routs, *et id omne genus*.

Our author gives no hint of any of these things; but if he had exercised that "certain freedom of remark" which he indulged in with reference to the Presbyterian Church, they would, we think, have claimed consideration as possible factors in Episcopal progress. The only thing in this progress suprising to us is, that under *all* the circumstances, it is not greater than it is.

But what are the facts? We will "weigh the fish" before accepting the author's solution.

His declaration as to the very greatly superior rapidity of their growth surprised us the more because just before reading it we had seen a statistical statement of that Church for the preceding year, taken from the Year Book, which statement indicated a falling off in every single item, excepting only that of contributions.

Is it true that the Episcopalians are growing with "extraordinary rapidity," while "it requires a close calculation to show that we are holding our own"?

We present herewith a table compiled from *Dorchester's Problem of Religious Progress*.

Years.	CHURCHES.		MINISTERS.		COMMUNICANTS.	
	Episcopalian.	Presbyterian.	Episcopalian.	Presbyterian.	Episcopalian.	Presbyterian.
1775.	300	300	250	140		
1800.	320	500	264	300	11,978	40,000
1850.	1,350	4,163	1,595	3,399	89,359	347,551
1870.	2,742	5,995	2,803	5,078	207,762	528,575
1880.	3,000	7,417	3,532	6,104	347,781	698,699

In this table we have added the figures of the Old and New School for the *ante bellum* statistics, and the Northern and Southern for the years since the division. If we had included all the *dis-*

*tinctively* Presbyterian bodies in the United States, which would have been strictly just (as we have *all* the Episcopal strength united in the two branches of that Church), the figures would then have been 937,640 Presbyterian as against 347,781 Episcopalians.<sup>1</sup> Let us compare the benevolent contributions. Up to the year 1880, the Episcopalians gave to Foreign Missions \$3,076,208, the Presbyterians,<sup>2</sup> \$10,539,996; to Home Missions, Episcopalians, \$3,474,232, the Presbyterians \$10,244,025; the Woman's Boards of the Episcopalians; \$67,278, of the Presbyterians, \$986,489—which makes a total of six millions for the Episcopal Church, as against *twenty-one* millions for the Presbyterian. It is worthy of note here, as in numerical statistics, that you will find *all Episcopal work under Episcopal figures*; they are strictly *non-coöperative*; their Church gives only to their own church societies; whereas the Presbyterian Church helps every worthy cause; *e. g.*, the American Bible Society, American Tract Society, etc. It is an utter impossibility ever to get complete returns of Presbyterian contributions; her gifts flow into every channel and enrich all work that enlists Christian sympathy and invites Christian co-operation. While she is not much of an authority on religious æsthetics, she may be depended on for religious *work*; her *services* may not be “cheerful, varied, and sympathetic,” but her *service* is.

And now, following the example of our author, we propose to do a little portrait painting. We shall not claim for it universal fidelity. To the extent of our observation, however, it is strictly faithful. We leave it to our readers to pronounce on the general justice of his and of ours.

#### 1. While the liturgy compiled by the Episcopal Church is un-

<sup>1</sup> It is worthy of note, as bearing still more decisively and conclusively against our author's position, that notwithstanding the moral and material support of the government during the colonial period, and all the advantages of a state institution for firm establishment, the Episcopal Church has, nevertheless, when brought into fair competition with the *non-liturgical* Churches, sunk below them *all* in numbers, and stands *seventh* in the list.

<sup>2</sup> The New School Church, up to 1870, contributed to the A. B. C. F. M. In this table only their contributions since 1870 are included.

questionably among the finest monuments of uninspired devotional literature, yet inference from this to the necessarily superior impressiveness of the services of that Church is hasty. One would presume that the majesty and beauty of the liturgy and the large place it occupies in the worship of the Church, would develop in its "clergy" the art of reading to its highest perfection. On the contrary, the Episcopalian clergymen, as a class, are, in our judgment, the poorest readers we know. The majesty of their grand liturgy is sacrificed by the way in which they murder it in the rendering; their *ore rotundo*, "steeple-in-the-throat grandeur; their aristocratic, theologic, parsonic, supernatural, infra-mouthing of language and rolling over of words," is intolerable to all who have not been hardened to it by long custom. Of all the ministers of that Church ever heard by us, only one rendered the service with any marked impressiveness. So far from having a fragrance of the martyr's funeral-pyre, the prayers are generally rushed through as if leader and led were "neck and neck" in a "go as you please" race. We have tried more than once to join in with the Lord's prayer, but have been invariably left in the rear.

As to the desirable impersonality of the burial service, we have been impressed with the very opposite. Though we have suffered some from the embarrassment noted by our author, in conducting the funeral of irreligious people, we have not been entirely satisfied as to the propriety of reading such a service as the Episcopal at the funeral of this class of people. It is evident, from the rubric at this point, that such use of the service was not contemplated, else there would have been no limitation fixed to its use. Moreover, so far from being impressed with its "sympathetic" character, we have been most forcibly impressed with the very reverse. The service is less sympathetic than anything we know; the same stereotyped, crystallised, hardened form for every one and for all circumstances—for infancy and old age, for the abandoned criminal and the acknowledged saint—nothing special, nothing personal, from beginning to end. Fine undoubtedly! Yes, as glittering and beautiful as an ice prospect, and as cold; there is not a *heart-throb* in it, from the opening to the closing

word. This impersonality is just exactly what we do *not* admire; we prefer even "the detailed enumeration, etc.," which our author paints so vividly and condemns so severely; it may disgust a critical taste; but this personality is just what comforts the heavy hearts who are burying their dead, and it is for their comfort mainly that the prayer is offered. His sketch may be true of some rare instances; they have never fallen under our observation. As a portrait of the "ordinary Presbyterian cultus," we know the whole picture to be a miserable caricature, while his representation of the Episcopal cultus, if of *their* ordinary worship, is equally on the other extreme.

2. Liturgy always weakens the pulpit. The two do not flourish together; the former absorbs the time and attention at the terrible expense of the latter. If the two ever conflict, the sermon must yield. The Episcopalians go to "service," not to preaching. Our author himself, in accounting for the number of their recruits, says: "Certainly they have not been enticed by the greater impressiveness or eloquence of the pulpit." P. 49. It develops æstheticism and taste, at the expense of power. We will give here some unbiassed authority in support of what might otherwise be considered a prejudiced and invidious opinion. Our authority is an article in the (London) *Westminster Review*, entitled "*Retrospective Survey of American Literature:*"

"In no other department is American literature so rich as in that of theology and religion." (Then follows a list of authors.) "In this list it will be observed that we have mentioned no member of the Episcopal Church; and it is remarkable that the American branch of the English Establishment has never furnished a man of first rate abilities, or one whose writings have in them the elements of enduring life." (Then follow the names of some of the most influential of its ministers, and the writer goes on.) "But we do not find among them all any one to be compared with a dozen in the Presbyterian Church, to Dr. Williams in the Baptist, or Andrews Norton in the Unitarian denomination. The dearth of eminent capacities is still more noticeable among the Roman Catholics," etc.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps the English Church will occur to readers as an exception to this rule as to the influence of liturgy; but they will remember that this Church has all the *prestige* and power of a state

<sup>1</sup> *Westminster Review*, Vol. LVII., January and April, 1852, p. 157.

institution; under the fostering care of the government a large class of professional bookmakers are supported, ordained *sine titulo* and remain permanently *sine cura*. The average "curate" of the Church of England is perhaps the weakest specimen of *præacher* extant. The liturgical system suits the feminine taste (male and female) and repels the masculine. We have often noticed the predominating attendance of women over men in the Episcopal Church; this is true to a certain extent of all Churches, but it is preëminently and peculiarly so of the Episcopal. Upon a communion occasion you will see the women in a body remain to partake of the sacrament, while the men will rise almost *en masse* and leave the church. Of this Church it is true, so far as our observation extends, far more than of any other, that the ladies of a family will be found ardent zealous Church-women, while the men are absolutely indifferent to all religion; taught the exclusive claims of the Episcopal Church and yet finding nothing there to satisfy them, they attend no worship and are rarely seen in any church except upon special occasions. The Episcopal Church does not take hold of the men. We think this is owing to the character of its pulpit. The masculine taste does not dote on millinery; it cannot be long gratified with confectioneries, and it requires a very invalid appetite to be *fed* by the ordinary liturgical table.

As to the alleged craving after Episcopal pabulum, we can only say that it does not prevail in our latitude; we think the course of our author admirably adapted to justify, encourage, and increase it wherever it does exist. We are satisfied that a liturgical movement in our section could not command the support of a corporal's guard.

The Episcopal cultus presents quite a lively scene, and hence with show of reason may be called "cheerful"; we fancy, however, that the regular repetition of precisely the same words week after week would tend to wear the bloom off the "variety" feature of it; and as to its being "restful," the almost unanimous verdict of *the sects* is that it is anything else. Suggested by this alleged craving, arises a question which we will throw out for the reader to consider and answer: Admitting such to be the case,

what lies at the *root* of it? What is the exact character of that feeling which is "offended" and "disgusted" at Presbyterian worship? What kind of spirit is it that hankers after a "more cheerful, more varied, more restful service"? What is it that craves the "attractiveness" of æsthetic beauty and demands the adjuncts of a splendid ritual in the worship of God? We do not think that such an inclination is necessarily a favorable sign or hastily to be encouraged. It is a significant lesson of history that this beauteous array has not always been the bridal attire of a new spiritual life in the Church, but has at least occasionally proven the decking of a dead body, the ghastly mockery that hides incipient decay under the glory and beauty of a gorgeous ceremonial. Moreover, we enter a decided protest against the contrast constantly instituted by our author between "hearing a sermon" and "worshipping God." He knows very well that the doctrine distinctly enounced in our standards is, that God is worshipped in the hearing of the word; that preaching is as really a part of public worship as prayer. We might inquire here if it is not one of the distinguishing characteristics of the new dispensation that the preaching of the gospel assumes predominant importance in the worship of God? Is not this evident from the New Testament history of the Church? One would judge from it that the disciples "went to preaching" on the Sabbath, not "to service." The liturgical idea is the Old Testament idea. Certainly the most prominent feature of the worship recorded in the Acts is the sermon.

This remarkable concession to the silly clamor of the liturgical is unworthy of a great teacher of Presbyterian Polity.

Let us now examine the principle upon which he advocates a change.

"The method is not of the essence of acceptable worship; and the decision in the one case against forms of prayer, and in the other for them, may be equally legitimate. The only real question is, How may our worship be made most devout, attractive, and edifying?" P. 43.

Upon such a principle we think it would be a difficult matter to define *will-worship*, which is an undoubted offence in the sight of God. What is here designated as the only real question is,



we think, no question at all. It would leave the form of worship to be determined by the taste of the worshipper, a criterion all history unites to prove absolutely unstable and untrustworthy. It is just the principle which produced the manifold corruptions of Papal worship. It is just the principle which divided between the two great branches of the Reformation and left the one espousing it only half-reformed; one branch holding that all not expressly commanded in the word was implicitly forbidden, the other that all not expressly forbidden was implicitly granted; a difference containing in germ all that separates between the Presbyterians and the Lutherans.

In our author's short paragraph there lies couched all the latitudinarianism which makes the evangelical party in the Episcopal Church a meagre minority, leading a forlorn hope against the Romanising tendencies and practices of the high ritualists. It is this principle which makes the "cheerfulness, variety, and restfulness" of the Episcopal cultus a geometrically increasing progression, a voyage upon a shoreless ocean with no guide but human fancy and cultured taste and no conceivable ultimate haven but Papacy. The appetite grows with what it feeds upon, and has led to the introduction of so much novelty and innovation by way of improvement that the old-school Episcopalians sometimes confess sadly to feeling more at home in the Presbyterian Church than in their own. Shall we place our Church upon this inclined plane? God forbid!

But this is not a question for argument; it is a mere matter of interpretation. No man, however eminent his position, can speak for Presbyterianism. Our standards do this, and they give no uncertain sound on this point. Since our author is a Professor of Church Polity, we may be pardoned for citing the *Confession of Faith*:

"But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is *instituted by himself*, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men. . . . or in any other way not *prescribed in Holy Scripture*." Chap. XXI., 1.

"The duties required in the Second Commandment are, the receiving, observing, and keeping pure and entire, all such religious worship and ordinances as God hath instituted in his word."

"The sins forbidden in the Second Commandment are, all devising, counselling, commanding, using, and in any wise approving any religious worship *not instituted by God himself*." Larger Cat., Q. 108, 109.

So that according to our standards the only real question is, What does God's word declare to be the worship acceptable to him? Man's tastes and views and judgment have no more to do with the matter than with the plan of salvation. He has no more option in the form of worship than he has in the form of theology. Whether right or wrong, this seems to be the plain teaching of our standards. The theory our author advances is Neo-Presbyterianism. To sum up our criticism of his argument, we deny his facts, we doubt his inferences, we repudiate his principles.

But while we charge our author's representation of the ordinary Presbyterian worship with exaggeration amounting to caricature, we would not be understood as implying perfect satisfaction with our cultus; and though we assert that a movement towards a liturgy would not command any appreciable support, we do not deny that there may be many in our Church who would be glad to see decided improvement in the conduct of our public worship. We agree with the author in desiring this improvement, we differ from him both as to the extent of its need and the method by which it is to be brought about; we do not believe that affairs are in anything like the deplorable state he pictures, and we cannot see how the optional liturgy would work the betterment we both agree in desiring. In our opinion all defect in Presbyterian worship may be traced to one thing, viz., we have allowed the sermon to absorb the care and attention of minister and congregation somewhat to the neglect of the other parts of worship. There is a tendency among Presbyterians to place a comparatively exaggerated estimate upon the preached word in the sanctuary services; we say "comparatively," because we do not think that less importance ought to be assigned to it. As already stated, the preaching of the gospel is the main feature of the worship recorded in the New Testament; it is the predominant work of the Church of the new dispensation as distinguished from the old; it is the chief function of the ministry. The minister is preëminently a *preacher* (α κήρυξ), not a priest; his com-

mission is, "Go preach my gospel;" he is primarily a preacher of the gospel, secondarily a leader in the devotions of the congregation. This we maintain as against the charge and claim of the liturgical that we go to church to hear a sermon while they go to worship God. It is this scriptural idea of the paramount importance of the preached gospel that has made the Presbyterian Church the teacher of Christendom; this has been her distinguishing glory. Believing this, we cannot argue for any lowering of this part of public worship; at the same time we desire to see a decided elevation of the other parts—reading of the Scriptures, praise, and prayer. This we conceive to be the teaching of our standards; they are minute, specific, and emphatic in their directions as to the conduct of these parts of public worship, devoting a chapter to each. What we need is to follow the spirit of these directions; there is no necessity for our becoming Presbyterio-Episcopalians, we only need to be more thoroughly and consistently Presbyterians. Let the sacredness of worship be associated with every part of the service. To be more specific, consider the matter of praise. Let ministers endeavor earnestly, persistently, but *discreetly*, to promote congregational singing, to impress the congregation with the fact that this is a part of their worship; let them conduct their part of it with solemnity and impressiveness. We incline to the opinion that the most defective part of our worship—and in this we are not inferior to any other Church—is in the announcing and reading of hymns; they are often read in such a way as to indicate on the part of the reader scant apprehension of their meaning, and certainly no adequate appreciation of their spirit, their force, their beauty. Some of these hymns are genuine poetry, some are rich with the marrow of the gospel, some are as stirring as a battle-song, and others exquisitely tender and plaintive; yet many of our ministers would read "All hail the power of Jesus' name," and "Jesus, lover of my soul," in precisely the same tone and style, utterly regardless of the fact that one is, as has been aptly said, the Christian Marseillaise, while the other breathes all the pleading pathos of prayer. We once heard a distinguished minister read, in public worship, the hymn beginning,

"Let Sion's watchmen all awake,  
And take the alarm they give;  
Now let them from the mouth of God,  
Their solemn charge receive."

He read it with great solemnity, in a deep, clear, distinct, sonorous tone; so far, so good; but he read it without the slightest variation of inflection, accent, or emphasis from beginning to end. Now let the reader of this article mark what a difference may be made, what additional force given, by the mere matter of emphasis alone; let him first read the stanza above given in the solemn dead-level monotony of tone which we have described, and then read it again emphasising the words we now italicise:

"Let Sion's watchmen all *awake*,  
And *take* the alarm they *give*;  
Now let *them* from the mouth of God,  
*Their* solemn charge receive."

This may be considered by some as too puerile a matter for their attention, but we have heard it said by intelligent persons that they have learned more from the mere reading of a hymn by some ministers than from a sermon by others.

The same remark apply to the reading of the Scriptures; they ought always to be read *reverently*; <sup>1</sup> but after a passage has been read in a reverent manner, with distinct articulation, there may yet remain much to be desired. The Bible is a very life-like book, containing great varieties of style, and sometimes vivid description, sharp contrast, spirited dialogue, and animated narrative, all in one passage. Where such is the case the minister ought to manifest some knowledge of the fact. The description of Elijah and Israel on Carmel, and the dialogues between Elijah and Obadiah, Ahab and Jezebel, ought not to be read as one would read the genealogical table in the first chapter of Matthew. The same general rule may be applied to all public reading, read intelligently and intelligibly; the former will generally secure the latter. Let the reader first be sure that he *understands* what

---

<sup>1</sup> This reverence ought to extend to the very handling of the Book itself. We have sometimes seen ministers at the close of the sermon *fling* the volume shut with a careless, or affectedly careless sweep of the right arm that was exceedingly offensive.

he is to read, and then let him as far as possible reproduce in his own mind the position, circumstances, etc., of the writer or speaker, endeavoring himself to imbibe the very spirit of the words. In order to do this, he must, of course, give some study beforehand to the passage to be read. No minister ought to read from the pulpit any chapter or hymn which he has not previously examined with care.

If this rule were rigorously observed, there would not be that air of listlessness which often pervades a congregation while the minister is conducting "the introductory services." We have sometimes seen an attitude of surprised attentiveness steal rapidly over a congregation which had settled itself to wait patiently for the announcement of the text, as it discovered that the minister's *mind* and *heart* were in the first hymn read.

Every argument that can be urged in favor of forethought, care, and study in pulpit reading, applies with increased force to pulpit prayer. We do not think the importance of this matter can be easily exaggerated. In private prayer the form matters little, but the minister in the closet and the minister in the pulpit are two very widely differing persons; in the latter case he is the mouthpiece of the people to God, he is acting as *their* representative, presenting *their* needs and desires at the throne of the heavenly grace, and he ought to feel the dignity and responsibility of such high office, something of the intense solemnity that filled the heart of Aaron, and pervaded the camp of Israel, when as high priest, stripped of his ornaments, he passed into the holy of holies to carry the nation into the immediate presence of Jehovah. If the minister were always to bear this in mind, and enter upon the exercise of this solemn duty under its influence, it would manifest itself in the very *timbre* of his tones; there would be in it a sort of magnetism which would communicate itself to every listener, and though the preacher might be a man of uncultivated taste, of rude and even grotesque expression, yet the solemnity and sincerity of his manner would render any feeling of disgust impossible. Some of the most impressive prayers ever heard have been offered by illiterate men, and would have been almost ludicrous but for this element, they were redeemed by the glow-

ing fervor of those who offered them. But we do not think this burden of redemption ought ever to be laid on the fervor and earnestness of the leader in prayer; every minister should give great care and thought and study to his public prayers. He ought in the public services to approach God with well ordered words, manifesting at least as much reverence for him as for the congregation, respect for which leads to so much care in the composition of the sermon. The desires, needs, circumstances, etc., of the congregation, are not immutable and invariable, therefore the prayer ought not to be stereotyped; even the liturgy recognises this and makes what provision it can for it by prayers "for special occasions." To lead a congregation to the mercy-seat is not an exercise to be left to the inspiration or accident of the moment, the chance phraseology and hap-hazard ideas that may be sandwiched into a mind already preoccupied with the sermon, with notices, and often distracted and disturbed (particularly at country churches) by the conversation, suggestions, etc., incident to the greeting of acquaintances, Sabbath-school exercises, or meetings of Session; it is an exercise which may well call into full play the highest powers of mind and soul, as such it is worthy of all care and thought. At the same time there is in many minds a decided prejudice against a study of prayer and preparation therefor; and this notwithstanding the fact that homiletic manuals and works on sacred rhetoric uniformly urge the duty and the importance of it upon the attention of ministers. This feeling is founded doubtless upon an instinctive horror of anything like display in prayer, but the same feeling would likewise condemn study expended on the sermon. For surely, an enlightened conscience will shrink also from making the gospel a means of display, prostituting the proclamation of God's grace and subsidising the woes of sin with its terrible consequences, to win the applause of men; yet no sensible man would use this as an argument for attempting to preach without preparation; why then should it be allowed to influence men against preparation for leading the congregation in prayer? It is probable that most ministers attain greater excellence in preaching than in prayer, and it is safe for any preacher who makes no study of this im-

portant part of his duty, to conclude that he is deficient in it. Let him seriously consider the matter and resolve to attain to the highest standard within his reach. To this end let him study carefully and constantly the best models; first and foremost those in the Scriptures, and next, the best specimens of uninspired devotional literature; let him study the best liturgies, and study them extensively and *regularly*, not to borrow "scraps" to be worked into an incongruous mosaic of mediæval mysticism and modern practicality, but to become imbued with their devotional tone and spirit, and thus to elevate the whole character and style of his public prayer just as he studies the acknowledged masters of classic English to improve his style in speaking or writing.

That there is great need for such study cannot be questioned; and while we can say that we have never heard a prayer from a Presbyterian preacher which raised in us any feeling akin to disgust, yet we have heard many which fell very far short of our ideal, and indeed very far short of the ability and gifts of those who offered them. Moreover, it cannot be denied that extempore prayer, leaving so much dependent upon the culture and good taste of the preacher, opens very wide and indefinite possibilities for the violation of the proprieties and offers well-nigh infinite opportunities for sins against the "eternal fitness of things;" therefore, since good taste is not any too common, it is the more important that special study should be given to the matter; we have known men of decided ability whose influence and acceptability were very greatly marred by the want of this "sixth sense."

Perhaps the question may arise in the mind of some reader, "If such is the case, why not agree to the adoption of an optional liturgy? Instead of striving to approximate the model, why not use the very model itself?" In addition, then, to what we have said with reference to liturgy in general, we remark that an optional liturgy would not produce the desired effect, because

1. The very persons most needing it would be the least likely to use it. The very thing which occasions their deficiency is their lack of taste or their failure to appreciate the importance of the subject, and this would operate to cause them to decline

the liturgy just as it now leads them to neglect all effort to improve in this respect.

2. It would tend, so far as used, to introduce confusion growing out of a lack of uniformity; there would be the same feeling of strangeness and embarrassment between the members of different congregations worshipping together that is now experienced when Presbyterians attend the Episcopal Church, or *vice versa*.

3. We would reach the same results that we have pointed out as concomitants of a liturgy; one of which may be repeated here as bearing particularly upon the superior impressiveness of liturgical services, viz., the inevitable tendency of the perpetual parrot-like repetition of precisely the same form of words to deaden all appreciation of their meaning, and consequently to lead to a lifeless rendering of them. All of the advantages of spontaneous prayer would be sacrificed in favor of the perfunctory reading of a service robbed of every atom of freshness by long and habitual use.

Such are our deliberate convictions as to the use of a liturgy optional or enforced, and we believe they are shared by the overwhelming majority of our Church. The author "wishes it to be distinctly understood that this is an open question;" we think that if he brings it to a formal test he will be astonished at the exceeding *exiguity* of the question.

Should the Presbyterian Church ever be persuaded to pursue the course he recommends, she may write ICHABOD over her portals, for her glory will have departed.



## ARTICLE IV.

## THE SUPREMACY OF THE ANCIENT CLASSICS.

It is fashionable in these days, perhaps always was fashionable, with very small and aspiring geniuses, to find fault with everything which has about it the flavor of antiquity, and to unsettle, if possible, everything that has become venerable through custom. In compliance with this fashion we propose to find fault with the position which from time immemorial has been assigned to the ancient classics in our educational institutions. This is no new topic of debate. For some years past the relative value of the classics as a means of culture has been warmly discussed by many of the foremost thinkers of Europe, and some of the leading educators of this country have also contributed to the discussion. To show that the debate has been able, we need only to mention a few of the representative men on either side. Herbert Spencer, in his work on education, which has been before the public for more than twenty years, takes strong ground against the classics, and while he does not say it in so many words, he makes it abundantly evident that he would gladly see them altogether excluded from the curriculum and the natural sciences substituted in their place. Prof. Huxley, in a recent address delivered at the opening of a college in Birmingham, showed a strong leaning in the same direction. Matthew Arnold takes the other side, and puts in a strong plea for the Latin and Greek, insisting that they should continue to constitute the basis of all liberal education. He even argues to show that the influence of the classics will be more and more necessary as the domain of science is more and more extended. Moreover, he comforts himself and sympathises with the dogmatic assurance that while human nature remains what it now is, these splendid achievements of the ancient world will maintain their ascendancy. An equally ardent advocate of the classics is found on this side the water in Prof. Gildersleeve of the Johns Hopkins University. He says, "The ancient classics are life of our life. A part of our heritage from the ages, they are an indefeasible possession. We cannot get rid of Greece and Rome if we would. The phraseology of

VOL. XXXV., NO. 1—7.

Latin is wrought into our tongue. The scientific vocabulary of English is studded with Greek words. The whole body of our literature is penetrated with classical allusions." We are not surprised to find these men waxing valiant in fight. They are contending for their altars and their firesides. After giving them all praise for an earnest endeavor to promote the highest interests of education, we cannot forget that they speak as advocates, not as judges. Their views are colored by the warm glow of an excusable partiality for the studies to which they have devoted the intellectual energies of their lives. The two former are known to make an idol of all knowledge that has upon it the glitter of novelty. The two latter feel the kindlings of an equal ardor when they muse upon that knowledge which has gathered about it the associations of many centuries. Matthew Arnold frankly confesses that there is a probability of his doing the sciences injustice. Doubtless Spencer might truthfully make the same confession in reference to the classics. While, therefore, they are eminently qualified to debate the question, they are not well qualified to decide it. The judge or the jury should be free from bias. We believe the processes of our civil courts are based upon the assumption that a jury are the more likely to decide a case justly the more absolute their ignorance of its merits before it is brought before them. In view of this assumption, it could not be laid to the charge of egotism, should we claim to be well qualified to adjudicate the case of Huxley, Spencer, and others, *versus* Arnold, Gildersleeve, and others. Should it appear that our ignorance of both sides of the question might properly be described as at once comprehensive and minute, the disclosure would only prove our eminent fitness to serve on the jury.

So much by way of apology for our presuming to offer our services to the public. Should we be permitted to arbitrate, we would say to the disputants, *in medio tutissimus ibis*; and we should translate, *the classics should not be banished, but they should be dethroned*. Relatively, too much time is given to them and too much importance attached to them. We must begin our discussion of the subject by briefly noting two facts, out of which the whole significance of the discussion grows. First, the time

that can be devoted exclusively to the acquisition of knowledge is limited. We think we will all agree with Herbert Spencer, that "to prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to perform." We may differ as to what is meant by "complete living," but we will still agree that education can perform no higher end than to prepare us for it. Education is the means, complete living is the end. Of course, we cannot spend a'l our time in *preparing* to live. The stage of preparation must give place to the stage for which it is preparatory. We have decided that this preparatory stage, so far as concerns college training, shall ordinarily last only four years. Usually little of real value has been accomplished before that period. Much time may have been consumed, but perhaps six years of judicious study would be amply equivalent to all that has been done before the freshman year in college. We may say, then, that usually the time given to education, to a preparation for complete living, is about ten years. Secondly, the sphere of knowledge is practically illimitable. We are the heirs of all time, and the extent of our inheritance is distressingly great. We are encumbered with the abundance of the things which we possess. Dr. Alexander Bain tells us that in the universities of Scotland, from the time of their founding down to 1574, nothing was taught except the writings of Aristotle. Yet the students found enough in that one author to keep them busy during a four years' course. In 1574 other Greek classics were introduced; Latin classics followed; towards the latter part of the eighteenth century the English language was admitted. Since that time French and German have found an entrance. Later still, the doors had to be opened to modern sciences, whose spreading branches are now overshadowing the earth and reaching unto the heavens. Leaving out of account the smaller treasures of learning hoarded in other tongues, we have the accumulated literature of the ancient and modern world in the Greek, Roman, French, German, and English languages. Ten years can be expended in the literature of either one of these languages, and even then only a small part of its wide expanse will be explored. Hence the question emerges, What is to be done, since the time is so limited and the field to be traversed so

limitless? Manifestly if the ten years are to be turned to the highest use, the question must first be settled, In what part of this limitless field can the greatest fortune be amassed in a given time? It is like turning a colt loose in a pasture of a thousand acres. He can spend all the years of his colthood in one little corner. It is only a question as to which corner. To get the most good in a given time it becomes necessary to solve the problem, which grass is most nutritive and the most easily assimilated.

From this brief statement of facts we deduce the following canon of criticism: *Ceteris paribus*, that department of knowledge is to be preferred which yields the greatest return in a given time. Waiving for the present the question as to whether the *ceteris* are *paribus*, let us apply our canon to the ancient classics. In order to any profit at all, do they not make a very extraordinary draft on the student's time? Some one has anticipated us in the sage remark that "time is money." He might have followed it up with the equally sage remark that time is life. When man has used up his supply of time, he invariably finds that his supply of life is also exhausted. To give time, then, is to give life—a very valuable article of barter. No one ought to give it without an exceedingly valuable return. His stock at best is small, and cannot be replenished. Is it by any means certain that for the amount of life invested in them, the dead languages always make a satisfactory return? May we not in most cases be bartering a great deal of the living for a very small modicum of the dead? "Could a man be secure that his days would endure as of old, for a thousand long years, what things might he know! What deeds might he do! And all without hurry or care." If we could be perfectly certain of remaining here until we had thoroughly explored the living world, and then have leisure left—time hanging heavily on our hands—we might well afford to spend life's morning hours in robbing the graveyards of the past. But we have time only for a fashionable call, and if we try to cultivate an acquaintance with the taciturn Greeks and Romans, the fear is that the time for leaving will arrive before we have hardly broken the ice. Those old people are very reserved. The German poet,

Heine, as quoted by George Eliot, says: "The Romans never would have found time to conquer the world, if they had first had to learn the Latin language. Luckily for them, they already knew in their cradles what nouns have their accusatives in *im*. I, on the contrary, had to learn them by heart in the sweat of my brow." Putting aside for the present the comparative values of the knowledge gained, as well as the more important matter of mental discipline, consider how much time is given to Latin and Greek. These languages are contemporary with all other branches of learning. Look at the curriculum of any of our first-class colleges. In order to enter the Freshman Latin, the pupil must have compassed two or three grammars and read a couple or more books of Cæsar. To enter the same class in Greek, he is gently reminded that he must have read some of the simpler prose; *i. e.*, he must have travelled many weary parasangs through Xenophon, and, to borrow the witticism of Prof. Gildersleeve, he must form a very intimate acquaintance with the two sons of Darius and Parysatis in all their varying moods and tenses. Then from the Freshman, on through, while the student is dropping off this, that, and the other study as finished, these cling fondly to him until he reaches the depot on his final departure for home. Usually they are contracted in early youth, about the time a boy has gotten well over the measles and whooping cough, and they increase in severity until the awful crisis is reached, often proving fatal just on the eve of graduation. These languages antedate nearly all the studies in the curriculum, and those which they do not antedate they outlive. But this is not all, nor the worst. They crowd everything else to the wall. When you see the student's lamp shooting its lonely beams through the window into the midnight darkness, rest assured that it is shining on the open page of Latin or Greek. When you enter the student's *sanctum*, and find him with brow contracted, lips compressed, eyes set, and the whole frame giving evidence of great mental agony, set it down that he is trying to dispose of an apparently *surplus* word that ages ago flowed from the facile pen of Livy, or to fill up from the stores of his imagination a hiatus in the sparsely settled sentences of Tacitus. All other sources of knowledge beckon

to him in vain. Astronomy, with her glittering jewels displayed; geology, with her rocky bosom uncovered; chemistry, with her ever-fresh surprises freely offered; natural history, with her astounding facts temptingly arrayed—try in turn to win a look of favorable recognition. Their allurements are all lost on him. Still he sits with pale, sad face, bent over the ponderous lexicon, and his eager eyes rapidly scanning its pages, as if in search of the evidence that was to save him from the gallows on the morrow. By-and-by he shuts the big book and takes up his pen. Watch the nervous twitching of the mouth, the frequent thrusts of the fingers through the hair, and see his eyes “in a fine frenzy rolling.” One who had not travelled the road would think that he was scaling the heights of Parnassus and feasting his soul on the landscape of poesy, while his spirit was fast becoming charged with the inspiration of the Muses. But we know from experience that such twitchings and contortions, such intense endeavor to see the invisible, belong to no species of composition known among students, except Latin and Greek exercises. He is only torturing memory to recall some precedent that will enable him to decide whether, in a particular construction, purpose is to be expressed by an infinitive, a gerund, or *ut* with the subjunctive. Such is the chief employment of college life, from the day the student enters as a timid Freshman to the day, the never to be forgotten day, when he crams one hundred and fifty pages of rules for his final examination. Nearly the whole time, devoted to serious work, is spent in digging up the gnarled roots and tracing out the twisted branches of the dead languages. Other studies are hurriedly skimmed over. A glance at natural philosophy before breakfast, moral science between breakfast and chapel, physiology between the student's room and the class-room, stolen peeps into mental philosophy while other members of the class are reciting. Something after this order is the way in which studies in English are prosecuted. Not only, then, is a large place assigned to the ancient classics in the curriculum, but they usurp a still larger place. The explanation is easy. To make any show at all in Latin and Greek, the student must *work*. He is bound to delve if he get any, even the smallest quantity of

ore. On the other hand, he can snatch a gem here and there from his other studies while running. Hence the student comes to regard Greek and Latin as the great business, and he takes all risks on other books. His feeling is: "If I can only get Latin and Greek off my hands, I can manage the others." So he sets deliberately to work to get them off his hands, and by the time he does it he must manage the others in the way described. In estimating the amount of time given to the classics, we are not to be guided by the specifications of the curriculum. We are to take into account that they domineer over their colleagues to such an extent that it is perhaps under the truth to say that three-fourths of college life is absorbed by them. Judged by the return they make, are we sure that they are entitled to this position of overpowering supremacy? Is it settled beyond all doubt, that for the great amount of time and effort invested, the student receives an equivalent?

Before considering definitely what is the profit derived from the ancient classics, let us subject them to another standard of criticism. *Cæteris paribus*, that department of knowledge is to be preferred that yields the most pleasure. This statement sounds like the harbinger of a glorious millennium to the toil-worn student, and he mentally ejaculates, "*Too good to be true.*" Perhaps so; but we believe that it is just good enough to be true, and that it is truth that is exercising more and more influence in shaping educational methods. Prof. William Sloane, of Princeton College, writing on the public schools of England, says: "The aim of English school-masters has changed within the last century. They are no longer fitly characterised by the Westminster boy's translation of *arma virumque cano*—arms and a man *with a cane.*" Herbert Spencer says: "Of all the changes taking place in plans of teaching, the most significant is the growing desire to make the acquirement of knowledge pleasurable rather than painful; a desire based on the more or less distinct perception that at each age the intellectual action which the child likes is a healthful one for it, and conversely." Another English author in a recent work, when laying down rules to guide us in our choice of books, says: "First of all the book which you

would choose must interest you. If you are not interested, you will not open your mind; and if you do not open your mind, you will take in no ideas. The book may be one of the great masterpieces—full of high ideas and noble sentiments; yet to you it will be nothing but a mass of printed paper.” He quotes Shakespeare in confirmation of his teaching:

“No profit grows where is no pleasure taken;  
In brief, sir, study what you most affect.”

We are free to confess that we think this last line of the immortal bard is a little too strong to be made the rule in teaching lazy boys, for the reason that many of them do not “most affect” anything. Yet it is sound doctrine, however liable to perversion, that profit in intellectual pursuits is measured with approximate accuracy by the pleasure experienced. We all know that when physical development is normal, it takes place after a manner that floods life with boisterous joy. The same is true in reference to intellectual development; at least to this extent, that it will be more rapid and vigorous when the activities called into play are of a kind to give pleasure. How will the ancient classics stand the test when we apply to them this canon of criticism? Such was the hatred cherished by the monks of the Middle Ages for Greek, that they were accustomed to call it the “invention of the devil.” If the reason of the average boy is in like manner swayed by his feelings, perhaps he entertains a half-formed belief that both Latin and Greek are the invention of that wicked and cruel spirit. What the mind naturally craves is new ideas, or new combinations of ideas. It delights in the discovery of new truth, or old truth in new forms and relations. Hence the discursive faculties, the reasoning powers, the imagination, give delight in their exercise. But there is little or no room for their exercise in the study of the dead languages. The faculty chiefly called into exercise is memory, and its work is purely mechanical. The great business is to store the mind with a vocabulary of words and a lot of rules that are principally useful as a starting point from which to go in quest of the one thousand and one exceptions. Nothing is more arbitrary than the structure of language, and hence there is little scope for the exercise of the reasoning



powers, and the acquisition of new ideas is too tedious to afford pleasure.

Furthermore, whatever may be said in favor of distasteful studies as a means for developing the mind, no one can doubt that the knowledge thus acquired is soonest forgotten. When the day of liberty comes and the pressure of authority is taken off, the hated text-book is laid aside, and the pursuit of knowledge in that direction is for ever abandoned. This accounts for the fact that if all the Greek and Latin which are forgotten by the great army of college graduates during the first five years of business life should be gathered, "I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." If it be true, then, as we think it is, that the dead languages are to the average boy a distasteful drudgery, kindling no healthful glow, stimulating no thirst for truth, awakening no ennobling aspirations, and prompting to no future acquisitions, surely whatever profit they confer is purchased at a great cost.

We are now prepared to consider definitely the amount of profit. Matthew Arnold very truthfully says that what we want in our culture is to know the *best* that has been thought and said in the world. If, in order to know the best, we must know the Latin and Greek languages, then the study of these languages is to be prosecuted at any cost. To simplify our present inquiry, we will look successively at the two distinct objects to be accomplished. One is to strengthen the mind, the other to store it; one is to expand the mind, the other to fill it. Looking at the last mentioned object first, will any one contend that the ancient classics are worth the time and labor expended on them for the sake of the mental furniture gained? We believe it is questionable whether the mind of the average graduate contains one important fact in history or in science, the knowledge of one great principle in ethics or philosophy, which is due to an acquaintance with the dead languages. It may be true, as Mr. Mill says, that "the speeches of Thucydides; the ethics, rhetoric, and politics of Aristotle; the dialogues of Plato; the orations of Demosthenes; the satires and epistles of Horace; all the writings of Tacitus; the great work of Quintilian; and in a less formal manner, all that

is left us of the ancient historians, philosophers, orators, and even dramatists, are replete with remarks and maxims of singular good sense and penetration, applicable both to political and private life." Certainly we are not prepared to dispute the truth of this statement. But however true it may be, it is not more true than the statement, that all these wise and penetrating maxims can be had in English, in a far more intelligible shape than they will ever appear to the average student who looks at them through what to him is the murky atmosphere of the original languages. Not only so, but after all the time devoted by the college graduate to learning how to read the classics in the original, when he wants to possess the ideas they contain, he seeks the translations. About all the store the mind gets is a vocabulary of words and certain peculiarities of grammatical structure. The most enthusiastic champions of the classics confess that such knowledge is, in itself considered, of very little value. Prof. Gildersleeve tells us that "Latin and Greek are to be studied primarily for the knowledge of the life of the Roman and Greek people, as manifested in language and literature, and not because Latin and Greek are convenient vehicles for the communication of a certain amount of linguistic philosophy or comparative grammar." Matthew Arnold expresses his opinion on the same subject in the following decided terms: "When I speak of knowing Greek and Roman antiquity, I mean more than a knowledge of so much vocabulary, so much grammar, so many portions of authors in the Greek and Latin languages. I mean knowing the Greeks and Romans, their life and genius; what they were and did in the world; what we get from them, and what its value." If we have understood these able defenders of the classics, they concede that a mere philological study of Latin and Greek is of small value; and in conceding this, they concede that the average college student derives but small benefit from them. Whatever it may be intended for him to know, "more than so much vocabulary, so much grammar, so many portions of authors in the Latin and Greek languages," it is certain that he does not actually know anything more. Notwithstanding so much time and effort have been expended, it is the exception, and not the rule, when there has been that thorough

mastery of vocabulary, idiom, and structure that is necessary to bring the student into easy and pleasant communication with the ancient mind. We are ready to concede that in these exceptional cases great and varied benefits accrue. The soul is animated and exalted, its powers stimulated and developed, by contact with some of the noblest sentiments of philosophy and the loftiest inspirations of poetry. The taste is cultivated, and the English language becomes an instrument of greatly increased efficiency. But educational methods should have reference to the rule, not to the exception. The rule is for the student to reach the end of his course with only such store of knowledge as will enable him, by slow and irksome effort, to spell out the author's meaning, and usually he is content to put this meaning into the most slovenly and uncouth English.

The assertion is frequently made that the best literature of modern times is based upon the great models of antiquity. Then it is gravely asked if we had not better take our inspiration from the fountain-head? This question becomes amusing when we reflect that not one in ten of those who have sought the fountain-head has ever found it the source of anything approaching to inspiration. To the average student the fountain-head has the appearance of a muddy spring, and when left to consult his own pleasure, he will drink far down the stream where the water, if it be the same, has become clear and pure by filtration. That Homer was a great poet, Aristotle a great philosopher, Demosthenes a great orator, he learns from the English preface to their writings. He never becomes sufficiently familiar with their language to think in its peculiar idioms, and hence can not appreciate their merits of style, nor have his heart warmed by the glow of their ardent minds. He follows their line of thought, or of argument, in his own crude and imperfect translation, and it is needless to say that little of their literary beauty passes into his rendering. Surely, we cannot assign the classics their present position of supremacy, because of the valuable stores which they bring to the mind. Even the vocabulary and grammar are soon gone from memory. Few graduates who have been out five years could boast with the German poet from whom we have already

quoted. After suggesting that the Romans knew in their cradles what nouns have their accusatives in *im*, while he had to learn them in the sweat of his brow, he goes on to say, "Nevertheless, it is fortunate for me that I know them, and the fact that I have them at my fingers' ends if I should ever happen to want them suddenly, affords me much inward consolation and repose in many troubled hours of life." How few who, like him, have purchased such knowledge by the sweat of their brow, can, like him, draw consolation and repose from the continued possession of it! The unfortunate many, if called on suddenly, or for that matter slowly and deliberately, for the Latin accusatives in *im*, would be as non-communicative as if their tongues were suddenly paralysed.

It is claimed for the ancient classics that the study of them in the original languages gives us proficiency in the use of our own tongue. The validity of this claim is conceded, but with this important reservation, viz., the benefit is more than counterbalanced if a knowledge of the dead languages is gained by the neglect of a careful analytical study and thorough mastery of the structure of the English itself. There is no doubt that such is often the case, and that it accounts for certain facts that have awakened surprise. Our Revised New Testament, for example, is the fruit of the ripest classical scholarship that can be found out of Germany. Through what a storm of censure their English has passed since their work was submitted to the public! We may mention one or two specimens of this censure from high authority. A critic in the *Edinburgh Review* says: "It will remain a monument of the industry of its authors, and a treasury of their opinions and erudition; but unless we entirely mistake, until its English has undergone thorough revision, it will not supplant the authorised version." Another critic is much more severe: "It is startling to find in a work which has occupied for ten years a large portion of the time of twenty-five of our most illustrious scholars, so many gross violations of the most elementary laws of grammar." Mr. G. Washington Moon has filled a good sized book with mere specimens of these gross violations. We cannot refrain from introducing a criticism from one of the most distinguished scholars of our Church, or, for that matter, of our country. After

avowing the fact that "Greek scholarship is far in advance of what it was under the patronage of the Stuarts," he draws the following contrast between the English used by the Greek scholarship of that period and of this: "The English Bible given us by King James is the greatest classic in the language, and the one of all others that lies nearest the popular heart. The idea of such a book as the revision becoming a classic at all is preposterous; and the idea of its acceptance in lieu of the people's most sacred and most cherished literary and domestic treasure would be a species of midsummer madness." An English critic accounts for the bad English of the Revision by saying that their work "shows still more conclusively than was already apparent that the study of English has been—and no doubt still is—very much neglected in our high schools and at the universities." A writer in the *Fortnightly Review* says: "It is one of the paradoxes of literary history that in Germany—which is the world's schoolmaster in learning the Latin and Greek languages—so little of the style and beauty of those immortal models passes into their literature." Doubtless the paradox finds its explanation in the fact that attention has been paid to the ancient languages to the neglect of the mother tongue. Perhaps the true state of the case is that the very highest proficiency in English cannot be had without Latin and Greek; while at the same time the actual proficiency would be higher if less attention were paid to the dead and more to the living.

What now remains to be said in behalf of the ancient classics? It may seem that we have been very grudging in allowing them any praise; and that if our verdict is just, the sentence should not be deposition merely, but perpetual banishment. We are not conscious of any motive that would prompt us to be unjustly severe. It is under a sense of that solemn responsibility which attaches to the office of one set to dispense even-handed justice that we speak when we say that, as ordinarily studied, the ancient languages are chiefly valuable, if not solely valuable, as a means of mental discipline. That they do exercise the mind vigorously, no one who has groaned over them will deny. That vigorous exercise will develop and strengthen mental muscle

needs no proof. Possibly the dead languages are a more valuable instrument for the one single purpose of mental drill than can be found elsewhere. It is in virtue of this possibility that our verdict calls for nothing more than deposition. President Porter puts forth distinctly this claim for them. His words are: "The ancient languages, in their structure, their thoughts, also in the imagery which their literature embodies, are better fitted than any modern language can be for the single office of training the intellect and the feelings and the taste." It will be noticed that he claims more for them than the training of the intellect, but we have already considered the other part of his claim for them, namely, their influence on the feelings and taste. In the April number of this REVIEW for 1883, is an article under the heading, *A Thoroughly Educated Ministry*. No "superscription" is given, but the "image" is at once recognised, and the greatest name in the field of theological controversy is not needed to make us read with reverent attention. Here is his weighty opinion: "Translation from language to language is the prime means for training men to discrimination in using words, and thus in thought. There is no discipline in practical logic so suitable for a pupil as those reasonings from principles of syntax by processes of logical exclusion and synthesis to the correct way of construing sentences. As a mental discipline this construing of a language other than our vernacular has no rival and no substitute in any other study." This writer does not assert for the ancient languages a superiority over the modern, as did President Porter. He merely asserts that "the construing of a language other than our own" is the best possible discipline. Prof. Joseph Le-Conte, of the University of California, a warm friend of the ancient classics, uses this mild form of statement: "No doubt the mental culture involved in the translation and writing of an ancient language is both admirable and varied; but it is at least doubtful whether the same culture may not be attained by the study of a modern language." If the ardent advocate speak after this manner, surely the judge should not be suspected of bias if he go a step further and say, "It is at least doubtful whether the same culture may not be attained" without passing the boundary

of the English tongue. Why should it be taken for granted that no discipline is equal to that involved in the acquisition of a language? What particular powers of the mind are reached by the study of language that cannot be reached by some other study? What proof does the author of "A Thoroughly Educated Ministry" offer in support of his proposition that "as a mental discipline the construing of a foreign language has no rival and no substitute in any other study"? Is it assumed that this proposition is so manifestly true that it only needs to be stated? Or is it so plausible in itself that it needs no more to support it than the power of strong assertion? Or is it supposed to be sufficiently supported by the previous assertion that "there is no discipline in practical logic so suitable for a pupil as those reasonings from principles of syntax by processes of logical exclusion and synthesis to the correct way of construing sentences"? But what supports the supporter? Where there is such serious and well considered difference of opinion, it might be worth while to maintain assertions by the use of a little "practical logic." It is the opinion of some that the logical process involved in the construing of sentences is a very insignificant part of the business. It has been said that if you take a child of five years and a man of twenty-five, and let each use the same exertion to acquire a knowledge of any *spoken* language, the child will easily excel the man. Our own observation bears this out. A few years ago we became acquainted with a colony of Welsh, fresh from the old country. It was generally remarked that the children soon acquired a complete knowledge of the English as it was spoken by their American neighbors. Men in middle life had more difficulty, and some of those quite advanced in years made so little progress that they gave up in despair. The explanation offered is that "the ear, and the memory derived from the ear, are the means by which languages are acquired." Substitute eye for ear and you will have the chief means that are employed in the acquisition of a *written* language. If memory holds in its possession the peculiarities of *idiom*, the rules of syntax, especially the *exceptions* to the rules, the gender of nouns and the meaning of the words, it is a very feeble intellect that cannot perform the logical process of putting

the sentence into such shape as to extract its meaning. It may be going too far to say, as one has said, that "as a rule it is not the reasoner, or person gifted with great brain-power, who the most quickly learns the language, but the superficial thinker, gifted with ear." It is not going too far, we think, to protest against the policy which makes the power to acquire languages the supreme and all-decisive test of one's intellectual stamina. Should we grant that the chief end of collegiate education is to discipline the mind, to train it to think; should we further grant that the ancient languages are an excellent means to this end, we could not grant that they are so surely the best means as to entitle them to their present position of supremacy. If the chief end is mental discipline, there are other ends which, though subordinate, are very important. Suppose these subordinate ends can best be accomplished by other studies, and that these other studies will at the same time contribute greatly to the chief end, would not this entitle them to a position coördinate at least with the ancient languages? Sometimes the physician must forego the use of a remedy that would be most efficient in staying the chief disease of his patient because of complications. There are minor matters to be considered, and so much weight is due to them as to make it the part of wisdom to use means less efficient for the chief end, but remedies that will accomplish subordinate ends. Now, surely the acquisition of knowledge during the ten or twelve years spent in school is no mean object to the man whose after life is to be altogether taken up with the duties of his business calling. All must admit that for the acquisition of knowledge, there is no field equal to that covered by the varied and exhaustless literature of the English tongue. Would it not be a great saving if there could be found in the same field the means of mental discipline, so that both objects could be accomplished at once? Suppose these means of mental discipline were not the best possible, might not the fact that they served another very desirable purpose make them equivalent to more efficient means that served no other purpose? Bear in mind that we have not admitted that there are not in the whole range of possible English studies any means of mental discipline equal to the ancient



languages. We are disposed to think there are. A great thinker has said: "It would be utterly contrary to the beautiful economy of nature if one kind of culture were needed for the gaining of information, and another kind were needed as a mental gymnastic." To this we may add that the great law of parcimony which prevails everywhere in God's works, and which excludes all superfluity of means, would lead us to expect that whatever department of knowledge best serves the purpose of storing the mind with useful information will also best serve the purpose of developing its powers. The story is told of Stephen Girard, that once when a man came to him for work, having no useful employment for him, he put him to removing a pile of stones from one part of his grounds to another. When the man reported the job finished, he told him to carry them back. He kept him at this for some days, merely for the sake of giving the man something to do. Stephen Girard could afford to pay for work that had in it no other object than to exercise the powers of the body. But we, who are so poor in time, and so rich in opportunities for acquiring useful knowledge, can ill afford to give the best years of life to labor that has for its ulterior aim nothing more than the exercise of the mind. To put the case briefly, we should be very sure that we cannot kill two birds with one stone before we almost exhaust our strength in throwing an extra stone merely for the sake of practice.

We have, perhaps, delayed too long to notice an objection that may have been thrusting itself forward to weaken the force of all our logic. How account for the fact that all through the centuries since the awakening of the mind of Western Europe, after the sleep of the Dark Ages, the ancient classics have constituted the basis, the bone and gristle, of all liberal education? Does not the fact of such long-continued and universal agreement among educators show that the system must be not only good, but the best? An affirmative response is loudly given by all those who think the present age one of dangerous tendencies, and whose favorite way of attempting to restrain these tendencies is to declaim against the degeneracy of the age. "It is forgotten," say they, "that the objections now paraded with so much pretence of

superior wisdom, were maturely considered by the great and good men who settled the system for us, and were properly overborne by the affirmative considerations." Thus they would pronounce against every proposed change on the simple ground that it implies that we can improve on the work of our betters; *quod auctoritas*, as friend Turretin would delight to say. We are conscious of a humility which will not suffer us to assume a position that necessarily implies that we think ourselves wiser than our fathers. To avoid the implication, however, it is enough to suggest that they could not have had certain considerations before their minds which will now occur to minds of far less strength, compass, and acuteness. These considerations have reference to changes that have taken place since the fathers fell asleep. When the great universities of Western Europe were founded, and for centuries afterwards, there was nothing to teach and nothing to learn, except Latin and Greek. All the literature of the world that was worth anything, was locked up in those languages. This state of affairs continued long enough for those institutions to make histories, and hence to come under the mighty influence of precedent and prescription. It is indisputable that nowhere is conservatism so petrified as in old, long-established seats of learning. The school-master's infallibility is proverbial, and this is only a personal manifestation of a spirit that pervades such venerable institutions as the universities of Europe. It only remains to be said that until recently the universities founded in the Middle Ages have been giving law to the learned world in all matters pertaining to education. Thus it has come to pass that what began in necessity has continued under the constraint of custom. Surely there can be no impropriety in suggesting that educational methods which were determined in one set of circumstances might possibly be changed for the better in an entirely different set of circumstances. Had the wise fathers who gave us our present system been endowed with the vigor of Methuselah, they might have lived to weigh other considerations than those which influenced them then. How different the world of letters now from what it was even as late as the age of Elizabeth! When she and her contemporaries were educated, the English language

was in its formative stage. Of the books it could boast, only Chaucer is found at this day in the ordinary walks of literature. Shakespeare and Milton, Bacon and Newton, Pitt and Burke, who have rivalled Homer and Virgil, Aristotle and Plato, Demosthenes and Cicero, were all in the future. So were the hundreds of illustrious scholars, whose names will live for ever on the lips of men, who have brought to every department of knowledge its richest stores, and to general literature its supreme glory; while they have pushed forward the boundaries of physical science, until we of the nineteenth century live on a new earth and gaze upon new heavens. Is it reasonable that the staple of our education should continue to be now what it wisely and of necessity was then? They went to the ancients because there were none others to whom they could go. No one can say that there is the same reason for our going there. The riches bequeathed to us by the ancients are but a poor pittance compared to the great and priceless stores that have been gathered into the treasure-house of the English tongue. We are constrained to think that it is largely due to the tyranny of custom, that the student is forced to turn his back upon these riches of easy access to delve for a meagre fortune amid the rubbish of antiquity. We have read with great admiration of Lady Jane Grey's accomplishments in Greek; also of the wonderful proficiency in the same language acquired by Sir Anthony Cook's daughters, one of whom was the wife of Elizabeth's Prime Minister, and the other the mother of Lord Bacon. They could make Greek verses, and, if necessary, write their love-letters in Greek. But we must bear in mind that there was little else for them to learn. We should not admire them so much if they had given all their time to Greek, when they might have learned to play the piano, sing Italian songs, and master other accomplishments which make the ladies of our day much more lovely and enjoyable than any amount of Greek would make them. In a word, there are other things now which merit the attention of men and women, and all that we insist on is, that the ancient classics shall divide time with these other things, in proportion to their importance. The Greeks and Romans were great men, and did great things, but

wisdom did not perish with them. Why should the bright years of youth's vigorous prime be consumed in efforts to learn what the ancients knew, largely to the neglect of what has been discovered since their time? A limited experience in examining young men for admission to the ministry, suggests that the average graduate knows little enough about the ancients and still less about the moderns. He can tell you something about Latin and Greek conjugations and declensions; but ask him about the laws of motion, the number of mechanical powers, and he is as one that dreameth. His time has been consumed, and his mental energies exhausted, in efforts to acquire that superficial knowledge of the languages which is demanded as a condition of graduation. However extensive his attainments in other directions, he is not honored with the badge of scholarship unless he can make some show in Greek and Latin. Thus a high premium is set on this knowledge, and the student will acquire it at the sacrifice of all opportunity to acquire other knowledge. Here is just the point of our protest, and the exact ground of complaint.

The bearing of the foregoing argument on the subject of "A Thoroughly Educated Ministry" must be briefly noticed. One conspicuous feature of the recent discussion of this subject is, that if any one ventures to suggest any change whatever in our present standard of ministerial education, he is credited with a desire to lower it, and then charged with seeking to introduce uneducated men into the ministry. The history of the Methodist and Baptist Churches is referred to for the purpose of proving the un wisdom of such a course. It is thus constantly assumed that there is no intermediate stage between illiteracy and a knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; that there is no learning worth the name, except that which embraces the study of these languages. It is in vain to point out that the English tongue has in the last two or three centuries swept the whole field of knowledge, ancient and modern, sacred and profane, and has brought to the feet of its master the treasures garnered in all other tongues. It is not so much a question of what one knows, as a question of how he came by it. The quantity of knowledge is not the thing demanded, but the quality. All parties are agreed that

the sole function of the preacher is to teach a certain thing; still it is in vain to point out that he can acquire a thorough and accurate knowledge of that thing through the medium of English, and therefore the possession of another medium should not be made essential. It is not a question of knowing what he must teach, but a question of the medium through which the knowledge is acquired. It will not avail to say that he can gain a very much more accurate knowledge through the medium of English by availing himself of the help of critical experts than he could through the use of his own imperfectly mastered Greek and Hebrew. He must be able to silence the gainsayer, not by quoting the authority of some world-renowned scholar, but by his own *ego dico*. The gainsayer might ask if the world-renowned scholar were inspired, and this would be embarrassing. Of course he would be too polite to ask if the *ego dico* were inspired. However, the point we wish to notice is the assumption that there can be no standard of learning that will guard the doctrinal purity of the Church, if the dead languages are omitted. Cease to make these a part of the candidate's trial, and you throw away your safeguards and the touchstone by which culture and orthodoxy are to be tested. There can be no safe substitute for even the superficial knowledge of the languages which our present standard exacts. It is very hard to make this appear reasonable, and especially hard to make it appear scriptural. Our present standard was, beyond a doubt, based upon the college curriculum. "Aptness to teach," means, in addition to knowing what to teach, that the teacher must have a well disciplined mind. The means of discipline are furnished by the college and accepted by the Church. There is certainly no Scripture to offer in justification of each separate specification of our standard. Where is the Scripture, *e. g.*, for demanding of the candidate a knowledge of the "natural and exact sciences"? What did any preacher of apostolic days know of the natural and exact sciences? Did that Ephesian mechanic know aught of chemistry? If we must needs learn Greek because he knew Greek, surely no such reason can be given for our learning chemistry. With all his intimate familiarity with those subjects which now constitute the science

of biblical antiquities, did he know anything about geology? Why, then, should we be compelled to study geology? The reason is not that there is scriptural authority, either in the shape of precept or precedent, but only that these sciences constitute a part of the regular college course, and the regular college course is thought to be necessary to give one "aptness to teach." Everything but Greek and Hebrew must be defended on this general ground. There is no more Scripture for Latin than for Sanscrit. Latin happened to be in the curriculum, and Sanscrit happened not to be. Our standard is what it is, because the college curriculum happened to be just what it was at the time the standard was determined. Suppose it be possible to change the curriculum so as to give the student a different but an equivalent course of study to that on which our standard is based, would not the design of our standard be met? As a matter of fact, has not such a change actually taken place in the curriculum of many colleges? It has been four years since Dr. Goldwin Smith wrote: "The curriculum, both at Oxford and Cambridge, till about twenty-five years ago, was confined to classics and mathematics. Now physical science, history, and jurisprudence, are included as optional studies for the final examinations." Have not similar changes taken place in all high-grade institutions of learning? How different the course of study at Princeton from what it was when Jonathan Edwards was President! The additions are far in excess of the original course. The same is true in respect to all colleges whose histories go back to the time when our standard was determined. Does one necessarily set himself at variance with the spirit of our system, and does he necessarily plead for a lowering of our standard if he ask that practical recognition be made of this great change in reference to the means of mental discipline? A student may now take a select course, omitting both Latin and Greek, that will involve as much time and hard mental labor as the whole course involved a century ago. Then, to be educated, one must know the things specified in our standard, for those were the only things embraced in the course of study prescribed by the colleges. Now, in most colleges, modern languages have been admitted, English literature is allowed a place,

and the list of the natural sciences has been greatly enlarged. Yet our standard takes no notice of these accessions to the means by which "aptness to teach" may be acquired. One may now find in our institutions of learning a course of study lying almost exclusively out of the line of our standard, that will furnish him all the mental store and mental culture that are necessary to give him passport into educated circles; that will fit him to grapple successfully with the most difficult, practical problems in politics, philosophy, theology, and science, and that will enable him to attain to eminence in any of the learned professions. Yet we are debarred from utilising his talents in our ministry, unless he will consent to accept the humiliating condition, and come in under the provision for "extraordinary cases." We still refuse to admit that anything can give "aptness to teach" except the means that were employed centuries ago. We still refuse to acknowledge culture unless it has been attained in a certain prescribed method. We prefer a little culture that is the result of studying Latin and Greek to any degree of culture that has been acquired without these venerable assistants. It does seem that one might reasonably plead for a little more flexibility, a little more adaptability to the changed circumstances of the time. We are dropping behind some of the most conservative colleges. Some of these are yielding to the growing sentiment against the longer supremacy of the ancients, to the extent of allowing two modern languages in lieu of one ancient. They will not withhold the badge of scholarship from him who drops Latin, provided he will atone for it by acquiring both French and German. Suppose the alumni of these colleges who take this course knock at our doors? It seems that we are shut up to the necessity of either sending them back to learn how to "discuss in Latin a *thesis* on some common head of divinity," or of taking them in as "cases extraordinary." Is it not better to so modify our standard as to recognise the fact, for fact it is, that there are thousands of well educated men, "apt to teach," and therefore possessed of all scriptural requisite, who are yet destitute of the ordinary superficial knowledge of Latin and Greek upon which we now insist? It is not forgotten that Greek and Hebrew are defended on the ground that they are the lan-

guages of the original Scriptures. We have only time and space to repeat, what has often been truly said, that they are / not the languages through which those who are forced to study them derive their knowledge of the Scriptures.

R. C. REED.

---

ARTICLE V.

CHRIST'S TESTIMONY TO THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.<sup>1</sup>

In being formally inducted into the Professorship of Biblical Literature in this Seminary, it is but natural that I should find my thoughts recurring to the veteran scholar who for so many years adorned this chair by his learning and piety. A student from his earliest years, and coming to his work with ample furniture in Oriental scholarship, attained under the stimulating instruction of the famous Moses Stuart, Dr. Howe, for more than fifty years, devoted his energies to enlarging his knowledge and broadening his views of Biblical Literature. To recount Dr. Howe's toils and sacrifices for the Seminary, would be to tell a familiar story. To him I believe we owe its survival to this good hour, pressed, as it has several times been, by dangers that threatened its destruction. Laborious to a fault, and faithful to duty, he wrought his very life into these walls and into the hearts of the hundreds of students who here listened to his voice. Profound learning was veiled by a rare modesty, and transfused with a deep personal love for the Saviour. The simplicity of his nature, the depth of his piety, the kindness of his heart, are the traits which we who knew him associate most of all with his memory. To have been a pupil of Dr. Howe is a blessing to any man! It is a high privilege that I was not only his

---

<sup>1</sup>Inaugural Address delivered on September 19, 1883, before the Board of Directors of Columbia Seminary, by Rev. C. R. Hemphill, Professor of Biblical Literature, and published at the request of the Board.



pupil, but associated with him for several years in the teaching of his department. The reflection that I succeed Dr. Howe and hold the chair which binds his name to the institution he loved even unto death, enhances the feeling of responsibility inevitable to me under these circumstances.

It is not out of place to assure the Directors and friends of the Seminary that I take up these duties with some adequate conception of what lies before me. To exaggerate the importance of the studies embraced within the scope of Biblical Literature, would scarcely be possible. It deals with the foundations and gives the principles of any Christian theology which has a right to the name. The Canon, Biblical Criticism, Exegesis, with all that these imply, are the subjects of this chair. In accordance with the Protestant principle of the absolute dependence of theology, in all its phases, on the Scriptures, these studies are, at any time, essential, but they now have a special importance. It is well known that controversies of vast import to the Christian religion now traverse the field of this department, and it is probable that conflicts, of which only faint echoes have heretofore reached us, will rage for some time within the English, Scotch, and American Churches. Dr. Green of Princeton, who is by no means an alarmist, has recently said "that all the signs of the times indicate that the American Church, and, in fact, the whole of English-speaking Christendom, is upon the eve of an agitation upon the vital and fundamental question of the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible, such as it has never known before." Every one may detect symptoms of this agitation in books recently published, and in articles in reviews and newspapers, dealing with the critical study of the Scriptures. To meet the exigencies of this critical study of the Bible calls for such scholarship, such piety, such judgment, that I may be pardoned for expressing my own sense of deficiencies for the work intrusted to me.

With God's help I shall earnestly and faithfully seek to instruct my pupils in the truth, and provide them with the means of defending the word of God.

In thinking of a suitable topic for this occasion, it was but natural that the stirring question of the authorship of the Penta-

teuch should suggest itself. The Pentateuch has engaged the earnest attention of distinguished scholars for many years, and it is unnecessary to rehearse the history of the rise and progress of the various critical views. A clear and accurate account of these may be found in an article in the *Presbyterian Review*, for January, 1883, from the pen of Dr. Briggs. It is enough to say that the latest hypothesis, known as the Reuss-Graf theory, completely revolutionises the common view of Jewish history, and, by consequence, the common view among Christians of the nature of revelation and inspiration. It is my belief that here we have the logical outcome of the methods of treating the Scriptures which have prevailed among rationalistic and semi-rationalistic scholars. The prominent advocates of this hypothesis do not hesitate to say that they proceed on the naturalistic basis, and on this basis it might have some claim to consideration; but the effort to combine evangelical views with this hypothesis must be pronounced a signal failure.

The authorship of the Pentateuch is too large a question to be handled in more than one of its phases in this Address. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the literature of this subject constitutes a library in itself. Nor do I think it at all needful that a man acquaint himself with these minute investigations and discussions of critics, in order to reach a perfectly satisfactory and rational belief. If the New Testament writers have uttered a decisive opinion, then most biblical students will rest their belief on this basis, rather than on the shifting sands of opposing schools of criticism. This, we may be confident, will commend itself to the common sense and practical character of American Christians. If it can be shown that the New Testament renders no decision in the premises, then we are thrown back on the results of the Higher Criticism. And I may be allowed to say that I have no fears of the ultimate findings of the Higher Criticism. It is unfortunate that the most conspicuous students of this science have been more or less rationalistic in their views. On this account the science itself has fallen into reproach among Christian people, and is regarded by many as necessarily sceptical in its tendencies. The truth is, that it is by the Higher

Criticism that we settle the literary claims of all books, the Bible among them, and it is our duty to show that the rationalistic critics have employed false principles, or made a wrong application of true principles. We need more of such work in this direction as has been done in this country by Dr. Green in his relentless tracking of Colenso, Kuenen, and Robertson Smith; by Dr. Willis J. Beecher, in his admirable exposure of the logical methods of Kuenen; and by Dr. Rufus P. Stebbins, in his valuable study of the Pentateuch.

But while I would give free course to this method of settling the question of the authorship of the Pentateuch, I desire to see what light is thrown on the matter by the New Testament. This method is not adopted for the purpose of stifling discussion or forestalling critical investigation, but in the belief that this is the safest method possible by which to reach the truth, if it be found that the New Testament writers have delivered an explicit testimony. To narrow the question, and to present the investigation in the most simple and intelligible manner, I shall exclude all testimony but that of our Lord, and shall ask you to follow me in an effort to sift his testimony, and to discover what opinion, if any, he held and taught. But before undertaking this, it may be well to meet certain objections that are offered to our accepting his decision as final, even if it should be found that he delivered a definite opinion.

It is objected that he was ignorant of some things, and that this may have been included in that category. There is no need to discuss what is implied in our Lord's increasing in knowledge and in his being ignorant of one fact at least, viz., the day of final judgment. It is sufficient to say that, however limited his knowledge was beyond the sphere of religious truth (and of these limits we can assert nothing), it has never been shown that he taught an error as true. It is one thing to be ignorant of a subject, and to keep silence; it is a very different thing to be ignorant of a subject, and yet presume to teach it. Undoubtedly, the pretence to knowledge where there is ignorance, is not merely a weakness, but a sin; and giving a definite opinion on a matter of which one is ignorant is sinful. This objection, therefore,

strikes at the centre of Christ's claims, which are based on his sinlessness, in imputing to him that he taught a definite view on a point of which he knew nothing.

It is objected, again, that even if our Lord does seem to have delivered a positive opinion, we are not compelled to accept it, for the reason that he did not come to settle the questions of Biblical Criticism, any more than he undertook to teach us physical science. The plausibility of this idea is removed by the reflection that we are to decide what he intended to teach, not by some criterion of our own, but by what he really taught. It must be admitted that Christ vouches for the historical character of the Pentateuch. This is one of the topics of Biblical Criticism. He therefore taught this part of Biblical Criticism; and if this, why not the one under discussion? It is easy to see that the objection is akin to the one first mentioned; and we would be shut up to the admission that our Lord entered a sphere in which he had no right to speak, and uttered himself, it may be, erroneously, where he ought to have kept silence.

The most formidable objection is put in this shape: Granted that our Lord does seem to teach the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, yet in this he may have accommodated himself to current views, without endorsing them as true. To have opposed the Jewish belief in the authorship by Moses, would have excited their prejudice against the higher truth he wished to impress. The subject of accommodation in the Scriptures is confessedly difficult. In any communication from the Infinite to the finite, the form of the revelation must be accommodated to the language and mental constitution of the creature. It is clear, however, that there is no accommodation in the sense that the Scriptures teach error on any subject. By the abuse of this principle there are men who maintain that our Lord teaches nothing as to the personality of Satan and the existence of evil spirits; nothing as to the atonement and other vital doctrines. Now, whatever else may be true, and whether we can always formulate the limitations of this principle or not, it seems certain that we must stop at the point where by this principle Christ or an inspired writer would be made to teach positive error. In other words, while Christ

may have been under no obligation to correct current erroneous views on the authorship of the Pentateuch, if such there were, yet he was under an obligation not to teach an erroneous view by explicit statement, or by good and necessary consequence from his explicit statements. The same argument that prevents us from denying that he taught the personality of Satan and the possession of men by demons, would prevent our explaining away his positive teaching on this subject.

It is apparent, then, that if Christ did teach that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, the loyal believer in him must accept this teaching. At the name of Jesus, every knee must bow and every tongue confess—the Higher Critic as well as the illiterate peasant.

Since this inquiry is a matter of exegesis, I now proceed to lay down certain principles of interpretation by which it is to be conducted, and which are such as to commend themselves to your acceptance. I shall make some extracts from the standard treatise on Hermeneutics by Dr. Francis Lieber. Though the treatise is intended to give the rules for legal interpretation especially, yet the author gives the following rules as applicable to all interpretation :

“Interpretation,” he says, “is the art of finding out the true sense of any form of words ; that is, the sense which their author intended to convey, and of enabling others to derive from them the same idea which the author intended them to convey.”<sup>1</sup>

1. “A sentence or form of words can have but one true meaning.”

2. “There can be no sound interpretation without good faith and common sense.”

3. “Words are, therefore, to be taken as the utterer probably meant them to be taken. In doubtful cases, therefore, we take the customary signification, rather than the grammatical or classical ; the technical, rather than the etymological.”

4. “That which is probable, fair, and customary, is preferable to the improbable, unfair, and unusual.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Lieber's *Hermeneutics*, edited by Prof. W. G. Hammond. St. Louis: 1880. P. 11.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, pp. 108, 109.

I shall also cite a general principle of great importance from Dr. Planck's Sacred Philology and Interpretation:

"The second general law of interpretation is this: always to explain with a view to the spirit and mode of thinking of the age for which a writing was immediately intended; or to express this in clearer and more general terms, that may always be considered as the true sense of the writer, which, either alone, or at least as the most natural sense, could be suggested by his expressions to the men to whom and for whom he wrote. When, therefore, a reader meets in a work with ideas which he knows were in circulation among those for whom the work was intended, and were circulated in a certain definite form; when he finds there not only particular words and phrases, but entire representations and series of representations characteristic of the age in which the work originated, he may confidently presume that the writer whom he would explain connected therewith the same sense which they must first present to his readers, even if grammatical exposition could discover in his expressions another sense."

To get this more clearly before us, let me add this from Whately:

"There is a maxim relative to the right interpretation of any passage of Scripture, so obvious when stated, that it seems strange it should be so often overlooked, viz., to consider in what sense the words were understood by the generality of the persons they were addressed to; and to keep in mind that the presumption is in favor of that, as the true sense, unless reasons to the contrary shall appear. Some are accustomed to consider what sense such and such words can be *brought to bear*, or how *we* should be most naturally inclined to understand them; but it is evident that the point we have to consider is the sense (as far as we can ascertain it) which the very hearers of Christ and his apostles did actually attach to their words."<sup>2</sup>

I may add a note appended to Lieber's Hermeneutics by the editor, Prof. W. G. Hammond: "It is not always necessary or

<sup>1</sup> Planck's Sacred Philology and Interpretation. Ed. by Turner. Edinburgh: 1834. Pp. 142, 143.

<sup>2</sup> Essay on Christ and his Kingdom, § 4.

desirable to begin interpretation with the meaning of each separate word. An entire phrase often has a definite and well-settled meaning, quite independent of the usual meanings of its component words. In such cases it would confuse, rather than explain, to attempt analysing the sense into as many parts as there are words to utter it. The phrase or sentence is, in such cases, itself a unit—the equivalent of a single word—as may often be clearly seen by translating into a foreign language, or even finding a synonym in the same.”<sup>1</sup>

Having laid down the exegetical canons by which I expect to be governed in this inquiry, I shall next state certain facts in the light of which we will be prepared to apply these principles and render a proper interpretation.

The first is that the Pentateuch, as we have it, existed in the same form in the days of our Lord. This needs no proof.

The second is, that while the division into five books was known, yet the Pentateuch was regarded as one book; just as the History of Herodotus is one book, though divided into nine books.

The third fact is, that this one book claims to have been written by Moses. This is proved in different ways.

Without stopping to mention passages in Exodus and Numbers, which state that Moses wrote down particular transactions; passing by, also, statements in Deuteronomy which may most naturally refer to the writing of that special book, I call attention to the assertion in Deut. xxxi. 9–11: “And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel. And Moses commanded them, saying, At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing.” The expression, “this law,” here appears to me to denote the Pentateuch. At verse 24 of the same chapter, we have what is probably an appendix by some contemporary of Moses: “And it came to pass,

---

<sup>1</sup>Lieber's *Herm.*, p. 106.

when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in (or at) the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee." To my mind there is here a direct testimony to the whole Pentateuch's having been written by Moses. Remembering that it is one book, and that here, near the close of the book, we have this direct assertion, I do not see what right we have to limit it to one particular part of the book.

Again, though we should admit, for the sake of argument, that Deuteronomy alone is included in these assertions of Mosaic authorship, we must conclude that Moses was the author of the preceding books, for the reason that Deuteronomy presupposes their existence, and his authorship of Deuteronomy carries with it the authorship of the Pentateuch.

To give a list of the references in Deuteronomy to the preceding parts of the Pentateuch, especially the middle books, would consume pages. There is scarcely a chapter in Deuteronomy that does not abound in these allusions, of which any one can satisfy himself by the use of a reference Bible; so that until the rise of the Reuss-Graf hypothesis, Deuteronomy was for this reason classed by nearly all critics as the latest book. To say that the facts referred to in Deuteronomy, and which we now find in these preceding books, may have existed in oral tradition, or be drawn from some other writings, is a gratuitous supposition, for which there is not a particle of evidence. I believe with Dr. Stebbins, in his "Study of the Pentateuch," that the author of Deuteronomy was familiar with the preceding books, or historical questions are incapable of settlement.

Again, if we examine the middle books of the Pentateuch, we meet in almost every chapter with these and like phrases: "The Lord said unto Moses;" "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying;" "Moses said unto the people;" "Moses commanded," etc. If these statements be historically true, then the only natural supposition is that Moses wrote these numerous details of revelations which God made to him, and which he gave to the people. Other-



wise we must conceive a miracle of greater magnitude in their reproduction than those which usually cause our critics to be offended. These are some of the most obvious facts which lead us to believe that the book, as a whole, claims to be of Mosaic authorship. To cite all such facts, is unnecessary to my argument. I conclude, then, that the Pentateuch cannot be acquitted of the charge of claiming that its author was Moses.

A fourth fact is, that in the time of Christ the current view was that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. This is the traditional view, and is thus set forth by Bleek, one of the most learned of the critics who wrest the honor of authorship from Moses: "The prevalent view in ancient times, both among the Jews and in the Christian Church, was that the whole work was written by Moses, the principal actor in the events related in the four last books. We can safely assume that this was the view at the time of Christ and his apostles, and we find it expressly stated in Philo and Josephus. In the Talmud we read that Moses wrote his book (*i. e.*, the Pentateuch), with the exception of only eight *pesukim* (the eight last, the writing of which is ascribed to Joshua). This was also the view of the later Jews, and of all the fathers of the Church; yet we find, even in the first century of our era, some differing opinions among small parties in the Church, principally Gnostics, who were opponents of Judaism and the Jewish law." <sup>1</sup>

Bleek is certainly correct in stating thus broadly that it was the current view of the time of Christ, that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. I have met with no other opinion among writers on this subject until recently, when the intimation has been made that it is by no means so sure that this was the usual, or at least the universal, view. Now it would not be necessary for my purpose to show that every man in the time of Christ had this belief; it is only necessary to prove that the majority of his contemporaries among the Jews, who had any opinion on the subject, and whom he addressed, held this view. I may add that not a single piece of evidence has been produced to maintain

---

<sup>1</sup>Bleek's *Introd. to O. T.*, Vol. I., p. 192. London, 1875.

this intimation. Still it may be well to glance at the proof that no other view was known among the Jews. Josephus, who was born four years after the ascension of our Saviour, gives abundant evidence of his belief in the premises. He was of a priestly family, and had every means of knowing the prevalent opinion, and no reason for concealing it. It is unnecessary to burden these pages with quotations from his writings. From the reading of a few pages of the first four books of his *Antiquities* or the sections referring to Moses in his polemic against Apion, any one can certify himself of these facts, viz., that Josephus identifies the law or laws of Moses with the Pentateuch; that Moses is a person, not a system; that Moses, as a lawgiver, is identical with Moses as an author. There is no hint that any other view had ever been entertained.

The same affirmations can be confidently made in regard to the opinion of Philo, the learned Alexandrian Jew, born about 20 B. C. A brief examination of his life of Moses is sufficient to show that he considered Moses to be the author of the whole Pentateuch, even of that part of it which gives an account of his death. There is not the most remote suggestion of the existence of a contrary opinion.

If we consult the Apocrypha of the dates nearest the Christian era, we find their writers speaking of Moses as the Lawgiver, of "the Law," "the Law of Moses," the "Book of Moses." Now, while these expressions might be consistent with the supposition that Moses gave the laws which were recorded by other, and perhaps later, hands, yet their most natural reference is to Moses as the author as well as lawgiver. The views of the Talmudists are expressed in one of the most ancient tracts, the well-known *Baba Bathra*, where the Mosaic authorship is directly asserted. The same mode of representation occurs throughout the New Testament. The familiar division into Moses and the Prophets, or the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, or the other writings, had been current for years. All the testimony accessible to us proves that the current and only view in the time of Christ was that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. The first questioning of this, of which we have any record, was

made by representatives of heretical parties in the Church, who based their objections, as every one knows who examines their statements, on dogmatic and not on critical grounds. It is not until the time of Aben Ezra, in the twelfth century, that we hear of any critical doubts on this subject, and these extended only to a few passages which Aben Ezra supposed to be interpolations or additions.

If the principles of interpretation I have laid down are correct, and if the facts are as I have stated, there will be little difficulty, I imagine, in reaching a conclusion as to what view our Lord held and taught.

To aid us in getting Christ's general point of view, I call your attention to the way in which Christ alludes to the Pentateuch, without mentioning the book or the author. In his temptation, he makes three quotations from Deuteronomy, under the general reference, "it is written." He treats it as the acknowledged law of the Jews. When the lawyer came to him, tempting him, and said, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? he said unto him, What is written in the law; how readest thou? And he answering, said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy strength and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live." This was not simply an argument *ad hominem*; but Christ endorsed the truth of the quotation from the Pentateuch. All the allusions, direct and indirect, made by Christ to different parts of the Pentateuch, produce the impression that he adopted and taught the current opinion that it was inspired and authoritative, and that he believed it to be, in its origin and authorship and authenticity, what the Jews believed it to be. Moreover, his references to Moses suggest that he regarded him as a real historical person, and that he did not use the name as a convenient designation for a system, or as a pseudonym. These two illustrations are sufficient: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."

It is admitted by evangelical critics that these and similar allusions of Christ teach the historic character of the Pentateuch. If by this is meant, what certainly must be intended, that the claims of the Pentateuch itself, as to its authorship, must be allowed, then I believe we are compelled to say that Christ testified that Moses was the author. And for this reason, that the Pentateuch, rationally interpreted, makes this claim; and if it be historical, *i. e.*, trustworthy as to what it asserts, most of all must it be so in the matter of its teaching as to its own origin. I cannot therefore agree with the statement frequently made now-a-days, that since Christ asserted the divine authority and historical character of the book, we need not be troubled about the matter of its human authorship. It is said that there are several books of the Old Testament whose authors are unknown, and yet this does not affect their historical character or divine authority. It ought to be remembered by those who advance this argument, that these anonymous books make no claims or assertions as to authorship; whereas the Pentateuch, for what I conceive valid reasons, does set up a positive claim, which must stand or fall with its historical character.

But the testimony of Christ is even more direct than this, and I shall now consider some of his more specific references bearing on my subject. I shall proceed from the clearer to the less clear, and quote first from the Gospel of John, where Christ is in controversy with the Jews. "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" John v. 45-47.

Now what is the true sense of this passage? First, observe that Moses is referred to as a person just as Christ refers to himself as a person. Observe, again, that Christ affirms that Moses *wrote*, and speaks of his *writings* as well-known to his hearers. Observe, again, that the Pentateuch was a book well-known to the Jews, and firmly believed by them to have been written by Moses. How would they necessarily construe Christ's language? Necessarily as endorsing their belief about the authorship of the

Pentateuch. Putting it in another form : Moses *wrote*. What? His writings. What are his writings? By universal consent, the Pentateuch. Therefore, Moses wrote the Pentateuch. This is clearly the opinion of Christ. Dean Alford draws the only possible inference, that this "is a testimony to *the fact* of Moses having written those books which were then and are still known by his name."

Let us look for a moment at these statements of our Lord : "For Moses said, Honor thy father and thy mother." Mark vii. 10. To the leper he had healed, Christ says : "Go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded." Matt. viii. 4. Where is this saying? Where this command of Moses? In the Pentateuch, a well-known book, believed to claim Moses as its author, and believed by the hearers of Christ to have been written by Moses. Could they doubt that Christ agreed with them in this opinion?

Let me now group several expressions of Christ, which are equally as decisive : "And as touching the dead, that they rise ; have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him?" Mark xii. 26. "They have Moses and the prophets." Luke xvi. 29. "These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." Luke xxiv. 44. "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law?" John vii. 19. It is useless to multiply quotations of the same character. Here Christ employs the phrases, "the law," the law of Moses," "the book of Moses." According to the note I quoted from the editor of Lieber's *Hermeneutics*, we are to interpret phrases as well as words by the *usus loquendi*, not by mere grammatical and etymological analysis. What did these phrases and expressions mean to the hearers of Christ? I have shown that they meant not simply that Moses was the originator of the law, but the writer of the Pentateuch ; and I maintain that unless something in the context or in Christ's other teaching on this subject be brought forward to modify these expressions, Christ must be held responsible for using and in-

tending to use these expressions as they were understood by his hearers ; and as they must have understood them to mean that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, we are obliged to conclude that our Lord held and taught the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

This conclusion derives fresh support from the fact that it harmonises with Christ's conception of the origin and history of the Old Testament religion and Sacred Scriptures, and especially with his conception of the relation of Moses to the religion and history of Israel. It is a leading principle of exegesis that the results of the special interpretation of a passage or series of passages must be tested by comparison with the general interpretation of all passages relating to the subject. I submit that it is evident to any student of the Bible, that it is easier to give a consistent representation of Christ's attitude towards the Old Testament Scriptures on the supposition that he believed that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, than on any other supposition. In many things respecting these Scriptures, our Lord took occasion to differ with his contemporaries, and it was this utter diversity of views that intensified the hostility of the Jews towards him. But in regard to this fundamental tenet of the origin of the Jewish religion, there is nowhere a hint that Christ thought the Jews to be in error. He knew that they believed Moses to be the writer of their most sacred book, which lay at the basis of their system. He challenged their many perversions of this book and the religion it inculcated, yet he never corrects their opinion on this essential point of origin. Not only so, but he uses the very language that he would have used if he had wished them to believe that he agreed with them in their views of Moses and his relation to their religion.

It is evident, furthermore, that if we suppose Christ to have been in ignorance of the true authorship of this book, it will require much special pleading to explain his language in consistency with his general position towards the Old Testament. On the more extravagant supposition that he knew that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch, we have a problem which I fear no ingenuity can solve, in explaining his direct references to the

subject, and in saving him from inconsistency, not to say contradiction, in his conception of the whole movement of the religious history of the Jewish people.

As it is clear that our conclusion falls in with all that Christ taught concerning the religion of Israel, so it is also clear that it is in complete harmony with the point of view assumed by all the New Testament writers in their allusions to Moses, the Pentateuch, and the Mosaic economy. This assertion I must leave to be verified by your own knowledge in the premises.

It affords additional ground for confidence in the interpretation I have reached, to notice that if the principles of exegesis upon which I have conducted this inquiry be repudiated, or the facts I have cited be denied or disregarded, we shall be shut up to drawing from the language of Christ only so much as is yielded by the most rigid grammatical and verbal analysis. The results of this process would give us a few and generally unimportant enactments as the legacy of the great lawgiver and most heroic figure in Jewish history. Such a wretched conclusion is a sufficient refutation of the methods by which it is reached.

Having now prosecuted the study involved in the title of this address by a purely exegetical process, and having found the results to be natural and legitimate, and having tested these by a reference to the general attitude of Christ and the New Testament towards the subject, I am prepared to affirm as my judgment in the case, that Christ must be held responsible, not only for the historic character and inspiration and divine authority of the Pentateuch, but also for the Mosaic authorship of the book. If this be a just exposition, it must be acknowledged that the question which more than any single question absorbs attention among Old Testament scholars to-day, is not left to be decided by purely scientific inquiry, but has been settled for the loyal believer in Christ by the great Teacher himself. The believer is not at liberty to reject the Saviour's teaching, and base his judgment merely on the results of literary and historical criticism. He is not prevented from pursuing the critical method; but in this matter as in all others on which Christ speaks, he is to subordinate the results reached by his criticism to the affirmations of

him who is "the truth." If what purport to be the ascertained conclusions of criticism are antagonistic to the utterances of Christ, we must make our choice and abide by one or the other. We cannot serve two masters. And this is no hardship. We hold the philosophic inquirer subject to the decisions of the word of God. If he claims that the result of philosophic inquiry is materialism, we do not wait to prove that his method or principles are at fault, and that a true philosophy proves the opposite; we do not hesitate to affirm, on the authority of God's word, that his supposed result is false. In the same way, we hold the Biblical critic to the teachings of the Scriptures, in matters included in his science. If this principle were more fully recognised, there would be less prejudice against Biblical Criticism, before which there is such a wide and inviting field for legitimate investigation. By the results of this science we have been brought to a clearer apprehension of the wonderful Book, and in many things we shall look to it for further aid.

C. R. HEMPHILL.



## ARTICLE VI.

CHURCH AND STATE IN THEIR RECIPROCAL RELATIONS AND FUNDAMENTAL CONTRAST.<sup>1</sup>

Appearing before you in accordance with long standing custom and by your express appointment, to pronounce a discourse as part of the formalities of my induction into the Chair of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity, I venture to present for your consideration: *Church and State, in their reciprocal relations and fundamental contrast.*

The theme is especially suited to the occasion, because it draws largely upon the two allied branches of study which you have confided to me in this Seminary. A complete handling of it, indeed, would involve a critical examination of fifteen centuries of Church History, as well as the polemical treatises of such disputants as Calvin, Bellarmine, Erastus, Hooker, and Gillespie, in the past. Nor is the debate by any means finished. It is among the living questions of the time, employing the pen of Mr. Gladstone and taxing the deep policy of Prince Bismarck. It meets us in the Encyclicals of the Pope, in the enactments of the French Parliament, the decisions of English tribunals, and the "deliverances" of Presbyterian Assemblies. Churches whose boast is that they hold fast to the Westminster Standards, (some of them, of course, in an amended form,) are not more widely separated by the Atlantic than they are divided in opinion and in practice as to this question. And it is a fact which must serve to invest the subject, as far as we are concerned, with an imperishable interest, that our own Church, the youngest in the Presbyterian sisterhood, owes her separate existence to fundamental differences between ourselves and our former associates (now composing that great body which is commonly called the Northern Presbyterian Church) as to the respective spheres of Church

<sup>1</sup>Inaugural Address delivered on September 19, 1883, before the Board of Directors of Columbia Seminary, by Rev. Wm. E. Boggs, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity, and published at the request of the Board.

and State. A different explanation of our separation from them has, indeed, been insisted upon by persons outside of our communion. But we have always declared such explanations, however they might have been designed, to be in fact injurious and offensive breaches of Christian charity. They plainly contradict the solemn testimony of our Church herself, speaking through her first Assembly at Augusta in 1861, and reiterated again and again from that day to this. For, in her "Address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the earth," our Church solemnly testified that we did not separate from our brethren because of the war between the States, but because of the political action of the Assembly at Philadelphia in 1861—action which was there protested against by Dr. Charles Hodge and sixty members of the Assembly, on the ground that it was necessarily political in its nature, and therefore unscriptural and unconstitutional. These political "deliverances" have been reaffirmed year after year by that Assembly, and now seem to constitute an impassable bar to our reunion with them, unless indeed we are prepared to abandon our principles and accept their policy. With these reasons for a deep personal interest in this question, let us consider it in a two-fold aspect—*First*, from the standing point of History, let us take a brief survey of opinions; and *secondly*, in the light of Scripture, let us endeavor to ascertain the *right* and the *truth* as regards these conflicting opinions.

I. It is well known that the event which first originated the question was the conversion, or the alleged conversion, of Constantine about the year 323 A. D. I say *alleged* conversion; for it is of no consequence whatever so far as this discussion, or the evidences of Christianity, or indeed anything or any body, save Constantine, are concerned, whether the Roman Emperor ever experienced a real change or not. That he retained the old heathen title of Pontifex Maximus, held by all preceding Emperors from the time of Julius Cæsar, that he was not baptized until near his death in 337, that in the meantime his life had been out of harmony with Scripture, are all facts which no one now cares to dispute. But it was the adoption by Constantine of Christianity *as the State religion*, rather than as his own creed,

which introduced the question now under discussion. This is a significant fact, that for more than three hundred years such discussion would have been wholly foreign to the thoughts of men. Till then the kingdom which is "not of this world" had been an object of suspicion, fear, and persecution to the heathen State religion. Now, however, a great change takes place. The Emperor undertakes to provide from the imperial treasury the cost of public worship, the maintenance of the clergy, the repair and construction of churches. The rights of asylum are transferred from the heathen temples to Christian sanctuaries. The worship of "heretics" is forbidden; their churches closed; their leaders punished by confiscation and banishment. The clergy were erected into a privileged class by being exempted from civil trials in certain causes. Bishops are made legal arbiters in law suits between the brethren, in accordance, as was claimed, with 1 Cor. vi. 1-6, though bishops are not named in the text. A distinctive dress, too, was prescribed for the ministers of the State Church—which was similar to that worn by Constantine's soldiers—habili-ments that are, by many who ought to know better, deemed essential to the decorum of worship, and even to the validity of New Testament ordinances. This great revolution in the religion of his empire, Constantine himself is said to have indicated in some general way by words addressed to his bishops: "You," he said, "are bishops as to things within the Church; I, as to things without."<sup>1</sup> The purport of these words seems to have been rendered by the famous law phrase: "*Jus in sacris; jus circa sacra.*" The paraphrase, if such it may be termed, is sufficiently indefinite and flexible to render it capable of doing service on both sides of nearly every controversy. Ultramontanist, Gallican, Anglican, and Presbyterian, have in turn first construed, and then approved it. Even Cunningham and Bannerman, the champions in our day of the Scottish Establishment, seem not unwilling to accept it, as Gillespie had in the days of the Westminster Assembly. These last, however, we may shrewdly suspect, with a construction of their own, which might have excited

---

<sup>1</sup> Ὑμῖς μὲν ἐπίσκοποι τῶν εἰσὶν ἐκκλησίας· ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς.

the amazement of George Gillespie, and surely would have provoked the sword of Constantine or the Long Parliament.

However, the change was too grateful to the persecuted Christians contemporary with Constantine to awaken criticism on their part. One thing more the first of Christian emperors did, the consequences of which even his keen eye could not foresee. For political reasons, he removed the seat of empire from the banks of the Tiber to the shores of the Hellespont, thereby unconsciously paving the way by which the Bishop of Rome was in due time to become *the first citizen of the Eternal City, the first of Italy*—and then *the first in all Christendom*. A revolution had been effected, in no wise inferior to that which occurred under Augustus. A revolution, the full development of which would require a thousand years, and how much more is known to God alone.

The wheels of time roll swiftly onward. The feeble progeny of the mighty Constantine are swept from his throne. Heathenism under Julian puts forth one convulsive effort, and then acknowledges itself to be vanquished. Dynasty succeeds to dynasty. And anon the vast empire, the product of a thousand years of conquest, riven by dissensions and undermined by decay, falls with a resounding crash beneath the battle axes of Northern barbarians. But even in its dissolution, the spirit of Roman order and the spell of Roman glory subdue the awe-struck children of the North. Foremost in the work stand the bishops and priests. Among these contending tribes the valiant Franks rise to superiority and hold dominion from the heart of Germany to the frontiers of Spain. Chlovis, (the first of many kings of France bearing the name of Louis,) hardly pressed in battle, vows to serve the God of Queen Chlotilda, if only he will give him the victory over the Allemanni. The prayer was hardly an orthodox one; but Chlovis conquers, and keeps his vow. His hardy warriors follow their chief to baptism as to battle. They are brethren, doubtless, whom the Apostle would have styled "weak in the faith." But they were strong in fight, and they had one virtue which, in the judgment of the clergy of that day, atoned for all faults. As heathen they had paid reverence which was but little short of divine worship to their priesthood, who were for them the

only means of appeasing the wrath of their deities and of holding communication with the mysterious powers of the unseen world. All this reverence the Franks transferred to the ministers of their new faith. Years pass away, and a "sluggard king" sits upon the throne of Chlovis, while Pepin, *le Bref*, as Mayor of the Palace, administers the government and leads the Franks to battle. The question of dethroning Childeric and crowning Pepin divides the nation and threatens civil war. But the expedient of arbitration is suggested. And the chief bishop of the Church is chosen the referee. He decides the case of conscience in favor of Pepin, and thereby gains for the Holy See a powerful friend. The Frankish warriors receive with shouts of approval this solution. And Pepin, after being elevated on the shield, after the Frankish custom, is anointed and crowned by "Saint" Boniface, after the Hebrew manner, taking an oath to rule justly and to defend the Church. Meanwhile Italy groans under the oppression of the Lombards, and Pope Stephen goes in person to implore of Pepin help for the Church. At the head of a Frankish army Pepin descends from the Alps and forces the Lombards to relax their grasp upon central Italy and the city of Rome. And from this conquered territory he donates certain territories to St. Peter. Thus in the year 754 the Pope becomes a temporal prince, subordinate of course to the King of the Franks. Pepin *le Bref* dies, and the Lombards again oppress the Romans. Again the Pope calls in the name of all for help, and Charles, known in history as the Great, bursts like an avalanche upon the Lombards, effectually subdues them, and annexes their domain to his sway. Constantinople cannot protect the West; why not have a sovereign who can, and will? Such is the feeling among the Romans. And so at Christmas in the year 800, Leo, bishop of Rome, by common consent, places the imperial crown upon the worthy brow of Charlemagne. It was done as if by sudden impulse, during the solemnities of public worship, but there was doubtless an understanding between the parties beforehand. The bishop of Rome swears allegiance to Charlemagne as his lord. But suggestions have been made which will bear fruit by and by. The Pope will argue that, as he transferred the imperial crown

from the Byzantine to the Frankish dynasty, he has authority from God to demand obedience from temporal princes—to depose the disobedient and refractory.

Meanwhile an idea begins to take shape in the minds of men. At first vague and changeful as the morning cloud, it seems to melt into air. But it reforms and reappears. It is the idea which ultimately finds expression in the words "The Holy Roman Empire." They are understood as intimating the changes wrought by Constantine's conversion and the relations of the civil to the ecclesiastical in mediæval society. This conception embodies a twofold representation of God's dominion: the State symbolising God's rule in this world; the Church representing his dominion in heaven. At the head of one is a world-monarch; at the head of the other a world-priest. The two are necessarily harmonious and equally divine, but the spiritual is the nobler.<sup>1</sup> The idea shapes itself into a forgery, the most potent of all "pious frauds"—the "Decretals of Isidore." The emperor Constantine, (so the story ran,) being marvellously recovered from leprosy, removed to Byzantium and left the West to the Pope! . . . Three centuries roll by. The mighty emperor has long slept in his tomb at Aix-la-Chapelle, the crown still upon his brow, the globe and sceptre in his nerveless grasp. His degenerate race have been swept from the throne to make room for Saxon and Franconian dynasties. It is midwinter in the year of grace 1077. A pilgrim thinly clad, bare-headed and bare-footed, stands for three days in the court-yard of Canossa, humbly suing for pardon. Within sits his inexorable judge who long refuses to see him. That pilgrim is Henry IV. of Germany, the successor of Charlemagne, and within the castle sits Hildebrand, the successor of that Leo who had knelt in the church at the Christmas festival and sworn allegiance to Charlemagne. The development has reached a crisis. The temporal power, long regarded by most men as inferior, had asserted itself against the spiritual, and the error must be expiated.

A discussion of the conduct and character of this wonderful

---

<sup>1</sup> Bryce's "Holy Roman Empire," Chap. VII.

man, personally the greatest of all the Popes, is beside the purpose of this paper. Suffice it to say that, all things considered, Neander's estimate is to be preferred to the severe condemnation of Hallam, or even the cooler criticism of Gieseler. The philosophic historian cites the letters of Hildebrand written, many of them, under conditions which preclude concealment. He also analyses the conflicting judgments of contemporaries, noting the fact that the best men of that day were generally with the Pope, as were the common people also. Those who opposed were priests and politicians who were not disinterested.<sup>1</sup>

"Gregory," says a judicious writer of our time,<sup>2</sup> "was not the inventor nor the first propounder of these doctrines; they had been long before a part of mediæval Christianity, interwoven with its most vital doctrines. But he was the first who dared to apply them to the world as he found it. His was that rarest and grandest of gifts, an intellectual courage and power of imaginative belief which, when once it has convinced itself of aught, accepts it fully with all its consequences, and shrinks not from acting at once upon it. A perilous gift, as the melancholy end of his own career proved, for men were found less ready than he had thought them to follow out with unswerving consistency like his the principles which all acknowledged."

The great Pope erred fearfully because the law which he so vigorously enforced was not the law of God, and the creed which, in common with his enemies, he believed, was not the gospel of Christ. A temporary reaction swept him from power, and he died at Salerno, grandly exclaiming: "*Amavi justitiam, odi iniquitatem, ergo in exilio morior.*" Had his Christianity been of the true apostolic type, the words would have been worthy of Paul himself.

The Pope dies, but the Papacy lives. A century rolls by, and Lothario of Anagni, as Innocent III., ascends the throne of St. Peter to reap the harvest which Hildebrand had sown in tears. He can muster the whole chivalry of Europe under Frederick of Germany, Philip Augustus of France, and the lion-hearted

---

<sup>1</sup>Neander, Vol. VII., pp. 112-139.

<sup>2</sup>Prof. Bryce's Holy Roman Empire, pp. 160-1.

Richard, to hurl it upon the dominions of Saladin. He secures the crown of Germany for Otho. The mighty kings of France and of England sheathe their swords at his command—even Richard foregoing his coveted pleasure of war and plunder. The crowns of Aragon, of Portugal, and of England under John Plantagenet, are actually held as fiefs dependent on the Holy See. And overawed by his anathema Philip Augustus, the ablest prince of the age—brave, victorious, and haughty—takes back his repudiated queen, Ingeburgis. The temporal supremacy had reached its climax. Europe was a theocracy, and the Pope was autocrat of all.

The limits of this paper will not suffer us to follow closely the Papacy into its decline and "Babylonish Captivity" at Avignon. Nor can we criticise the efforts of Councils at Constance and at Basle, to reform the Church as they said "in its head and in its members." Such efforts, when made on Romish principles, were fore-doomed to failure. Relief came at last according to the ancient formula, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." The word of the Lord, so long concealed from the world, flashes out once more, and the Protestant Reformation sets in like a flood, with Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, as God-appointed leaders. In this recoil from Papal absolutism history discovers two elements which make common cause against a common foe. Oppressed nationalities struggle desperately to shake off an incubus which is stifling their breath. And the restored gospel of the Son of God starts forth afresh upon its merciful mission to the children of a lost and ruined race. It was but natural that amid the agony and darkness of that conflict powers, separate in their nature, but having a common peril, should become more or less identified in men's thoughts. Indeed, we may well doubt whether anything short of a new dispensation of supernatural inspiration could have drawn again at once the line of separation between things secular and things spiritual. However, the great confessions of the Reformation era, one and all, exhibit traces of this confusion—the Augsburg Confession, perhaps, strangely enough when we recall the history of religion in Germany, least of all; the Anglican most; and the Westminster with



abundant demonstration, Cunningham and Bannerman to the contrary notwithstanding.

II. But it is time that we devote ourselves to the other aspect of the subject, that we may consider Church and State in their mutual relations and fundamental contrast from the view-point of right and duty, testing conflicting theories by the unerring standard of God's word.

1. And here we encounter, first of all, as a fully developed dogma, the Roman doctrine which in Europe bears the name of *Ultramontaniam*.<sup>1</sup> "Let the secular powers, whatsoever offices they may hold," (so speaks the Church of Rome through the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215,) "be induced, and admonished, and, if need be, compelled by ecclesiastical censure—that as they desire to be accounted faithful, they should, for the defence of the faith, publicly set forth an oath that, to the utmost of their power, they will strive to exterminate from the lands under their jurisdiction all heretics who shall be denounced by the Church. . . . But if any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to cleanse his lands of this heretical filth, let him be bound with the chain of excommunication by the metropolitan and the other co-provincial bishops. And if he shall scorn to make satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to the Supreme Pontiff, that thenceforth he may declare his vassals absolved from their allegiance to him, and may expose his land to be occupied by the Catholics, who, having exterminated the heretics, may without contradiction possess it, and preserve it in purity of faith."<sup>2</sup>

This is official. Rome herself speaks these words by her Council in the palmy days of Innocent III. Individual members of her communion have repudiated the claim here advanced by their Church. But she, whose boast it is that she alone is immutable amid all the fluctuations of human opinion, has never retracted the words which, through her so called "Œcumenical"

<sup>1</sup> *Ultra Montane*—over the mountains, beyond the Alps, *i. e.*, Italian or Roman.

<sup>2</sup> Cited in the Latin and translated into English by Dr. Bannerman, "Church of Christ." Vol. I., p. 104.

Council, she uttered more than six centuries ago. They are entirely consistent with the "Syllabus of Errors" issued in 1864 by Pius IX.<sup>1</sup>

To the definition and defence of this far-reaching power, Bellarmine, more than three centuries afterwards, devotes all the resources of his controversial genius, in the fifth book of his famous treatise, "De Romano Pontifice." Into the details of this discussion it is impossible to enter because of the limits of this paper, but the core of his argument must be criticised with some care.

In nothing is the skill of the practised debater more apparent than in his definition of the Papal doctrine. Three opinions are presented, one embodying the extreme doctrine that the Pope is *jure divino* the lord of all the earth, being endowed with all political power immediately. This is the form in which Boniface VIII. held it when he displayed himself to the vast concourse of Jubilee pilgrims, bearing two swords and exclaiming, "I am Cæsar! I am emperor!"—thereby betraying that he was a blunderer in priestcraft. But of this little *contretemps* Bellarmine, of course, has nothing to say. The other extreme is that of the heretics that the Pope, as such, has no temporal power whatever. While as the golden mean, remains the true Catholic doctrine: "*Pontificem, ut Pontificem, non habere directe et immediate ullam temporalem potestatem, sed solum spiritualem; tamen ratione spiritualis habere saltem indirecte potestatem quandam, eamque summam, in temporalibus.*"<sup>2</sup> (That the Pontiff, as Pontiff, has not directly and immediately any temporal power, but spiritual only; nevertheless by reason of the spiritual he has, yet indirectly, certain power, and that the highest, in temporal matters.) The distinction is taken with a care which comports with its value; for while it veils from the jealous eyes of princes the full import of the Pope's claim, it puts no real limitation upon

<sup>1</sup> Cited by Dr. Schaff, "Creeds of Christendom," Vol. I., p. 128.

<sup>2</sup> *Disputationum Roberti Bellarmini*, Tom. I., pag. 1062. The edition cited from is the elegant one of Sartorius, Ingolstadt, 1601, in 4 vols. folio. It forms part of the collection of rare and costly books on the Roman Controversy bequeathed to the Columbia Seminary by the venerable Dr. Howe.

his authority, since he is left sole judge as to when and how spiritual interests may demand his intervention. This definition Bellarmine expands in succeeding chapters, winding it all up by citing the words of Innocent III., the mightiest of the Popes: "The Pontiff exercises temporal jurisdiction incidentally only" (*solum casualiter*.) Then in Chap. VII. he proceeds to establish "by reasons the opinion of the theologians." It is here that the champion of Rome lays out his strength. If he fails here, his cause is lost. His reasons are five in number, and the first is paramount in importance, so much so that the others would hardly stand without it. Let it therefore be given in his own words:<sup>1</sup>

"Prima ratio est ejusmodi: Potestas civilis subjecta est potestati spirituali, quando utraque pars est ejusdem Reipublicæ Christianæ, ergo potest Princeps spiritualis imperare Principibus spiritualibus, et disponere de temporalibus rebus in ordine ad bonum spirituale. Omnis enim Superior imperare potest inferiori suo.

"Quod autem potestas politica non solum ut Christiannæ, sed etiam ut politica, sit subjecta ecclesiasticæ, ut talis: *Primo*, demonstratur ex finibus utriusque. Nam finis temporali subordinatur fini spirituali ut patet: quia felicitas temporalis non est absolute ultimus finis et ideo referri debet in felicitatem æternam: constat autem ex Aristotele, lib. I., *Ethic.*, Cap. I. ita subordinari facultates, ut subordinantur fines. *Secundo*, Reges et Pontifices, Clerici et Laici, non faciunt duas Respublicas, sed unam, id est, unam Ecclesiam. Sumus enim omnes unum corpus, Roman. 12 et 1 Corinth. 12. At in omni corpore membra sunt connexa, et dependentia, unum ab alio: non autem recte asseritur, spiritualia pendere a temporalibus, ergo temporalia a spiritualibus pendent, illisque subji-ciuntur. *Tertio*, si temporalis administratio impedit spirituale bonum, omnium judicio tenetur Princeps temporalis mutare illum modum administrandi,<sup>2</sup> etiam cum detrimento temporalis boni; ergo signum est sub-jectam esse temporalem potestatem spirituali."<sup>3</sup>

Such is Bellarmine's argument, first in importance as in place, if one may judge by the space it fills and by the care with which it is elaborated. It is characteristically destitute of a scriptural basis. A reference is lugged in, but without the least regard for the meaning of the passages as they stand in Paul's letters. More of prominence indeed is given to Aristotle. The whole structure

<sup>1</sup> Disp. Ro. Bellar., Tom. I., pag. 1081.

<sup>2</sup> *Debet* to be supplied, being probably omitted by printer.

<sup>3</sup> Disput. Rob. Bellarmini, Tom. I., pag. 1082.

rests upon the assumed coalescence of the civil and the spiritual in the "*Respublica Christiana*" (Christian commonwealth). Having made this assumption, he is very careful to show how the civil must thereupon be subordinated to the spiritual—(1) Because the end contemplated by the temporal power being inferior to that of the spiritual power, the first must itself be subordinate to the last according to Aristotle's canon.

(2) Inasmuch as kings and pontiffs, clergy and laity, constitute, not two, but one commonwealth or Church, there must be connexion and mutual dependence of the members; but to make the spiritual dependent on temporal is inadmissible. Therefore, the temporal is subordinate to spiritual.

(3) All parties being agreed that a temporal administration impeding a spiritual good must be abated, even at a sacrifice of the temporal, this presupposes the subordination of the temporal.

Each of these points is open to a ruinous criticism, but inasmuch as they all stand or fall with the main principle, we may save time by examining that. It is not clear from Bellarmine's language whether he means us to take "*Christian commonwealth*" as a metaphysical entity or as a logical genus. We will view it in each of these aspects and test his argument. *First*, then, regarding it as a logical genus, State and Church (proper) are the two species under it. But it is necessary, in this case, that the genus as the essence be contained in each of the species. Thus, when "*Pachydermata*" is the genus with "*Elephas*" and "*Rhinoceros*" as the species, then the whole of "*Pachydermata*" must be found in "*Elephas*" and also in "*Rhinoceros*." The whole, therefore, of "*Christian commonwealth*" must be in its two species "*State*" and "*Church (proper)*." There cannot, then, be a "*State*" which does not contain the genus "*Christian commonwealth*." But this is contradicted by the fact, which Bellarmine himself admits, that there are lawful governments among the heathen.<sup>1</sup>

So much for the concrete case. Now, if Bellarmine be understood as arguing concerning the abstract conceptions "*spiritual power*," "*temporal power*," he would then assume "*ecclesiastical*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid*, pag. 1065.

power" as the proximate genus having these under it as species. But when we come to examine the concepts "spiritual power" and "temporal power," the specific differentia are evidently "spiritual" and "temporal." The true genus therefore is formed by omitting the specific differentia, leaving not "ecclesiastical power," as Bellarmine assumes, but "*power*." And this, of course, is of no value to the Pope. The vice in this classification is in either alternative that of assuming a species which is really coördinate with the alleged genus.

Metaphysically regarded the argument stands or falls with the legitimacy of the assumed entity "Christian commonwealth" endowed with its two kinds of power "temporal" and "spiritual." For the existence of such an entity or being, the Cardinal offers no proof whatever. He evidently argues on the assumption that we will concede the fact without question. And in so doing he only avails himself of the mediæval myth expressed in the words "The Holy Roman Empire"—terms which were supposed to intimate to some degree the change in civil and ecclesiastical government that necessarily grew out of the general acceptance of Christianity instead of the old Paganism.

How and when such a conception originated it is not easy to say, further than that it was gradually evolved from the condition of things introduced by Constantine. But when the conception is challenged, Bellarmine offers no proof whatever of its reality. So far, therefore, as he is concerned, we are fully justified in applying the canon of logic—"De non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio."<sup>1</sup> And thus the great myth upon which the temporal supremacy of the Pope is based vanishes into air.

Bellarmino's second argument need not detain us so long. "The ecclesiastical commonwealth," he says, "ought to be perfect and self-sufficient as a means to its proper end. For such are all well-ordered commonwealths. Therefore, it must have all power necessary to the attainment of its own end. But the power

<sup>1</sup> That is, concerning things which are not made apparent (by evidence) and things not existent the same rule of procedure applies—they cannot be used as media of proof.

of using and disposing of temporal things is necessary to the spiritual end. For otherwise wicked princes would be able to cherish heretics, and so overturn religion. Therefore it has this power also."<sup>1</sup>

The reply is plain. Bellarmine assumes that there is but one method of inducing princes not to cherish heretics, but he does not prove it. The Church may be endowed with the necessary means for overcoming opposition, and yet may not be armed with a sword. His argument is a flagrant *petitio principii*. We read (but not in Bellarmine) of "weapons not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of the strongholds of Satan." True enough, sometimes these weapons of the Church seem inefficient. But it is not different with other weapons. "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." The Church did not use the sword in her contest with heathen Rome, yet she conquered.

His third argument is: "It is not allowed to Christians to tolerate an infidel or an heretical king, if he endeavor to lead away his subjects to his heresy or infidelity. But to judge whether or not a king may seduce to heresy pertains unto the Pontiff, to whom is committed the care of religion; therefore it pertains to the Pontiff to judge that the king is to be deposed or not deposed." Here we have several instances of the fallacy of "begging the question." The Pope is to take care of religion. Very well, for argument's sake, we will grant it. But is he the only one who is to do this? Bellarmine's argument assumes it. But at the same time it denies it; for he, not being Pope, is engaged hereby in taking care of religion. It is "begging the question" to assume that to the Pope alone belongs this judgment. Besides, he "begs the question" in adducing Deut. xvii. That proves, indeed, that it was sin in the Jews to elect an heretical king, but it does not prove that when elected he must be deposed, nor by whom. Elijah lived under Ahab without rebuke. Moreover, he "begs the question" in adducing the example of the early Christians under Nero. They did not depose, but they would have done it if they could, because, says Bellarmine, the apostle in 1 Cor. vi. ordered them to appoint new judges! The apostle himself says simply

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid*, p. 1084.

that Christian brethren must not have unseemly law-suits. He orders them, however, to obey Nero for conscience' sake.

His fourth argument is: "When kings and princes come to the Church that they may become Christians, they are received with the stipulation, expressed or understood, that they subject their sceptres to Christ, and promise that they will preserve and defend the faith of Christ, even under penalty of losing their realms. Hence, when they become heretical, or oppose religion, they may be by the Church judged, and even deposed from their chieftaincy; nor is any wrong done them, if they are deposed." This, again, is "begging the question," because it assumes without proof that allegiance to Christ is the same in all cases as allegiance to the Church, and that the Church can do all that it is right for Christ to do. It may be, for aught that appears to the contrary, that subjecting one's sceptre (or anything else he may possess) to Christ, is quite different from surrendering it to the Pope. Doubtless a Christian might forfeit to Christ his realm (or other possessions), by failing to use it for his Lord's service, and Christ may deprive him thereof, as he did David for a time, but without calling into use the censures of the Church.

Lastly, the Cardinal argues that the command to Peter, "Feed my sheep," necessarily involves the temporal power, for only thus can he discharge the threefold office of shepherd as it pertains to wolves, to rams who wound the flock, and to the other sheep. This is again assuming the point under discussion—and that, too, in the face of the well-known fact that the true Peter lived, labored, and died without a particle of temporal power. He was commanded to put up his sword into its sheath, but was endowed, as Romanists delight to be for ever telling us, with the *keys* instead. With these keys he could shut out wolves and exclude contentious rams also. And this was the extent of his commission.<sup>1</sup>

It is not worth while to follow Bellarmine into the long list of examples adduced in Chap. VIII., to confirm his position. Ten of these are from ecclesiastical history, and two only from the Bible. Those of them which are pertinent are all instances of "begging the question." The very point to be proved is, whether

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1085.

Popes have acted rightly in assuming authority to depose princes. And it is not legitimate to adduce as evidence of the right the fact that they did depose this or that king. Others are not to the point at all, as Ambrose's excommunication of Theodosius, which was legitimately excluding from the ordinances of the Church a member who had grievously sinned. His worldly rank had nothing to do with it. Other instances are apocryphal, as the alleged transfer by the Popes of the empire from the Romans to the Franks. The biblical "examples" are not to the point, and his argument is as to them an *ignoratio elenchi*. He cites the case of Uzziah resisted by the priests in his wicked attempt to officiate at the altar, and of Athaliah, slain by command of Jehoiada, the high priest. Now, not to raise in this place the question, how far the legal authority of priests under the theocracy may or may not be given to ministers of the gospel (imagining, if we can, for the time, that the Pope were one), it is obvious to remark that Uzziah's political rights were not affected by the conduct of the priests, but by the act of God in sending leprosy upon him. Nor does it appear that Jehoiada was acting in his sacerdotal capacity at all, when he ordered the death of the usurping idolater and murderer. He was a man, a Jewish citizen, as well as a priest. And besides, he was the guardian of the lawful heir. He may have acted in that capacity. Or his deed may be ranked with Moses slaying the Egyptian, and Samuel hewing Agag in pieces. The Mosaic ritual does not set down the deposing power as among the duties of high priest.

Thus crumble like a rope of sand the mighty pretensions of Rome to be a species of theocracy. And the Ajax of Roman champions utterly fails to maintain his cause.

2 The next theory of the relations between Church and State which we shall consider is that propounded by Erastus. And in doing this, we disregard the order of time, inasmuch as Erastianism is the opposite extreme from the Papal supremacy, both in the conduct of the argument and in the results to which it leads.

Erastus bases his argument entirely upon an alleged exposition of Scripture. It is, therefore, in this respect, thoroughly Protestant. He proves from Scripture that civil magistrates are



recognised as clothed with authority to punish evil doers. He shows that under the Jewish theocracy, kings and judges, by immediate authority from God, punished idolatry, blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking, and many other spiritual offences. And from this induction of particulars, he infers that God designs that civil rulers continue to the end of the world to punish flagrant sins against his law. Filled with this prepossession, he fails to discern the natural and necessary import of the many passages in the New Testament, which teach a total change of administration, by revealing a system of spiritual laws, to be administered by spiritual officers in the name of Christ, by means of spiritual censure, and not by physical force.

The refutation of Erastus is simple enough. His narrow and defective exegesis is to be opposed and upset by one that is wider and deeper—one that takes account of all the facts recorded in Scripture. This has been done many times, and the best of these refutations is the one furnished in the Book of Church Order, with which your office, my brethren, requires that you be familiar.

It is rare in the history of letters that such results are produced as followed the publication of the seventy-five brief propositions which Erastus designated "Theses on Excommunication." The world was soon filled with the controversy, and the invalid physician of Heidelberg has attained immortality of fame. Personally, Erastus seems to have been a man of pious and pure life. His purpose seems to have been good. He wished to set free religion and the ministry from all questions involving strife and the employment of force. His method is clear, his meaning transparent, his spirit earnest. But there is neither eminent ability nor wide scholarship in his little book. The cause of its mighty influence is rather to be sought in the circumstances of the age. The world in which he lived still shuddered at the horrors of the Inquisition, and was startled by the suggestion of priestly dominion. The princes of Europe were eagerly reaching after the power which had lifted the throne of St. Peter above every crowned head in Christendom.

3. We come next to consider the State-Churches as embodying more or less perfectly that very unity which is asserted from different view-points by Erastus and by Rome.

It would doubtless be a study as instructive as it would be saddening, to take a comprehensive survey of the whole history of State-Churches in Germany, France, Switzerland, Holland, and Great Britain. We should see everywhere the deplorable consequences of making religion and the Church a part of the machinery of civil government. We should find Romanism allied in France with the tyranny of the Bourbons, till at last human patience is exhausted, and the French people, frenzied by intolerable wrongs, rise in their resistless might, to overwhelm in one indiscriminate ruin the throne and the altar. On the other hand, we should see the Church of the Huguenots, the Church of Calvin, of Coligny, of Claude, alternately drenched in the blood of her martyrs, and then smothered by State protection, like the Roman maiden under the glittering ornaments which had tempted her cupidity. In Germany, we should see the effects of religious tests which prohibited men from holding any office, civil or military, until they had produced evidence of having taken the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Hypocrisy begets infidelity. David Frederick Strauss can hold up his head among honest men, though as a minister—of what? Shall I say, of the gospel? No; but of the State-Church. And Hegel is provoked into uttering the shocking sentiment: "The Church is but the crutch of the State."

However, the limits of this paper require that the discussion be limited to the principles embodied in the religious establishments in Great Britain. Here the free constitution of Anglo-Saxon institutions affords the best field for critical inquiry. And the results in the mother country more nearly concern us.

The great Anglican communion takes especial pride in the presentation of its case by "the judicious Hooker." His famous argument is compendiously stated in the eighth Book of his *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Recurring to the typical case of the Church in the time of Constantine, he argues: "But when whole Rome became Christian, where they all embraced the gospel, and made laws in defence thereof, if it be held that the Church and common weal of Rome did then remain as before, there is no way how this could be possible, save only one, and that is, they must

restrain the name of a Church in a Christian common weal to the clergy, excluding all the rest of believers, both prince and people. For if all that believe are contained in the name of the Church, how should the Church remain by personal subsistence divided from the common weal, when the whole common weal doth believe? The Church and the common weal are in this case, therefore, personally one society, which society being termed a common weal, as it liveth under whatsoever form of civil law; a Church, as it liveth under the spiritual law of Christ."

To this argument the reply has been pertinently urged that it is mere hypothesis, the fact being that neither "whole Rome," in the days of Constantine, nor all of England in Hooker's, was ever "Christian" in his sense of the term, or, indeed, in any other true sense. There were many millions of heathen, and many Christian sects, in Rome, under the Christian emperors, as there were many Jews, Infidels, Romanists, and Non-conformists, in England. The two societies were therefore never one by "personal subsistence;" that is, in plain English, by being composed of exactly the same members.

This criticism suggests serious difficulties as to the practical value of Hooker's much-lauded argument; for if it be alleged that, neither in the Roman commonwealth under Constantine, nor in the England of the Elizabethan age, were the facts as he represents them, then granting the formal validity of the argument, the conclusion would only be an hypothesis awaiting its realisation in the future. *What proportion of the population must be Christian? And in what sense Christian?* are questions which Hooker may not cover up under the vague phraseology, "whole Rome," which he could not have intended literally.

But allowing that these difficulties were removed, is the argument, as to its form, valid? The *cardo præcipuus* of Hooker is evidently identical with that of his subtle contemporary, Bellarmine—the coalescence of the two societies, Church and State, among a Christian population, so-called, into one society with two names. Hooker, however, ventures to attempt the proof of his major premise—whether the Anglican or the Jesuit be in this the more "judicious," will appear from the sequel. His

argument assumes the shape of a dilemma, thus: "When the two societies, which are, *ex hypothesi*, originally distinct, attain that point in their development when they are composed of the same human units, then they mutually merge into each other and become one society, having, however, two names expressive of the two relations in which it may be regarded; or else, if this be denied, then some of these human units must be excluded from one of the societies; *i. e.*, the name of a Church must be restrained to the clergy, which no Protestant will allow." That is, the identity of societies among men consists solely in the human units composing the membership, and has no reference that is essential to the purposes for which the society may be formed. This is evidently a fair and just interpretation of Hooker, for he offers no proof whatever to restrict his principle to the two forms of association among men commonly termed Church and State. So far as he avers, it is a universal characteristic of all societies—identity of membership is identity of societies. Of this subsumption, he offers no evidence, so that he begs the question at a point one step behind Bellarmine's argument. His conception of societies is what may be termed the mechanical or mathematical. To the mathematician, when he employs the unit of weight—a *pound*, say—it makes no difference whatever what composes the pound—feathers, lead, or gold. So many pounds are so many units; they are the same sum. But this view is evidently at absolute variance with the prevailing conception among men. Thus the commonwealth of England, as distinguished from other individuals of its class, has its identity during many ages, not from the sameness of the human units making up its membership, but from certain covenants specifying the purposes for which these human units have been and are associated. For practical purposes, the very reverse of Hooker's subsumption is held by men. Whether, indeed, in a more strictly accurate analysis, the membership may not be also a subordinate element, may appear further on in this discussion. But, in his attempt to establish by proof the major premise of the argument, Hooker plunges into a bottomless quagmire. Of this a popular illustration may be given. A, B, C, D, etc. (a number of these human

units) form a society for mutual improvement in literature, under the name and style of "The Pickwick Club." But, for purposes of lawful gain, the same persons organise themselves into "The Georgia R. R. & Banking Co." Now, according to Hooker, the membership of these two societies being the same, the societies are *ipso facto* merged into one, which may be properly designated "The Georgia R. R. & Banking Co.," as it operates in finance, and "The Pickwick Club," as it indulges in literary pastime and in dinners!

One other difference between Hooker and Bellarmine—it lies in the application made of the principle held by them in common. Bellarmine uses it (falsely, it is true) to establish the supremacy of the Church over the State. Hooker (with equal error) applies it to establish the domination of the State over the Church. His point of view is essentially Erastian. However, he contrasts with Erastus by resorting to philosophical reasoning instead of the attempted exposition of Scripture. He may, therefore, be termed a Rationalistic Erastian. The Jesuit unquestionably presents in this regard a far nobler conception of the Church.

Bishop Warburton's theory of an "unequal alliance," wherein the Church agrees to surrender her autonomy in consideration of the temporal benefits and protection accorded by the State, is yet more undisguisedly Erastian than Hooker's. Dr. Arnold of Rugby's somewhat mystical conception of a mutual inclusion—the *local* Church of England or Scotland being merged in the "Christian kingdom," while "the Christian kingdom" itself, as such, becomes part of the "holy Church universal"—is liable to the same fatal objection, that it ignores the divine constitution of the Church of Christ as set forth in the Holy Scriptures. Arnold's "holy Church of Christ universal" is, so far as yet appears, not materially different from that which we commonly term Christendom—a loose conception of those peoples who in some sense prefer Christianity to Paganism or Mohammedanism. And in this view of the matter, his local Erastianism, in England, Scotland, etc., would be poorly compensated, indeed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Miscellaneous Works of Arnold*, Appleton's Ed., N. Y., 1845, p. 500. Dr. Arnold fully acknowledges, indeed, that upon the supposition of the

Passing by, for the present, the elaborate essay on Church and State by the now famous Premier of Great Britain, Mr. Gladstone, we next encounter the modification of the union between Church and State as it is exemplified in Presbyterian Scotland, on the basis of the Westminster Confession in its primary form; that is to say, as propounded in the "humble advice" of the Assembly of Divines, enacted with some amendment by the Long Parliament, and ratified by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. The paragraphs bearing on this topic are these:

Chap. XX., Sec. 4. . . "And for their publishing of such opinions, or maintaining of such practices as are contrary to the light of nature, or to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation; or to the power of godliness; or such erroneous opinions or practices as either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing or maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church; they may lawfully be called to account and proceeded against by the censures of the Church and by the power of the civil magistrate." (Last clause stricken out in the American revision, 1789.)

Chap. XXIII., Sec. 3. "The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; yet hath he authority, and it is his duty, to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the Church; that the truth be kept pure and entire; that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship or discipline prevented or reformed, and all ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof he hath power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever be transacted in them be according to the mind of God."

Chap. XXXI., Sec. 2. "As magistrates may call a Synod of ministers and other fit persons to consult and advise with about matters of religion; so, if magistrates be open enemies to the Church, the ministers of Christ, of themselves, by virtue of their office, or they, with other fit persons, may, upon delegation from their churches, meet together in such assemblies."<sup>1</sup>

---

Church having a divinely revealed constitution and government, such a union as he proposes would be wrong. *Id.*, 510.

<sup>1</sup> Am. Revision: "And it belongeth to the overseers and other rulers of the particular churches, by virtue of their office, and the power which Christ hath given them for edification, and not for destruction, to appoint

The discretion in ecclesiastical matters herein accorded to civil magistrates is, indeed, very wide, including not only the oversight of church officers, but also the infliction of corporeal punishment for violations of ecclesiastical law. The strenuous denial by Cunningham and Bannerman of this fact, so obvious when the language of the Confession is read in the light of contemporary history,<sup>1</sup> is only another melancholy illustration of the power of prejudice, when inflamed by controversy, to obscure high intellectual powers and warp the judgments of good men.

In Scotland, indeed, those evils which everywhere attend the union of Church and State have been held in check to a remarkable degree by two causes especially—the noble conception imbedded in the Confession of the Church as the spiritual kingdom of Christ ruled by his word and filled with his Spirit, and persecution. For it is plain to us now that the Lord in his tender love allowed the State to persecute the Church, in order that the two societies might be kept separate in fact, though united in name. Indeed, the last paragraph cited (Chap. XXXI. § 2), while fully acknowledging the authority of magistrates in the Church in a normal state of things, yet provides for the autonomy of the Church in exceptional cases. In this the Westminster Confession is a decided advance upon the Anglican Articles, which completely subject the assemblies of the Church to the will of the civil magistrate.<sup>2</sup> And in this largely lay the hope of an independent Presbyterian Church.

This brings us to the inquiry, How do Presbyterians, holding the "*jus divinum*" doctrine as to the constitution of the Church, justify themselves in consenting to such an alliance with the State? With them, philosophical speculations on this subject

---

such assemblies (Acts xv.); and to convene together in them, as often as they shall judge it expedient for the good of the Church (Acts xv. 22, 23, 25)."

<sup>1</sup>In the unamended Confession, among the sins forbidden in the Second Commandment is, "tolerating a false religion." Stricken out in 1788, A. Ed.

<sup>2</sup>Art. XXI. (cited from the Eng. Ed. of 1571, in Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," Vol. III., p. 500): "Generall counsels may not be gathered together without the commaundment and wyll of princes."

must be lightly esteemed. They admit the Church to be a positive institute, grounded on the word of God, and not deducible by reason from the nature of things. As such she lives and moves and has her being in the utterances of the divine oracles. The maxim of this Presbyterianism is, Whatsoever is not commanded is therefore forbidden. Now all parties acknowledge that there is no authorisation of such a relation in the New Testament, the most that is claimed as regards the New Testament being that it does not forbid the connexion. Scriptural authority must be sought in the alleged exemplary character of the Hebrew theocracy. Thither resort, therefore, the Presbyterian advocates, from Gillespie to Cunningham and Bannerman; the two last-named being content to refer to Gillespie's demonstration of the principle. If this fails them, "the Establishment Principle" is left without so much as a peg left in the Scriptures upon which it can be supported.

(1) It is needful, therefore, that we examine carefully into the alleged example, that we may see whether the necessary points of identity can be verified. Is the Jewish theocracy, then, of the same species as the Presbyterian State-Church set up by the Westminster Confession? One might almost assume that the mere asking of the question is sufficient. The Hebrew theocracy is *not* of the same species as a modern State-Church. Men have taken the liberty of borrowing an element here or there, but they have not gone according to "the pattern showed in the mount." Some are for taking more, some less. Gillespie gives to the magistrate a discretion very like to that exercised, with God's approbation and blessing, by pious princes under the theocracy. The Assembly of Divines and the Long Parliament, the latter with startling emphasis, are for using the sword upon stubborn and hardened sinners. They refer, with evident intention to claim the precedent, to the case of Samuel hewing Agag in pieces. And the practice of the Church of Scotland, as reported in Steuart of Pardovan's "Collections," testifies abundantly to the fact that the Assembly felt authorised to appeal to the secular arm.<sup>1</sup> But why stop short of the divine model, which not only

<sup>1</sup> Here are references to a few instances hastily gathered. The edition



permitted but required the death of the idolater, the necromancer, the blasphemer, the Sabbath-breaker? To this no reply can be made unless it amount to this, "Such parts of the divine model are intuitively felt to be incongruous with the institutions of the New Testament." No word of God is pleaded showing what parts are perpetual and what are abrogated. The selection of the parts to be retained seems to be dictated by the feelings or fancy of each writer. Dr. Thomas Chalmers frankly limits the exemplary force of the theocracy to little, if any thing, more than providing for the financial maintenance of the ministry. Dr. Cunningham insists upon the obligation of magistrates bringing all the influence of their office to promote the "true religion." And he would fain have us believe that this moral suasion exhausts the intent of the Confession!

It is not wise to place the parts of a delicately constructed chronometer in the hands of a village blacksmith, that he may select those which are essential, and combine them for us in a new time-piece. Experience shows how hurtful it is for man to interfere with the *fauna* of a country. For example, a certain species of bird is found depredating upon our gardens. A violent remedy is at hand. Shot or poison relieve us of the feathered robbers. But behold nature's *nemesis*! That tiny insect, which had been kept within bounds by the birds, increases and multiplies, like the flies in Egypt, to devour far more than the birds had claimed for the protection of our property. In the divine model, God, its contriver, had a complicated system of checks and balances which are omitted in the coarse imitations of it devised by men. Among these checks and balances *inspired prophecy* holds the foremost place. Indeed, there is ground for the suggestion that for the most part, if not always, supernatural intimations of the divine will directed and limited the employment of physical force in the punishment of sins against God.<sup>1</sup> The alleged

---

used is that of the Edinburgh Printing Co., 1837. Pp. 178, 352, 357, 360, 361, 363, 364, 371, 395. The list might be increased largely.

<sup>1</sup>The limits of this paper do not allow us to enter upon the question of an ecclesiastical administration in Israel during the theocracy as distinguished from the civil administration. Gillespie's principles required

VOL. XXXV., NO. 1—11.

instance of the Jewish theocracy is not a case of the legitimate argument from "example" at all. It is a *lucus a non lucendo*—an example which does not exemplify.

The theocracy was indeed exemplary. It was designed to teach us something. And its divine Author has plainly shown us what he intended that it should symbolise. It was a type of Christ's spiritual dominion in the Church of the New Testament. Only this, and nothing more. The three offices, or the threefold office, of the Mediator—sacerdotal, prophetic, kingly—were essential elements of the indivisible, unique, inimitable structure. There is no place found for Cæsar, his prerogatives, or his relations to Christ's kingdom in it. To inject such an idea, is to confuse the divine symbolism and mar the picture.

So much for the alleged import of the Jewish theocracy. This is the main dependence of those who would fain prove, upon scriptural principles, the lawfulness of having a State-Church. There is another line of argument frequently mentioned, but generally not much insisted on. It is the argument from prophecy. In the prophetic Scriptures it is foretold of the new dispensation that kings and queens are to be "nursing fathers" and mothers to the Church. In a burst of impassioned song the Psalmist exclaims, "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth; serve the Lord with fear and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." (Ps. ii. 10-12.) And in a similar strain he sings again: "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Seba and Sheba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him." (Ps. lxxii. 10, 11.) The inference drawn from these words is that the official names of the persons addressed imply that the acts enjoined are also official. Kings (and other magis-

him to hold to such separation, and he argues for it at great length in his "Aaron's Rod Blossoming," but, to the writer's apprehension, unsuccessfully. The intimations which, in his opinion, show two sets of office-bearers, two Sanhedrims, one civil, the other ecclesiastical, are very obscure and unsatisfactory at best, while the instances are many and indisputable of the same men exercising both functions.

trates) are commanded, *in their political capacity*, to render service to Jesus Christ.<sup>1</sup> And this command, so it is alleged, authorises governments to frame laws for the maintenance of public worship and to do whatever else may be needful for the establishment of a State-Church. It is not without good reason that this argument is not emphasised by the advocates of State-Churches, for the wise maxim finds place here, "*Prophetica Scriptura ne sit dogmatica.*" That is, let not the prophetic Scriptures be employed to *originate* doctrines, but rather to confirm and illustrate such truths as may have been otherwise revealed. Experience, too, admonishes us that *literalism* was the rock upon which the Jews were wrecked when Christ came in the flesh. "The Messiah," so they affirmed, and truly, "is represented in prophecy as a mighty king and conqueror. He is David's son and successor. As such he is to sit upon the throne of David and to receive the homage of dependent kings and peoples. His enemies he will dash in pieces even as an earthen vessel is shivered by an iron rod." They expected such a Messiah, and showed unmistakable readiness to follow Jesus, if only he would consent to act some such part. And when they accepted his refusal as final, their hosannahs changed into hooting and blasphemies.

The prophecies admit of other interpretations which do no violence to the inspired words. If literal kings be meant, that is, if the royal names be more than eminent and influential persons, then we must remember that kings and princes are sinners, and as such need to be redeemed, like other men. And even if it be indubitably certain that *official* actions are required, still the precise nature and form of these actions are not defined. The demands of the prophecies may be fully met when magistrates perform in the fear of God such political acts as are proper to

<sup>1</sup> Up to this point the argument from prophecy has been used to maintain another doctrine, *i. e.*, rejecting the analogy of the Jewish theocracy, and with it every form of alliance between Church and State; there are those who hold that these prophetic Scriptures do enjoin religious actions upon princes and magistrates *in their political capacity*, such, for example, as publicly acknowledging God, the Creator and Preserver, or Christ, the mediatorial King, in their fundamental law, and also the appointing of Fast Days, National Thanksgivings, etc. The reply given in the text is believed to apply with equal force against this inference also.

their office. The acts may not be distinctively religious at all, and yet they are done in a spirit which glorifies God. This view finds countenance, as I humbly conceive, in our Confession—that is, in the American Revision of 1788, which thus speaks, Chap. XXIII., Sect. 3:

“Civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the word and sacraments; or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; or in the least interfere in matters of faith. Yet, as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the Church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such manner as that all ecclesiastical persons shall enjoy the full, free, and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions without fear or danger. And as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in his Church, no law of any commonwealth should interfere with, let, or hinder the due exercise thereof among the voluntary members of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief. It is the duty of magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people in such an effectual manner as that no person be suffered, either upon pretence of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse, or injury to any other person whatsoever: and to take order that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance.”

These are golden words. In them our Church confesses her belief as to the teaching of God's word touching the relation of the civil magistrate to the Church and to religion. The actions ascribed to them are, every one of them, *civil* as distinguished from religious. The sum of all that is said is that magistrates are to defend from all aggression the liberty to worship God, which is one of our inalienable natural rights.<sup>1</sup>

The authority alleged from the Old Testament Scriptures for the endowing and maintaining of churches by civil enactment being thus taken away, opportunity is thereby given for the unrestricted application of the Master's declaration: “My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.” Our Lord's life is a com-

<sup>1</sup> The Directory of Worship, Ch. XIV., Sect. 4, seems to go further by acknowledging the propriety of the civil magistrate appointing fasts and thanksgivings, which our people ought to respect.

ment on these words. He resolutely declined the title when the Jewish people eagerly urged it upon him (John vi. 15), even as he had refused the royal crown when tempted by Satan. He refused to act as a civil judge in questions of property (Luke xii. 13, 14,) and in criminal prosecutions (John viii. 3-11). He declined to decide the dispute about paying tribute to Cæsar, remitting the matter to the individual conscience, Luke xii. 13. And at the end he was careful to explain to Pilate that his kingdom had nothing in common with political institutions, so that there could be no opposition to or rivalry with Cæsar. Dr. Whately is fully justified in insisting as he does<sup>1</sup> upon the deep significance of this "good confession" before Pilate. He was impleaded on suspicion of treason against the Cæsar. And when Pilate, who is to judge of the accusation, questions the prisoner as to the allegation, our Lord, before replying to the inquiry, is first careful to learn from the questioner the precise purport of his words. Does Pilate use the word "king" in a spiritual or in a temporal sense? "Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell thee of me?" Pilate's impatient reply fixes his meaning. And so our Lord, calmly disregarding the scornful petulance of the vacillating Roman, answers the question in terms which imply a negative as to the main point of Pilate's inquiry. His words necessarily have this meaning: "My kingdom is in no sense political or civil. It is purely spiritual." Of this he submits proof in the fact that his servants did not repel force by force. Having thus cleared the way to the full declaration of his mission, our Lord further answers Pilate's inquiry as to whether or not he claims to be, *in any sense*, a king: "Yes; I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I (voluntarily) into the world, *that I should bear witness unto the truth*. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." "What is truth?" questions the judge, in the tone, doubtless, of the fashionable scepticism. Alas! he does not await the answer. But yet, with Roman justice, he pronounces the interesting enthusiast, as he seems to have regarded him, guiltless of the charge. There was no sense, as Dr. Whately correctly argues, in which Christ's kingdom could be

---

<sup>1</sup> "Kingdom of Christ," Essay I., Sect. 10.

termed political. He repudiates physical force in every form as a means of maintaining and propagating his gospel. He speaks for all time; for the Church in all ages. The ground is completely swept from beneath the Papal doctrine of the temporal supremacy, and State-Churches are cut up by the roots. Had Christ's professed disciples but learned of him this lesson, then infidelity had never blasphemed, nor humanity shuddered, over the horrors of "religious wars." The martyrdom of John Huss or of Michael Servetus would have been equally impossible. And persecution for opinions would have been unknown in Christian records, save as the more appropriate work of heathen and Mohammedans.

4. This may be a suitable view-point for noting the progress made in the solution of the problem set before us. The problem is to determine, upon scriptural principles, the reciprocal relations of Church and State, and to show the fundamental contrast between them. It may be safely claimed that the fundamental errors of the Roman and of the Erastian theories have been detected and refuted, and that we have discovered that there is no basis in Scripture for any sort of union or alliance between the two societies. Upon Presbyterian principles, therefore, all such relations are to the Church unlawful, since she may not do anything which Christ, her King, does not ordain. If, therefore, the State has any religious functions whatever, it cannot exercise them through the Church, whether in the form of a "Religious Establishment" or otherwise.

But there are those who, going heartily with us to this point, here feel constrained to part from our company. "State-Churches," they say, "are unscriptural. The Church indeed has no political functions, and cannot decide political disputes even when they seem to involve a moral duty. But the State itself has its religious duty which is independent altogether of any Church organisation. It springs directly from the relation of the State itself to God, its Author and moral Governor."

So far our friends seem to be agreed among themselves. But when they come to expand their general proposition, they are found to diverge almost as widely from one another as they do

from us. Some of them with Dr. Thornwell hold that besides the doctrines of natural religion the State is bound to acknowledge its fealty to Christ, as mediatorial head over all things to his Church. Others prefer the shorter creed of natural religion. Some with George Gillespie would hold the State bound to enforce by appropriate legislation the Ten Commandments. Others call for Sunday laws, at least. While still another school would be content with an occasional Thanksgiving or Fast appointed by public proclamation. This diversity does not of itself prove the falsity of all shades of the doctrine, of course, but it precludes us from following each variation into its details. The chief reasons alleged for the doctrine of the religious functions of the State, (disregarding now the all but endless variations as to the details,) are, *first*, that revealed truth that the State is *an ordinance of God*, and, *secondly*, the metaphysical postulate that the State is a *moral person*, from which it is inferred that it must discharge the religious obligations (or some of them) involved in such beings. Besides these chief reasons there are others of more circumscribed use and authority. Allusion has already been made to inferences based upon the prophetic Scriptures which, while excluding State-Church establishments, demand religious actions from kings and rulers in their political capacity. Dr. Charles Hodge seems to find a basis for some religious duties on the part of the American States and the Federal Government growing out of the circumstances which attended their foundation and early history. But, turning our attention now to the two reasons above specified, let us carefully examine them and criticise the inferences which are claimed to follow from them.

(1) *First*, then, it is a revealed truth that civil government is an ordinance of God; and from this truth it follows, so our friends think, that the State in its organic capacity must, in some distinctively religious way—just what, they cannot agree upon among themselves—honor its Author. This inference is certainly true as regards *some* of God's ordinances, as, for example, the family and the Church. But is it a universal fact, true alike of all the ordinances of God? The validity of the argument can be maintained only upon this assumption, for it is the *major*

*premise* of the syllogism. The advocates of the doctrine have somehow omitted to prove this *major*, so far as I can learn. They assert it with such confidence as, in the absence of the proof, would suggest that it may be deemed an axiom, or law of thought, and, therefore, of equal validity and self-evidence with the law of causality. But contenting myself with having signalled the omission and waiving the easy task of showing that the proposition, "All ordinances of God must perform acts that are distinctively religious," is not self-evident, I go on to consider the words of Scripture alleged as the basis of the doctrine. The *locus classicus*, as every body knows, is found in Rom. xiii. 1-7. In this famous passage the apostle grounds the duty of obedience to the lawful commands of magistrates upon the allegation that government is the "ordinance of God for good." The inquiry before us is, What relation as between God and human governments is herein declared?<sup>1</sup>

The "historical environment," (to borrow an expressive term,) enables us to answer the question with confidence. *Paul wrote these words to Roman Christians under Nero's government.* Obviously, then, he does not here treat of any relations between the power and providence of God, on the one hand, and human government, on the other, which do not enter into this concrete case. It is not David's reign over Israel, nor Victoria's in Britain, but *Nero's* that furnishes the key to his meaning. In what way,

---

<sup>1</sup> The precise limits of obedience are not involved in this discussion. But it is impossible for a Presbyterian to forget the doctrine of "Passive Obedience," and the part which it played in the sufferings of the Covenanters, the history of Great Britain, and the fate of the infamous House of Stuart. We cannot help thinking of the parsons and bishops who so filled the head of poor Charles I. with the "Divine Right of Kings" that the mischief could not be wholly undone by cutting the head off, and at last, after rivers of blood had flowed, the bloody House had to be deposed and banished. The clergy have indeed made all the amends, in their power to their victim, by making of a forsworn prince a saint and martyr. But their shameful abuse of Scripture is apparent in the simple fact that Paul spent his whole life in preaching the gospel contrary to the commands of the Cæsars. His writing this letter to Christians at Rome was an act of deliberate disobedience. And he was finally put to death as a violator of Roman law by this very brute, Nero.



then, was Nero's government related to God's providence? God, as Creator, may be said to be, in a sense, the Author of any government, in that he created man with such a nature and has placed him in such circumstances as to render government of some kind an absolute necessity with him. And political governments of any kind, even Nero's horrible tyranny, may be truly styled an "ordinance of God for good," inasmuch as any government, *even that*, is better than anarchy. As the God of providence, the Lord was related to Nero's government. He determined to permit him, being such as he was, to reign in Rome. God determined Nero's relation to the Roman commonwealth and also to each man in that commonwealth. To some his wickedness was overruled for good, by being made the instrument of God's fatherly discipline. It was so, beyond doubt, with Paul. To others—and these doubtless the vast majority—Nero was an instrument chiefly, not wholly, of wrath. It was an age of dreadful wickedness, as Paul testifies in the first chapter of this very Epistle. And as such it deserved richly the horrors of Nero and Caligula. But beyond this limit the circumstances of the case will not authorise us to go. This is the typical case by which the inspired words "an ordinance of God"—"a minister of God for good to thee"—are to be interpreted. And it goes without saying that these facts furnish no basis for the theory of inherent religious obligations resting on the State, as such. If, indeed, any other government be "an ordinance of God" to its subjects in a sense different from this, so be it; *but these added elements are not found in Paul's inspired words*. Nor can they appear in our doctrine.

It is curious to observe that Dr. Cunningham in his discussion intimates that the settlement of the sense in which Providence is related to political institutions has much to do with determining the question at issue. But there he does not help us by solving the problem. It is a pity that he passed it by. However, he prudently adds that, even though this analysis should fail to support his theory of the religious obligations of the State, yet his view might be maintained on the ground that, though religious duties be not an end to the political *office* itself, still they are to

the *agent*. As he puts it, though religious acts be not *finis operis*, they may be and are *finis operantis*. This is truth, and important truth. The service and glory of God are an end to magistrates (and to all men) in every work of life, in civil as well as in ecclesiastical actions. But then, this great truth yields nothing for Cunningham's theory, *for it does not settle the distinctive character of the acts to be performed*. "Whether ye eat therefore, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." This does not settle the essence of the act, but indicates a quality that may belong to all human actions. The sincere Romanist misses the mark when he seeks to obey the command by refusing meat on Fridays. The zealous woman errs, when she undertakes to preach in public. The modern "evangelist," however praiseworthy in other respects, misapplies it, when he discharges the peculiar functions of the Christian ministry without ordination thereto "with prayer and the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." In a word, the pious magistrate may fill up the measure of his duty, so far as his civil office is concerned, by discharging all civil duties honestly, faithfully, and in the fear of God. The act would be civil, the spirit intensely religious.

(2) The next ground is the metaphysical assumption that the State is a *moral person*, and as such falls under the universal rule that moral persons must serve and glorify God by actions that are distinctively religious. This consideration weighed heavily with our beloved and honored Thornwell. The reader will find some criticisms upon this philosophical doctrine in Macaulay's review of Mr. Gladstone's early essay, "The State in its Relations with the Church." Mr. Gladstone embraced the proposition in all its length and breadth. He even goes so far as to discuss, with a *naïveté* which is sure to provoke a smile, the possibility of "corporations" having souls as well as bodies. The discussion is rather brief than prolific, of course. Adding to this metaphysical postulate the political doctrine which is known as the "Paternal Theory of Government," he maintains that governments are bound to do all the good to their people that is possible. And as the promotion of religion is the highest good, government is under obligation to promote piety among its sub-

jects. This was more than forty years ago, however, when as Macaulay testifies, he whom we now know as the great leader of the Liberal Party in the British Parliament, was the rising star among the Tories. Whether he has changed his religio-philosophical doctrines as well as his political creed, one would naturally be glad to know. However, Macaulay in the review above mentioned undertakes upon Mr. Gladstone's doctrine the *reductio ad absurdum*. He signalises the fact that Gladstone fails to show that his reasoning is limited to that form of society known as the State. If, therefore, because of the fact, as alleged by Mr. Gladstone, that the State deals with personal rights and moral laws, it is a "moral person" and bound to have a creed, then other societies possessing the same marks are also moral persons, under obligations to have a creed. But this is true, as Macaulay urges with irresistible force, of all forms of association among men. Nay, Mr. Gladstone himself, in a recent controversial tract on Romanism, pertinently observes that when the Pope claims to have jurisdiction "*only* over morals," he makes no limitation whatever, for moral principles enter into every act of human life. Banking companies deal with personal rights and moral laws. So do the railway corporations. So do the owners of hacks and omnibuses, as Macaulay insists, for the Scriptures say that "a righteous man regardeth the life of his beast." Moral principle enters into even that relation. The conclusion seems inevitable, then, that these corporations are, all of them, "moral persons" in exactly the same sense as the body politic. If it be bound to profess a creed, to perform acts distinctively religious, to propagate religion, so are they. The reply seems to be a complete instance of a *reductio ad absurdum*.

Furthermore, if the State be a moral person in such a sense as thereby to be obliged to perform certain religious acts, what shall these acts be?

Mr. Gladstone, at the time of writing his essay, had no misgivings as to the proper reply to this question. England, at least, (and by good and necessary consequence all other commonwealths,) is held bound to hold and propagate the Anglican creed and worship. Moreover, endowed as she is with the incomparable gift of the

true apostolical succession, the Church of England so Mr. Gladstone thought (it were curious to know what he now thinks), is eminently entitled to the approval of every rightly constituted mind. Mr. Gladstone was not in favor of persecution, at least of employing physical force; but he held the State justified in excluding Dissenters from the universities and from civil office—which, as Macaulay justly observes, would be a milder form of persecution, and also an excellent plan for encouraging hypocrisy.

Our brethren in Scotland, for the most part, the United Church being dissentients, are quite as confident that the State ought to uphold the Westminster standards, albeit they do like canny Scots emit a doubt or two as to the theological qualifications of the national Legislature for dealing with the “five points.” As well they may, since the majority of them are Anglican Ritualists, and not a few Papists and infidels.

We of the American Churches must, of course, be content with a far shorter creed on the part of the State; but just how short it should be, and what articles must go into it, are likely to remain to the end of time mooted points. Some, as before remarked, are for the doctrines of natural religion—a very non-committal doctrine, by the way, since there is no way of deciding absolutely what the doctrines of natural religion are. Some, with Thornwell, are for confessing Christ as providential Ruler of the world. And this seems to involve, by logical necessity, the great mystery of the Trinity. Others seem to care less for the creed of the State than for right action. They are content if it will pass certain laws about the Sabbath and proclaim fasts or thanksgivings at proper seasons.

But, in the face of all this well-nigh hopeless diversity, the question will return, like the ghost of Banquo, If the State, as a moral person, be bound to hold religious truths and perform religious acts, what shall these truths and actions be? For all the parties in this discussion there is but one standard of truth, from which no appeal can be taken. “To the law,” then, “and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Those of us who hold, as our

Scottish brethren do, that the duties enjoined upon judges and kings under the theocracy are in some sense patterns for civil magistrates now, must show cause, if they can, why the Christian magistrate is at liberty to believe less or do less than his Jewish prototype, who was bound to profess and maintain *vi et manibus* the whole creed in its Old Testament form. In the absence of any other specific rules than those furnished by the theocracy, other men must be content, as it seems to me, with analogous cases as a guide. Scripture tells us expressly what God requires of the class "moral persons." It reveals precisely "what man is to believe concerning God and what duties God requires of man." We are clearly informed as to the limits of faith and of duty for man as an individual, and as he is associated with his fellows in two societies, the family and the Church. In each of these relations the same limits are imposed by God's authority. He must believe what the Scriptures reveal, and he must do what they enjoin. Neither more nor less. So far, therefore, as analogy is a guide, it would seem that the State, as a moral person, must believe what others of that class are required to believe, and do what they are obligated to do. That is, the State must hold, practise, and teach the *whole Bible*; nothing less. And this Mr. Gladstone interprets to be Anglicanism; we must, of course, with Bannerman, hold to be Presbyterianism. Our opponents are rather silent, so far as yet appears, as to the precise rules by which their various limits are fixed. In the meanwhile, let all ponder this serious question, What right has man, in any relations, under any conditions whatever, to hold a mutilated creed or to come short of the perfect standard of duty? This is, indeed, a solemn matter. For one I dare not advocate a conscious coming short of what God has spoken. It has no warrant, as I humbly submit, in the Holy Scriptures. And such criteria as "the nature of things," "the circumstances of the case," fail to satisfy; they have an ominous sound. I know nothing of "religion in a generic, broad sense of the word;" at least nothing that I can advocate.

But it is time that we inquire somewhat critically into the meaning of the terms "*moral person*," when applied to a society of men such as the State. In doing this, I am glad to avail

myself of the labors of a distinguished predecessor in the chair to which you have called me. Dr. B. M. Palmer has discussed the subject in two articles, which appeared in the third volume of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW. And it has been a comfort to find that my own humble efforts have led to the same results as his. Beginning with the derivation of the word *person*, Dr. Palmer avails himself of the light that the etymology and history of the word shed on its meaning. The term seems to be derived from the Roman theatre (*per-se-una*, that which is one in itself, is evidently far-fetched). The root is *sonare*, to give sound; *personare*, to sound through. *Persona* was the *mask* worn by actors, so designated with special reference to the mouth-piece which served as a sort of speaking-trumpet in sending out the voice through vast theatres. From the mask it grew to designate the *actor* himself; then the *character* "personated," as we say; and finally, the character which one sustains in real life, *an intelligent being, a moral agent, the man himself*. The present purpose does not require us to enter fully upon the philosophical inquiry, What constitutes personality in man? much less into the theological problems concerning personality in the divine nature. Human personality is equivalent to the man, and speaking generally, whatever is required to make the man, is required to constitute a person. Of these elements, intelligence and will are the most prominent factors. Philosophically speaking, then, a person, that is to say, a man, may be described as that unity which is made up of many human powers or faculties. Now, in what sense is the term-person transferred to a society composed of many individuals, as for example, a commonwealth? To this Dr. Palmer makes answer that the term is, in that case, evidently *analogical*, the analogy being couched in the comparison of many faculties (intellect, emotion, will, etc.) united in the one man with many distinct agents (A, B, C, etc.) united in the one society. This "resemblance of relations" or analogy justifies the use of the term. But to go beyond this, as Mr. Gladstone and others seem inclined to do, by implying that there is something very mysterious and transcendental in the terms "moral person," when applied to a commonwealth,

is to strain the analogy beyond the truth which it is intended to teach. It is a truth, as Dr. Palmer observes—and one *vital* in this discussion—that the words Church and State designate respectively a *relation* between this, that, and the other man; only this, and no more. Now, to disregard this truth, by employing the terms in the *ontological*, instead of the metaphorical sense; suppose them to indicate mysterious entities endowed with properties—this procedure inflicts such an outrage upon the language as can hardly find a parallel save in the vagaries of mediæval Realists. The only substantive beings on the earth which pertain to such societies as the Church and the State are the human beings thus related to each other. These human beings are the only “thinking substances,” “entities,” with whom this analysis is concerned. The words family, State, Church, all belong to that class which Locke terms “*mixed modes*,” and as such they stand sharply contrasted with the composite beings designated by the common names, *man, horse, stone*. Not, indeed, that these words denoting *relations* are less real than those denoting substances; for relations are as real and as essential as things. Indeed, some relations, as those indicated by the terms *parent, husband, Creator*, are of infinitely more importance than most substances.

Now, if it be suggested as a difficulty to the acceptance of this explanation, that “the State” generally survives while the individual part dies, or *vice versa*, the State perishes by war, while we live on to mourn it, the reply seems as simple as it is complete. The death of the individual dissolves his relation to his associates, as death dissolves the relation of husband and wife. Or else war violently dissevers the relations of the whole mass to each other, as divorce cuts asunder the marriage bond.

This being, as is humbly submitted, firmly established, the question returns upon us in this shape, Are men (the only thinking entities belonging to this world) bound in *all* their various relations with one another to profess a creed of some sort and perform duties of some kind? Or, if this be answered (as it is by common consent) in the negative, then what special evidence is there to show that men in the political relation are, under the gospel dispensation, more bound in their corporate organisation

to profess a creed and perform acts that are distinctively religious, than they are in other relations which, like the State, are formed for secular ends? If further reply be needed than has already been suggested, I might be allowed to adopt as my own the words of our beloved Church in her Address to all the sisterhood of Churches, as sent forth by the Assembly in session at Augusta in 1861; though I must in candor admit, even should I seem over-bold therein, that the interpretation put upon the words is more severely strict than might have been acceptable to some who adopted, even to the immortal pen that drafted, the paper: "The provinces of Church and State are perfectly distinct, and the one has no right to usurp the jurisdiction of the other. The State is a natural institute, founded in the constitution of man as moral and social, and designed to realise the idea of justice. It is the society of rights. The Church is a supernatural institute, founded in the facts of redemption, and is designed to realise the idea of grace. It is the society of the redeemed. The State aims at social order, the Church at spiritual holiness. The State looks to the visible and outward, the Church is concerned for the invisible and inward. The badge of the State's authority is the sword, by which it becomes a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well. The badge of the Church's authority is the keys by which it opens and shuts the kingdom of heaven, according as men are believing or impenitent. The power of the Church is exclusively spiritual, that of the State includes the exercise of force. The Constitution of the Church is a divine revelation, the Constitution of the State must be determined by human reason and the course of providential events. The Church has not to construct or modify a government for the State, and the State has no right to frame a creed or polity for the Church. They are as planets moving in different orbits, and unless each is confined to its own track, the consequences may be as disastrous in the moral world as the collision of different spheres in the world of matter. It is true that there is a point at which their respective jurisdictions seem to meet—in the idea of duty. But even duty is viewed by each in very different lights. The Church enjoins it as obedience to God, the State enforces it as the safeguard of order."



Thus our argument has conducted us, by steps that seem to be in full accord with the infallible teachings of God's holy word, to the conclusion that, save within the narrow limits of the pious household, the only institution on earth for professing, maintaining, and propagating "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," is the Church of Christ. Brethren, it is an inspiring thought—especially so to us, who, like our Covenanting forefathers in Scotland, have been made to feel the heavy hand of an unfriendly government. We, doubtless, needed such faithful dealing to save us from idolising the State, as the old Romans did. We have had, besides sorrowful recollections, little left us on earth save our family ties and the Church of our Lord. It is a significant fact, that our Church owes her existence, under God's providential leadings, to a solemn, necessary protest against an attempt made, contrary to Scripture and the Constitution, to intermingle and confound things spiritual and things temporal. We could not choose but affirm that in assuming the right to decide the disputed question as to which of the two political powers, the State or the Federal, the allegiance of American citizens was primarily due, the Assembly at Philadelphia acted outside of the authority given to the Church in the word of God, and violated the covenant by which all parts of the Church were bound together. The Scriptures do not treat of the complex system of government which the people of the United States have devised for themselves, and therefore the Church which knows nothing among men but the words of Scripture, cannot decide the question of the primary obligation as to allegiance in the American system. The whole question was extraneous to the Scriptures, and therefore, as to the Church, *ultra vires*. Besides, our compact, following exactly the word of God, forbade any such decisions. The language of the covenant reads thus: "Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary, or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate." Conf. of Faith, Chap. XXXI., Sec. 4. It has never been main-  
VOL. XXXV., NO. 1—12.

tained, I believe, that the action, against which we protest as subversive of the Constitution and as a violation of Scripture, was taken under either of the two exceptional heads. The justification has been that a question of duty was pressing for an authoritative settlement, and whatever was done by the Assembly was only to that end. The reply is, Precisely so; a political question was tacitly but really decided in order to reach the question of duty. This was exactly the transgression. Now, we humbly cenceive that the Church should have imitated her Lord when confronted by the question of tribute to Cæsar. That, too, involved just such a mixed question, partly political, partly moral. He declined to decide the political dispute, merely observing in effect as he called attention to the Roman Denarius: "I see that you have some sort of dealings with Cæsar. Very well; in all your dealings with him, render to Cæsar whatever is due to him, and to God what belongs to him."<sup>1</sup>

Nor have we been able to this hour to withdraw that protest. For our brethren have continued steadfastly to reiterate their adhesion to their action in 1861. Succeeding Assemblies have gone far beyond the "Spring Resolutions." The Baltimore Conference, in 1875, developed the fact of their unwillingness then to change a jot of their former action. And the negotiations of 1882, between the Assemblies at Atlanta and at Springfield, proved beyond a doubt that our brethren adhere with invincible resolution to their "Deliverances as to Loyalty and the Rebellion." This being the case, nothing is left to us but to hold fast to the purely spiritual functions of the Church, as they are set down in our Confession. It is our duty to protest, by our separate existence, for the glory of Christ, the supremacy of his word, and the good of all men. We are few among the thousands of Israel. But so were the twelve apostles and seventy evangelists. In themselves weak, they as God's humble instruments

<sup>1</sup> Sufficient evidence for this construction of our Lord's answer seems to be furnished by the conduct of his keen-witted interlocutors. Neither party attempted to use the words to his damage, as they had hoped to do. If he had said, No, the Herodians intended to report his speech to Pilate, as advising sedition; if Yes, then the Pharisees would have inflamed the ready jealousy of the masses.

were able to overturn the cherished opinions of the world. The Covenanters under Cameron and Renwick were a feeble band, and yet, when every other voice had been hushed, and British liberty had been all but sacrificed, they maintained their protest until the nation slowly recovered her senses and finally hurled the apostate race of Stuart from the throne. God seems to have given us this as our special mission, with a far wider view of the truth than was vouchsafed to Cameron and Renwick, to testify with a deeper meaning for the crown rights of King Jesus. Oh that we may be correspondingly faithful to our trust! Men will despise and laugh us to scorn for our self-conceit. Be it so. Let us not put on a sanctimonious face, which will be saying to the world, "See what noble martyrs we are!" But like Paul, let us rather forget self and pain in our Master's work.

Brethren, we are thoroughly agreed as to the inadmissibility of State-Churches. They are not only unauthorised imitations of the Jewish theocracy, but caricatures of it. We are united in the solemn purpose, I trust, of maintaining with modesty and charity our protest against all secular and political acts by the Church of Christ, and in particular by the Church under the compact of the Revised Confession of 1788. How can we sanction the assumption of the right to set aside a compact without the consent of both parties? And this being determined, are we not now prepared, in the light of our own experience, to go a step further, by renouncing all claim, as preachers of the word, to say in our official capacity, in God's house, and on his holy day, what we cannot affirm in our Synods? Will we not resolve to preach only and simply the word of God? A larger liberty has been claimed and exercised among us, doubtless with the best intentions, but also with the most disastrous consequences. But on what ground? If the courts are to represent Christ, is not the preacher to do the same? And is not his act, if possible, more absolutely restricted, as it is the highest function of the Church? Surely there has been error among us in this regard. It will be well for us, as preachers of the word, to go just as far as it goes, and to stop just where it ceases, with regard to the so-called "topics of the day," and all the sciences, whether physical or

metaphysical, ethical or political. We thank God for our ancestors who framed the Westminster Confession as it was enacted by the Long Parliament, though the Parliament had no right to touch it. We thank God for our fathers in America, who, in 1788, amended that old Confession, and greatly improved it, by bringing it more nearly into harmony with the word of God. We thank him for his grace which enabled us, amid sore trials, to keep the records of our Church free from all secular and political action. May we not pray to be kept from uttering in our pulpits one word which is not his word? WM. E. BOGGS.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

The books of the quarter that have fallen under our eye, or that we have had any glimpse of through the eyes of others, have interested us more than usual. The Pulpit Commentary<sup>1</sup> we have mentioned in a previous issue. Its homiletical merits are said to be extraordinary, but we have owned up to a certain scepticism in relation to professedly homiletical commentaries as a class. The work now under criticism is, on the whole, very conservative, and for the most part strictly orthodox, but in the exegetical portions displays no special vigor or originality. Mr. Cheyne (the expounder of Jeremiah) is unsound on inspiration, holding to the impossible sliding-scale of degrees, and contends that Jeremiah in its present form is a redaction by a later editor. "The Kingdom of All Israel"<sup>2</sup> is Mr. Sime's happy description of the undivided kingdom of the Jewish tribes, from Saul to Rehoboam. The work is one of great ability, as well as competent learning and high literary merit. The history revolves about the lives of Samuel, Saul, David, and Solomon. The antiquity and genuineness of the Pentateuch (and the Pentateuchal legislation) are fully vindicated from the attacks of the school of Reuss and Wellhausen, that derive their seeming force from the unsettled

<sup>1</sup> The Pulpit Commentary, Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M. A., Vicar and Rural Dean of St. Pancras, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol; and by the Rev. Joseph S. Exell, Editor of the *Homiletic Quarterly*. [St. Mark; Exposition by Dean Bickersteth; Homiletics by Mr. Thomson, 2 Vols., pp. xii., vi., 371. Jeremiah; Exposition by Mr. Cheyne; Homiletics by Professor Thomson. Vol. I., pp. xix., vii., 598—about 80 pages of Exposition and 518 of Homiletics. Joshua; Exposition and Homiletics by Mr. Lias, pp. lviii., xxxviii., 384. Introductions to Historical Books, by Mr. Plumer and Mr. Lias. Judges; Exposition and Homiletics by Lord Hervey, pp. viii., iv., 214; and Ruth, pp. xviii., i., 72 (in the same volume), by Dr. Morison.] New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

<sup>2</sup> The Kingdom of All-Israel; its History, Literature, and Worship. By James Sime, M. A., F. R. S. E. London: 1883. 8vo., pp. 621.

state of things during most of this period. The arguments of this school are shown to be based on trivial grounds, and the new critical method to be destitute of the sober wisdom and caution that ought to characterise scientific experts in so high and sacred a department of human skill and knowledge. Professor Ladd's Inquiry respecting the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments,<sup>1</sup> is a thoughtful and impressive discussion, and challenges the admiration even of those who cannot agree with him. The venerable ex-President Hopkins has just presented us with a philosophic (not exegetical) treatise on Biblical Psychology, that is rich and valuable.<sup>2</sup> Uhlhorn's Exhibition of Ancient Christian Charity is a grand one.<sup>3</sup> "The Philosophic Basis of Theism"<sup>4</sup> is an attempt on the part of Professor Harris, of Yale College, to state with articulate precision and adequacy the arguments for Christian Theism, in the new light that has been shed upon this subject by the discussions of our time. Almost the very same theme has been taken up by another Yale Professor, that sterling thinker and writer, Dr. Fisher.<sup>5</sup> With our knowledge of his opinions and of his eminent fitness on the score of his information and capacity, we cannot but rejoice that so important a subject has fallen into such able hands. It becomes more and more

---

<sup>1</sup> The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture: A Critical, Historical, and Dogmatic Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments. By Professor Geo. T. Ladd, D. D. 2 Vols., 8vo. \$7. Charles Scribner's Sons, N. Y.

<sup>2</sup> The Scriptural Idea of Man. By Mark Hopkins, D. D., LL. D. 12mo., \$1. *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Christian Charity in the Ancient Church. By Dr. Gerhard Uhlhorn, author of "The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism." 1 Vol., crown 8vo., \$2.50. *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> The Philosophical Basis of Theism: An Examination of the Personality of Man to ascertain his Capacity to Know and Serve God, and the Validity of the Principles underlying the Defence of Theism. By Samuel Harris, D. D., LL. D., Professor in the Theological Department of Yale College. 1 Vol., 8vo., \$3.50. *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief. By George P. Fisher, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. 1 Vol., crown 8vo., \$2.50. *Ibid.*

evident that the debate about Final Causes is the great debate between our Christian apologists and the metaphysical and naturalistic unbelievers of the age; and that Janet's disquisition<sup>1</sup> upon that topic is the strongest defence of final causes that has yet been essayed. The same writer's work on Ethics<sup>2</sup> will also be received with grave satisfaction, but will hardly occupy the position of exceptional and even unique excellence that has been accorded to his earlier production.

Professor Drummond, of the Glasgow Free Church College, has just enriched the library of sound contemporary apologetics by a striking and original work on the correlation observable between natural and spiritual law.<sup>3</sup> Professor Drummond is an evangelical of the evangelicals, and one of Mr. Moody's right hand men when that remarkable person was first in Scotland. Mr. Drummond has found out that natural science and Christian faith, when not perverted, go hand in hand. The writer contends that the scientific principle of continuity requires that the laws governing every lower province of the universe must hold good in every higher province, and even in the highest. This contention is perhaps pressed too far, but it is most ingeniously advocated, and is rendered at least as plausible as at the first blush it seems incapable of proof. The valuable work of Lipsius on the somewhat neglected subject of the Apocrypha is one of immense and accurate erudition, and of rare critical insight.<sup>4</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup> Final Causes. By Paul Janet, Member of the Institute, Professor at the Faculté des Lettres of Paris. Translated from the second edition of the French, by William Affleck, D. D.; with a Preface by Robert Flint, D. D., LL. D. Second edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1883. Pp. xxii., 520.

The same. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1883.

<sup>2</sup> The Theory of Morals. By Paul Janet, Member of the French Academy, author of "Final Causes." 1 Vol., 8vo., \$2.50. Charles Scribner's Sons.

<sup>3</sup> Natural Law in the Spiritual World. By Henry Drummond, F. R. S. E., F. G. S. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 27 Paternoster Row. 1883. 12mo., pp. 414.

<sup>4</sup> Die Apocryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden. Ein Beitrag zur althechristlichen Literaturgeschichte. Von Richard Adelbert Lipsius. Erster Band. Braunschweig. 1883. 8vo., pp. 622. New York: B. Westermann & Co.

literary, biographical, historic, and religious interest of the year centres in Martin Luther. Of the lives of Luther with which the German press teem, two are worthy of special note. One<sup>1</sup> is comparatively slight and popular; the other<sup>2</sup> (that of Professor Köstlin, of Halle) is pronounced a superb triumph of biographical success, by one of the most brilliant and famous historians and *literati* of the English-speaking race. Luther's figure is undoubtedly the most imposing figure in modern history, if not in all post-apostolic history. The two men who (certainly since the days of antiquity) have most stamped themselves on the world, are the soldier of Corsica and the monk of Erfurt. The one was the incarnation of physical and mental force, and of military domination; the other of moral intrepidity and energy, and of the victorious ascendancy of liberty and truth. Napoleon symbolises the idea of the subjection of the world to *self*; Luther, that of the subjection of the world to *Christ*. The structure erected by the genius of havoc and disorder has crumbled and is crumbling; whereas that erected by the gracious spirit of peace and conservation still stands intact, is daily enlarging, and will endure for ever.

The Reformation, it is true, has not had equal success in all lands. Its singular career in Sweden is well recounted by Mr. Butler.<sup>3</sup> To M. Herminjard is committed the self-appointed, yet most thankless, task of editing the correspondence even of the obscurest of the French Reformers.<sup>4</sup> The philosophic treatment of this general subject has been appropriately assigned as the task of the Hibbert Lectures this year.<sup>5</sup> The element of saving

<sup>1</sup> Martin Luther. Ein Lebensbild von F. Schmidt. Leipzig: J. Lehman.

<sup>2</sup> The Life of Luther. By Julius Köstlin, Professor in the University of Halle; with more than sixty Illustrations from Original Portraits, Documents, etc. 1 Vol., 8vo. Chas. Scribner's Sons.

<sup>3</sup> The Reformation in Sweden. By C. M. Butler. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 1883.

<sup>4</sup> Correspondance des Reformateurs dans les Pays de Lange Française, Recueillie et Publiée, avec d'autres Lettres Relatives à la Réforme et des Notes Historiques et Biographiques, par A. L. Herminjard. Tome VI., (1539 à 1540.) Avec un Index Alphabétique des Noms. 8vo., pp. 501. Genève: Bale: Lyon: H. Georg. Paris: G. Fischbacher. 1883.

<sup>5</sup> The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, in its Relation to Modern



truth which Luther and Zwingli restored to the restless thought of the world, was like the leaven in our Lord's parable, which the woman hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened.

M. Montet's essay on the principal Jewish sects,<sup>1</sup> is an exceedingly fine one, and novel in some of its positions. If we are to accept the views of this interesting writer, the Sadducees (not the Pharisees) were the national party, and in full sympathy with the Maccabean leaders. The Essenes were the extreme left of the Pharisaic party. The Pharisees opposed the Maccabean dynasty, and were out and out Separatists. The Sadducees had the priesthood, and the high offices generally, in their possession, and as an ordinary thing the control of the Sanhedrim. M. Montet notices a discrepancy between the Rabbins and the New Testament as to these points and as to the Scribes, and accepts the statements of the New Testament. This is the more worthy of remark, as he adopts the views of Reuss and Kuenen as to the Hexateuch. We welcome most heartily the new edition of Dr. Schaff's admirable and indispensable Church History.<sup>2</sup> *O si sic omnes!* But when will the time come when the story of the Church shall be written continuously, like that of Rome or England? Fancy Gibbon's or Macaulay's volumes cut up into the sort of chapters that are the opprobrium of such able works as those of Kurtz and Guericke! The same remark is applicable to Dr. Killen's charming account<sup>3</sup> of the Church of the three first centuries, from the point-of-view of North-Irish Presbyterianism in

Thought and Knowledge. Hibbert Lectures, 1883. London: Williams & Norgate. 1883.

<sup>1</sup> *Essai sur les Origines des partis Sadducéen et Pharisien et leur Histoire jusqu' à la Naissance de Jesus Christ.* Par Edouard Montet. Paris: Lib. Fischbacher. 1883.

<sup>2</sup> *History of the Christian Church.* By Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D. Vol. II. Ante-Nicene Christianity, A. D. 100-325. 1 Vol., 8vo., \$4. Charles Scribner's Sons.

<sup>3</sup> *The Ancient Church: Its History, Doctrine, Worship, and Constitution traced for the first hundred years.* By W. D. Killen, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology in the Irish Assembly's College, Belfast. New edition, carefully revised, with an introduction by the Rev. John Hall, D. D. Royal 12mo., 612 pages, \$2. A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

the nineteenth century. Fuller and more intimate acquaintance with this book warrants us in recommending it with the most cordial emphasis, after a somewhat attentive inspection of its varied pages.

Dr. Mombert's hand-book of the English Versions<sup>1</sup> will prove useful to many readers; and precisely the same thing may be repeated of Dr. Blaikie's Manual of Bible History,<sup>2</sup> now offered to us in a later and improved form.

The Epistle to the Ephesians is one of the richest and most precious mines of spiritual instruction and edification that ever was opened.<sup>3</sup> Superficially easy, it is in its profound depths one of the most difficult books in the New Testament to interpret. We should suspect the author of the present volume, with all his fine gifts, of having also some disqualifications for the task of expounding this sublime and mysterious as well as highly emotional and practical letter of Paul to the Asian Christians. It is astonishing to what an extent the Bible<sup>4</sup> is getting to be studied in our day by a comparatively small but exceedingly influential class, whilst at the same time it is falling more and more into neglect with a class that greatly outnumbers the one just referred to, and much more nearly represents the sentiments of the nominally Christian world. Every judicious attempt to establish the genuineness and authenticity and divine plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures should be received with favor. We have previously mentioned the new "City of God."<sup>5</sup> If anything of

<sup>1</sup> A Hand-Book of the English Versions of the Bible, with copious examples illustrating the ancestry and relationship of the several versions, and comparative tables. By J. I. Mombert, D. D. 500 pages, beautifully printed on laid paper, and neatly bound in cloth. Price, \$2.50. *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> A Manual of Bible History, in connexion with the General History of the World. By the Rev. W. G. Blaikie, D. D. New edition, revised and enlarged. 12mo., cloth. Price, \$1.50. Thomas Nelson & Sons.

<sup>3</sup> Lectures on the Ephesians. By R. W. Dale, M. A. 8vo., cloth, uncut edges, \$2.75. *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> The Bible: Its Revelation, Inspiration, and Evidences. By John Robson, M. A., D. D., author of *Hinduism and its Relation to Christianity*. 8vo., cloth, uncut edges, \$2.75. *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> The City of God. A Series of Discussions in Religion, by A. M. Fairbairn. 8vo., cloth, uncut edges, \$2.75. *Ibid.*

Augustin's soaring eloquence and profound spiritual insight have followed the selection of Augustin's memorable title, this book should be a treat indeed.

The convenient and symmetrical arrangement of the "Parallel New Testament"<sup>1</sup> will recommend it strongly to a multitude of readers.

It was a happy thought to present the New Testament books in the order in which they were written—so far at least as it is possible to do so in the present state of our knowledge.<sup>2</sup> Every new translation, whether close or free, if faithful and scholarlike, is to be generously commended. The first part only of this promising work has yet made its appearance. Dr. Porter, the author of "Five Years in Damascus," "Murray's Guide-book in Syria and Palestine," "The Giant Cities of Bashan,"<sup>3</sup> and other things of interest and value, is now at the head of the Belfast Free-Church College. We have noticed the book about Bashan before. The savans scout the idea that the giant walls, houses, beds, utensils, were those of Og and his generation. Whatever may be the decision as to the inferences drawn in this book, its *facts* stand unimpeached. The unpretending *octodecimo* of a Christian "layman" on Creation and Evolution<sup>4</sup> adds another volume to the pyramidal heap of books on this topic.

Dr. Briggs is one of the best informed men in America on the subjects treated of in this volume.<sup>5</sup> He is a great expert in that

<sup>1</sup>The Parallel New Testament; Greek and English. Giving the authorised version, the revised version, the revised Greek text, and the readings displaced by the revisers, in four parallel columns; also space for manuscript notes. Minion, octavo, cloth, bevelled red edges, \$6. *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup>The New Testament Scriptures in the order in which they were written. A very close translation from the Greek text of 1611, with brief explanations. Part I. containing the Six Primary Epistles to Thessalonica, Corinth, Galatia, Rome, A. D. 52-58. Cloth, 12mo. \$1. *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup>The Giant Cities of Bashan and Syria's Holy Places. By the Rev. J. L. Porter, A. M. 12mo., cloth, illustrated. New and cheaper edition, \$1. *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup>Conversations on the Creation. Chapters on Genesis and Evolution. By a Layman. 18mo., cloth, extra. 75 cents. *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup>Biblical Study: Its Principles, Methods, and a History of its Branches, Together with a Catalogue of a Reference Library for Biblical Study. By

department, and is besides the exponent of the reactionary portion of the New School branch of the reunited Church of the North. It is to be deeply regretted that a work otherwise so timely and admirable should be tinctured at all with the semi-rationalism that is one of the most baleful features of "the newer criticism."

Dr. Schaff's *Companion to the Greek Testament*<sup>1</sup> is preëminently *multum in parvo*. Here the student will find the latest discoveries and deductions in textual criticism, besides a symmetrical and somewhat detailed view of several of the topics in a course of Biblical Introduction. The revisers, in their eagerness for sympathy and approbation, are somewhat in danger of hearing the echo of the words of Solomon: "Let *another* praise thee."

The uncommon learning of Professor Toy as an orientalist stood him in good stead in preparing this useful work on the Quotations from the Old, in the New Testament.<sup>2</sup> It will probably supersede older works, such as that of Gough. Professor Toy's departures from strict orthodoxy are not likely to have affected this book seriously. The lives of the great missionaries, Paul, Carey, Martyn, Morrison, Livingston, and Judson, ought never to be suffered to fade from human memory.<sup>3</sup> "Stepping Heavenward" was in some ways an odd book, but it was truly pious and strangely fascinating. These traits are probably a reflection from the character of the lamented author.<sup>4</sup> Miss Haver-

---

Charles A. Briggs, D. D., Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages in Union Theological Seminary [New York]. 1 vol., 12mo., \$2.50. *Ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version. By Philip Schaff, D. D., President of the American Committee of Revision. With *fac simile* illustrations of MSS., and standard editions of the New Testament. New York. Harper & Bros., Franklin Square. 1883.

<sup>2</sup> Quotations in the New Testament. By C. H. Toy, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Hebrew in Harvard University. 1 Vol., crown 8vo., \$2.50. Chas. Scribner's Sons.

<sup>3</sup> The Life of Adoniram Judson. By his son, Edward Judson. One volume, royal 12mo., 612 pages, with four steel portraits, two maps, and three wood cuts, beautifully printed. \$2. A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

<sup>4</sup> The Life and Letters of Elizabeth Prentiss, author of "Stepping Heavenward." One volume, crown 8vo., 575 pages, with steel portrait and five full-page illustrations, cloth, \$2.25. *Ibid.*

gal's saintly life adds immeasurably to the force and sweetness of her saintly books.<sup>1</sup>

"In the Shadow of His Hand"<sup>2</sup> is also spoken of as a well of consolation to the bereaved and afflicted. Dr. Parkhurst's suggestive title-page<sup>3</sup> would seem to presage an argument (in his first sermon) on the evidential value of Christian experience. "Abide in Christ"<sup>4</sup> and "The Outermost Rim and Beyond"<sup>5</sup> are two little books of a soothing and devotional character. The one first named dwells on the blessedness of the Christian's fellowship and life. The second one reverently grapples with some of the difficulties that are apt to pose and baffle the faith and disturb the peace of the unwary.

Dr. Charles Robinson has made several excellent hymn books, and he is declared to have earned the thanks of good people of sense by these "Studies of Neglected Texts."<sup>6</sup> Pulpit style is a matter that every body is not fitted to discourse upon. This remark is singularly inapplicable to Professor Phelps.<sup>7</sup> We are informed by a Chinese missionary that Dr. Williams's "Middle

<sup>1</sup> Miss Havergal's Devotional Books, complete in one volume. Royal Grace and Royal Gifts. Comprising: Royal Commandments; My King; Royal Bounty; The Royal Invitation; Kept for the Master's Use; Loyal Responses. One volume, 576 pages. \$1. *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> In the Shadow of His Hand. Thoughts for Lonely Hours. By Rose Porter, author of "Summer Driftwood," "Our Saints," etc. 16mo., leatherette, gilt edges and sides, \$1. *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> The Blind Man's Creed and Other Sermons. By Charles H. Parkhurst, D. D., Pastor of the Madison Square Church, New York. 12mo, cloth, 246 pages. \$1. *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Abide in Christ: Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Fellowship with the Son of God. By A. M. "Abide in me, and I in you." New York. *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> The Outermost Rim and Beyond. A contribution toward Patience, Reverence, Silence, and Spirituality in the Study of Nature and of God. By Charles Van Norden. 12mo., cloth. \$1. *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Studies of Neglected Texts. By Chas. S. Robinson, D. D., Pastor of the Memorial Church, New York City, New York. American Tract Society.

<sup>7</sup> English Style in Public Discourse, with special reference to the Usages of the Pulpit. By Austin Phelps, D. D., late Bartlett Professor of Sacred Rhetoric in Andover Theological Seminary. New York. Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1883.

Kingdom''<sup>1</sup> is the one great book in English on the Flowery Land. Another and yet shrewder critic calls attention to the wonderful improvement in Dr. Williams's English. Dr. Martineau<sup>2</sup> is one of the keenest and most astute writers of the age. It is to be regretted that, so firm a theist, he should also betray something of the rationalistic tendency that so painfully marks our time. Spinoza is a puzzle. He is commonly set down as an ideal pantheist; but some still contend that he was a subtle kind of theist. It must be borne in mind that Spinoza was by blood and early training a *Jew*. Professor Stuckenberg's *Life of Kant*<sup>3</sup> is very full and able, but goes over a great deal of ground that had been well trodden before. The new history of the United States, by Mr. McMaster, is only begun,<sup>4</sup> but the beginning is one of rather brilliant promise. The book indeed is not without its grave faults. Dr. Taylor's learned work on the genesis of alphabetic writing is one of high value.<sup>5</sup> The handsome book of Dr. Vincent about the Pyrenees<sup>6</sup> is one that can be praised without serious drawback. The life of Professor Palmer,<sup>7</sup> the orientalist and traveller, was one of varied and surpassing interest.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Middle Kingdom: A Survey of the Geography, Government, Literature, Social Life, Arts, and History of the Chinese Empire and its Inhabitants. With illustrations and a new map of the Empire.* By S. Wells Williams, LL. D. 2 vols. 8vo. \$9. *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> *A Study of Spinoza.* By James Martineau, LL.D., D. D., Principal of Manchester New College, London. With a portrait. London. Macmillan & Co. 1882. Pp. 371.

<sup>3</sup> *The Life of Immanuel Kant.* By W. W. Stuckenberg, D. D., Special Professor in Wittenberg College, Ohio. London. 1882. Pp. 474. *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *A History of the People of the United States, from the Revolution to the Civil War.* By John Bach McMaster. In five volumes. Vol. I. 8vo. Pp. xv. and 622. New York. D. Appleton & Co. 1883.

<sup>5</sup> *The Alphabet: An Account of the Origin and Development of Letters.* By Isaac Taylor, M. A., LL.D. In two volumes. London. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883. 8vo.

<sup>6</sup> *In the Shadow of the Pyrenees. From Basque Land to Carcassonne.* By Marvin R. Vincent, D. D. With etchings and maps. Chas. Scribner's Sons.

<sup>7</sup> *The Life and Achievements of Edward Henry Palmer, late Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, and Fellow of St. John's College.* By Walter Besant, M. A. London. 1883.

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. 2.

---

APRIL, MDCCCLXXXIV.

---

**NOTE.**—As two of the Articles prepared for this number of the **REVIEW** relate to marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and as this subject will be acted on by the Presbyteries early in April, the Editors of the **REVIEW** feel it to be due the authors of these Articles that they be put in the hands of our readers as early as possible. We therefore send out a somewhat incomplete number, rather than delay longer, expecting to atone for this brevity in the succeeding numbers of the volume.

meaning to the passage. It is accepted by Prof. Bush in his Commentary. But Gesenius in his Thesaurus, as in Dr. Robinson's translation also, clearly makes out that "flesh of his flesh" is the true rendering. One of the most learned of the English Hebraists coincides with Gesenius. **שֶׁנֶפֶשׁוֹ** is rendered flesh in





# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXXIV.

## ARTICLE I.

### A BRIEF IN THE CASE OF THE MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

I. Is the law recorded in Leviticus xviii. and xx. directed against fornication, adultery, or incest? Answer: Leviticus xviii. 6–17, and the similar verses in Leviticus xx., are unquestionably levelled specially at incest. (1) This has been the judgment of the vast majority of the Church, both Jewish and Christian. There is hardly a dissenting voice. (2) If incest is not meant, the Jews had no written law against incest, which is wholly un-supposable when we consider the commonness and enormity of the crime. (3) The preamble to the law is, “None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness.” “Near of kin” is in the Hebrew **שֵׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ** — “flesh of his flesh.” The verse reads literally, “Man, man to the flesh of his flesh ye shall not approach.”

The margin of King James' Version renders **שֵׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ** by “remainder of his flesh;” and this gives substantially the same meaning to the passage. It is accepted by Prof. Bush in his Commentary. But Gesenius in his Thesaurus, as in Dr. Robinson's translation also, clearly makes out that “flesh of his flesh” is the true rendering. One of the most learned of the English Hebraists coincides with Gesenius. **שֵׁאֵר** is rendered flesh in

Ps. lxxiii. 26; Micah iii. 3; Jer. li. 35; Ps. lxxviii. 20; "body" in Prov. v. 11; "food" in Exod. xxi. 10. But the kindred word רֶמָנָה is properly translated "remainder," or "remnant," Isa. xi. 11; Zeph. i. 4. The same occurs in the Chaldee in Ezra and Daniel. The Septuagint paraphrases by πάντα οἰκεία σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, all the kindred of his flesh. The Vulgate also, *proximum sanguinis sui*, next of his blood, next of kin; which is followed by the English Version. In this, as in so many other cases, the more closely we adhere to the original, the more accurately and the more fully shall we get at the inspired meaning. This preamble shows conclusively that it is incestuous intercourse that is specially aimed at, and not fornication or adultery; while yet all sexual intercourse is forbidden. (4) This view is confirmed by the fact that, besides the multitude of condemnations of adultery elsewhere, the law in Lev. xviii., after finishing up the subject of incest, adds a prohibition of adultery along with other abominations in verses 19-23, and chap. xx. 10. See also xix. 20-22.

## II. Reasons for the law against incest.

(1) The preservation of the beneficent affection of kindred, which is incompatible with marital affection proper.

(2) The conservation of domestic purity.

(3) Augustine "held that the design of all these prohibitory laws was to widen the circle of the social affections." (Hodge's Theol., Vol. III., p. 409.) This may be a subsidiary benefit, but can hardly be placed in the front rank.

(4) Recondite reasons drawn from physiology as ascertained by recent scientific inquiries. For instance, that the reason why a man should not marry his brother's widow is that the widow has incorporated into her own body part of the substance of the body of her first husband, or else that at least her own physical condition has been permanently altered by the previous union. The objections to this are, 1st. The reasons for a law are not concealed four thousand years to be revealed at last only by science. 2d. Third, fourth, or fifth cousins would be prohibited from intermarriage on the same ground with a step-mother, an aunt, or an aunt-in-law.

## III. Is the law binding on the New Testament Church?

Affirmative: Because (1) The sins forbidden were the sins of Gentile nations, "the doings of the land of Egypt and . . . the land of Canaan;" not of the Jews particularly.

(2) The relations of the parties are race relations, not national; the relations of man to man, not of Jew to Jew. So the law is not a ceremonial or ritual law, having reference, like the law of sacrifices, to the coming Christ; and it is not a law of the Hebrew commonwealth, like the laws of inheritance, jubilee, etc., all which are done away; but a law concerning the permanent relations of mankind, and thus binding like the Ten Commandments, being in fact a corollary of the seventh.

(3) It is recognised in the New Testament. (See 1 Cor. v. 1.) Also John the Baptist said unto Herod, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife." Mark vi. 18. Not another man's wife, but *thy brother's*. Herod, as well as John, knew what the Mosaic law was.

(4) The conscience of the heathen has always, though dimly and incompletely, acknowledged the sinfulness of incest. Cicero cries out against it. If the heathen knowledge has been incomplete on this subject, it has been so in other departments of morals also.

(5) Incest is as wrong now as it ever was, and is condemned in all Christian countries. If the law recorded in Leviticus is not binding upon us, there is no law written in the Bible against incest that does bind us, except the scattered recognitions before mentioned.

## IV. Is the bearing of the law to be confined to the specified cases?

No. (1) The reasons for the law extend more widely, and hence the extent of the law must be determined by parity of reasoning. It is idle to say that we cannot understand the reasons for this law now after thirty-five or forty centuries of study, experience, and New Testament teaching. God always encourages a reverential study of the reasons for his laws. Indeed, his laws cannot be understood unless we learn the reasons for them.

(2) A servile verbal interpretation would lead us into the wild-

est blunders. A woman is forbidden to be married to her son, or even step-son, but a man might lawfully be married to his own daughter. A woman may not be married to her brother's son, or her sister's son, or even her husband's brother's son, in which last case there is affinity only, and no consanguinity at all; yet a man might be lawfully married to his own brother's or sister's daughter. It is impossible that this should be the intent of the law. Is it less absurd that a woman should be forbidden to be married to her deceased husband's brother, and yet be allowed to be married to her deceased sister's husband?

(3) Well nigh universal consent of Jews and Christians, even of the lax Talmudists, much more of the stricter Karaites, confirms this view.

V. A kindred question is whether by "nearness of kin," or "flesh of his flesh," consanguinity was meant, to the exclusion of affinity. This is easily answered:

(1) About half of the specified cases are cases of affinity. This alone settles the question.

(2) In the beginning God chose to make woman out of the substance of man, that so he might in the most impressive way teach the coming race that husband and wife "shall be one flesh." וְהָיוּ לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד; "and they shall be to one flesh," i. e., become one flesh. The whole tendency of unbelief is away from this primal scripture. The Church will take lessons from ill masters, if it shall forsake the oracles of God for infidel teachers. According to Holy Scripture, both Old and New Testaments, husband and wife are one flesh. The kindred of the one become the kindred of the other.

VI. It seems hardly worth while seriously to consider that flimsiest of all sophisms: that when one's wife dies the bond of connexion with her family is broken, and her family are no more or other to the surviving widower than any other family whatsoever. Answer: Then if my father dies after a second marriage, his widow, not my own mother, occupies no nearer relation to me than any other woman does, and I may lawfully marry my step-mother! Fortunately this is expressly forbidden, and the prohibition should teach us how to interpret the law generally. So,

too, one may not marry his father's brother's widow, nor his own son's widow, nor his deceased wife's daughter, etc. But the sophism does not deserve a refutation.

VII. Some English readers may be honestly puzzled by the fact that similar phrases in the law need to be taken in a somewhat dissimilar sense. Thus in Lev. xviii. 8: "The nakedness of thy father's wife thou shalt not uncover: it is thy father's nakedness." Of course the two clauses cannot be literally applied in precisely the same way. Hence it might be suspected that sexual intercourse was not meant by the phrase. It has been urged that the Septuagint employs the word *ἀσχημοσύνη*, shame. This reasoning, however, is wholly unsound.

(1) Whatever definite meaning we attach to the original phrase, it is plain that the transgressor *dishonors the bed of his father*, and inflicts a particular kind of shame upon his father's name.

(2) The Greek euphemism *ἀσχημοσύνη* cannot be pressed unreasonably into signifying any sort of shame. The whole context forbids this; especially the words *οὐκ ἀποκαλύψεις*, thou shalt not uncover. The LXX. plainly understood the passage just as we do.

(3) The repetition of the phrase in a slightly altered, yet kindred meaning, is entirely consistent with the terseness of the Hebrew, and the paucity of their vocabulary. Every Hebrew scholar feels the force of this.

(4) Since husband and wife are one flesh—not in the letter which killeth, but in a true scriptural sense—it is to be expected that the nakedness of the one should be the nakedness of the other also. Of course, if marriage were a mere partnership, the whole scriptural theory would fall to the ground, and the inspired phraseology become meaningless.

(5) Gesenius explains the phrase as it has always been understood.

VIII. What is meant by "a wife to her sister" in verse 18? The literal rendering of the verse is: "And a woman to her sister thou shalt not take, to vex, to uncover her nakedness upon her in her life." There are two interpretations of this verse. We propose to give them both, and the arguments by which they are defended. But either one of the two interpretations will answer

our purpose. It is agreed that to "take a woman" in the Hebrew sense of the phrase, is to take her in marriage, to wed her. Again, a slight variation is found in those cases in which one man is said to take a woman to or for another man. Thus 2 Chron. xxiv. 3, Jehoiada took for Joash two wives. The word "marry" in our own tongue is applied to the bridegroom, the bride, or the officiating minister. So there need be no trouble about this. Then the preposition *בְּ* upon, like prepositions in all languages, has considerable latitude of signification growing out of the primary one. Gesenius gives as synonyms, Lat., *ad, apud*; German, *an, bei*; English, *at, by, near*; and still others, as *near, at the side of, within, to, against*. All who have considered the Greek prepositions will understand the need of circumspection in translating this part of speech. Instead of the primary *upon*, the secondary meaning of *beside* seems appropriate; *by, at the side of*.

In favor of taking the word *sister* literally here, Dr. Hodge says: "(1) The words in question never mean 'one to another,' except when preceded by a plural noun, which is not the case in Lev. xviii. 18. (2) If this explanation be adopted, the passage contains an explicit prohibition of polygamy, which the law of Moses permitted. (3) It is unnatural to take the words 'wife' and 'sister' in a sense different from that in which they are used throughout the chapter. (4) The ancient versions agree with the rendering given in the text of the English Bible. The Septuagint has *γυναῖκα ἐπ' ἀδελφῇ αὐτῆς*; the Vulgate '*sororem uxoris tuæ*.'" Dr. Hodge adds that "In this interpretation the modern commentators almost without exception agree;" and quotes from Maurer, Baumgarten, Rosenmüller, and Keil.

Prof. Geo. Bush, in his Commentary on Leviticus, handles the question at considerable length, and arrives at the conclusion that the text of the English Version is the correct translation, "a wife to her sister." He adds, "It is not a matter of small weight in confirmation, that all the ancient versions, as the Chaldee Targum of Onkelos, the Samaritan, the Syriac, and the Arabic, adhere to the literal construction."<sup>1</sup> Referring to the idiomatic ex-

<sup>1</sup> The Targum of Onkelos renders Lev. xviii. 18, "And a wife with her

pressions, "a man to his brother," and "a woman to her sister," he says, "Of these phrases the former . . . occurs twenty-five times in the Hebrew Scriptures, and the latter . . . ten times. Neither of the phrases are (*sic*) confined to persons; they are both frequently, and in fact generally, spoken of inanimate substances." The following instances will suffice: Gen. xxxvii. 19, "And they (the brothers of Joseph) said one to another;" literally, a man to his brother. Exod. xxxvii. 9, The cherubim stood with their faces one to another (a man to his brother). Gen. xxvi. 31, Abimelech and Isaac swear one to another. Lev. xxv. 14, Ye shall not oppress one another (אִישׁ אֶת-אָחִיו a man his brother). Joel ii. 8 (of the plague of the locusts), Neither shall one thrust another (a man his brother). Similar phrases are, "a man as his brother," i. e., "one as much as another," English Version; "a man upon his brother," rendered "they shall fall one upon another," etc.

The other phrase, "a woman to her sister," occurs ten times. Thus Exod. xxvi. 3: "The five curtains shall be coupled together, one to another" (a woman to her sister). "And other five curtains shall be coupled one to another" (a woman to her sister). So of *loops* in Exod. xxvi. 5; of *curtains* again in Exod. xxvi. 6; of *tenons* in Exod. xxvi. 17; of *wings* in Ezekiel i. 9, 11, 23, and in iii. 10. "The wings of the living creatures touched one another" (a woman to her sister). The only remaining place is this, Lev. xviii. 18: "Thou shalt not take a woman to her sister." The simple, literal interpretation is, that a man is forbidden to take a woman to cause her tribulation by uncovering her nakedness over her in her life (time)."

The Targum of Palestine, commonly entitled the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, gives, "Neither shalt thou take a wife in the life time of her sister, to aggrieve her by dishonoring her nakedness over her, all the days of her life." Dr. Etheridge's "Targums on the Pentateuch, Vol. II. London, Longman, Green & Co., 1865." This translation is supposed to be quite reliable. I have no portions of the Targums in Chaldee except the extracts in a Chrestomathy. Dr. E. translated the New Testament from the Peschito Syriac also. The non-clerical reader will bear in mind that the Targums are free translations from Hebrew into Chaldee—Chaldee paraphrases, as they are styled. Onkelos is closer to a literal translation than the others.

den to marry a woman in addition to her own sister; *i. e.*, to have at one and the same time two sisters as his wives. The idiomatic interpretation, following the other thirty-four cases, is that a man is forbidden to marry one woman in addition to another; *i. e.*, the passage forbids bigamy.

In favor of the literal, and against the idiomatic interpretation, Prof. Bush alleges: 1. In every *other* of the ten instances the things to be added to each other are inanimate objects. 2. In all the nine cases, the subject of discourse is first mentioned as curtains, loops, and wings. 3. If we introduce the idiomatic rendering here, the passage will read, Thou shalt not take one to another. Query: One what? If we say *one woman*, we abandon the idiom, and have no right to understand the word *sister* idiomatically. 4. In the other nine cases the phrase has a *reciprocal* import. Things are so and so, *one to another*. But there is nothing of this in the woman and her sister in this verse. It is only taking one object in addition to another. His conclusion, therefore, is, that in this one instance the phrase cannot be taken idiomatically, but as *woman* means literal woman in the passage, so *sister* means literal sister.

It will be seen that the writer is not here stating his own views, but those of learned men, and in a concise way, for the benefit of English scholars as well as Hebraists. That there is force in the arguments of Hodge and Bush, all must admit; and even those who prefer the idiomatic rendering found in the margin of this English version.

IX. If the views just presented be adopted, it may be asked, Why, is there a specification of the brother's wife, and not of the wife's sister? Ans.—1. Because in the Bible the male is almost always made prominent. "*He* that believeth." But surely woman is not to be overlooked. If a man marry his deceased brother's wife, the woman sins too. So of all the other cases. When the man sins, the woman sins. God did not take woman from the foot of man, but from his side. Woman's position is secondary, but it is only secondary. So that our conceptions are precisely scriptural. 2. In those days the wife went to the home of her husband, and would be thrown with his brothers. Ps. xlv.



10. " . . . O daughter . . . forget thine own people and thy father's house." The husband would not be apt to meet his wife's sisters in the domestic circle. In our day and country all this is changed.

X. Is Lev. xviii. 18 intended to show that a wife's sister is an exception to the general law? This is the only foothold left to the advocates of a repeal of the article in our Confession. The weight of the foregoing arguments, derived from more than one source, seems to the writer irresistible, unless it can be made out that this verse indicates an exception to the rule. Against which it may be urged that,

(1) An exception here ought to be very plainly expressed. It ought to be as explicit and as unmistakable as the provision that if a man died childless, his brother should marry his widow and raise up seed unto his deceased brother. This is a manifest exception, and its purpose was manifest, viz., to keep the inheritance of real estate to the proper descent. In all such cases of general law an interpretation sustaining an exception ought to be the *only* fair and reasonable interpretation. Otherwise laws most salutary, and even necessary, might be frittered away by alleged exceptions. This is so plain that we surely need not dwell upon it. If there is any other fair and just understanding of this passage—this *single* passage, mark it, nowhere repeated—that will keep it in harmony with the body of the law, every jurist would say that it must be preferred. This is common sense applied to law. If there be offered an interpretation of this one clause, which throws obscurity upon all the rest of the law, and tends to overthrow the reason of many of the specifications of the law, and indeed the reason of the law as a whole, that interpretation must be rejected.

(2) Now is it thus *plain* that an exception is intended in Lev. xviii. 18? If so, the great majority of readers and interpreters in the Christian Church would have adopted that view. There is nothing in unrenewed human nature to keep men from adopting it; on the contrary, unrenewed human nature is in great danger of so doing. A man thrown into intimate domestic relations with his deceased wife's sister at and after his wife's death, sharing

with her the tenderness of a common grief, observing her sweetness of behavior toward his children, and for some time debarred from the society of other women, is in imminent peril of interpreting Scripture to suit his tastes and wishes.

Is, then—we repeat it—the exception so plain as to command the assent of the great mass of the Christian Church? Has there been a general agreement in the Church of the past nineteen centuries in favor of the intermarriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister? So far from it, the fact is notoriously the contrary. "In the whole extent of the Greek and Russian Church, and all the bodies which in the whole East bear the name of Christ, even those involved in heresy, these marriages with a wife's sister are wholly unknown and abhorred as incest, as in the time of St. Basil, and those before him. Whatever may be the decay in practice, the mind of the three great portions of the Church [Romish, Greek, and Anglican] is in accordance with that of the Apostles, as attested by the universal practice of the whole Church, wherever she was planted in all lands, and which, until a late unhappy period, remained unimpaired." (THE LAW OF MARRIAGE, by Pusey, Palmer, and Badeley.) "The first precedent in favor of the infringement of what, up that time, had been by the deliberate judgment of the Church, century after century, accounted the law of God, took place through the judgment of a man stained with almost every crime by which human nature has been disgraced, [Pope Alexander VI., the infamous Borgia, father of Cæsar Borgia,] and that to conciliate the favor of princes." This dispensation was given to Emmanuel, King of Portugal, in 1500 A. D. A bad paternity, surely, for a Presbyterian law. Alexander Borgia! And he not daring to deny that God's law forbade the marriage, but avowedly dispensing with that law.

Some of our readers may like to have individual facts. Let us begin, then, with the Apostolic Canons, not indeed enacted by the Apostles, but eighty-five ecclesiastical rules or laws describing the customs and institutions of Christians, particularly of the Greek and Oriental churches in the second and third centuries. It is an Ante-Nicene collection. In Canon 19, one who had married a wife's sister or a niece was forever excluded from the clergy.

Next we give the testimony of St. Basil, Archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (329–379), one of the most eloquent and godly of the Greek fathers, and of nearly as great influence in the Greek Church as St. Augustine wielded in the Latin. St. Basil wrote a letter to one Diodorus (Epis. 160, *ad Diodor.*), who, says Basil, “having been asked by some one whether, his wife being dead, he might marry her sister, shuddered not (*ἐφρίξε*) at the question, but meekly endured to hear of it, and in a truly noble way [irony of course] defended and abetted this impure (*ἀσελγής*) desire.” He speaks of “the practice established among us having the power of a law, and these laws (*θεσμοίς*—*instituta*) have been delivered down to us by holy men. . . . The practice has been, if any one at any time, overcome by an unclean passion, falls off into a lawless union with two sisters, that this be not accounted marriage, nor that they be received at all into the congregation of the Church before they be parted from one another. . . . I pray that either our exhortation may prove stronger than passion, or that this incest spread not into our diocese, but may be confined to the place where it was ventured upon” (*ἐτολμήθη*).

It will be borne in mind that the point here is not whether St. Basil's indignation was or was not well founded; but what was the well-nigh unanimous judgment of the Church in the earliest centuries, and whether they thought Lev. xviii. 18 was meant to introduce an exception to the general law of incest. The Council of Eliberis “annexes the same penalty to this marriage as to an aggravated case of repeated fornication, or of once falling into adultery, to be kept from communion for five years.”

When the Emperors of Rome became Christian they conformed the laws of the realm to those of the Bible and the Church. Thus a law of Constantius and Constans, A. D. 355, reads: “Although the ancients (*i. e.* the old Romans) thought it lawful, when the marriage of the brother was dissolved, to marry the brother's wife; and also after the woman's death or divorce, to contract marriage with her sister, let all abstain from marriages of this sort, nor think that legitimate children can be born of this union; for it is agreed that the children are spurious.” The

penalty, as perhaps all would hold at the present day, was extremely severe; most persons would regard it as not warranted by the offence. But the promulgation of the law to heathen, Jew, and Christian subjects alike proves our point for the fourth century.

Marriage with a wife's sister was forbidden by the Council of Epaon (A. D. 517, Can. 30); of Clermont i. (A. D. 535, Can. 12); quoted in the second Council of Tours (A. D. 567, Can. 21); and forbidden by the third Council of Orleans (A. D. 538, Can. 10).

The seventh general Council, composed chiefly of Oriental Bishops, and numbering over 200, was held in Constantinople in A. D. 692 in a hall in the imperial palace, called Trullus. Hence it is called "the Council in Trullo." This Council solemnly acknowledged and reënacted the discipline of the Canons of St. Basil. But the 68th Canon of St. Basil appointed for marrying two sisters successively the same penance as had been appointed for bigamists, that is, a penance of seven years' excommunication after the separation of the parties. This continues to be the Canon law of the whole Eastern Church to the present day, without change or modification.

John de Turrecremata, an eminent theologian and canonist, was in the confidence of Pope Eugenius, who (cir. A. D. 1431) referred to him for decision the application of the Dauphin (afterward king) of France, to be allowed to marry his deceased wife's sister. The decision was that the Pope himself could not dispense in such a case—*quod non poterat Papa dispensare.* That the marriage was prohibited by the Levitical law, or that the Levitical law was still binding on the Church, does not appear to have come into question.

Four old mnemonic lines sum up the prohibited degrees—

Nata, soror, neptis, matertera, fratris et uxor,  
Et patruī conjunx, mater, privigna, noverca,  
Uxorisque soror, privigni nata, nurusque,  
Atque soror patris, conjungi lege vetantur.

Daughter, sister, granddaughter, mother's sister, and brother's wife,  
And father's brother's wife, mother, step-daughter, step-mother,  
And wife's sister, step-son's daughter, and daughter-in-law,  
And father's sister are forbidden by law to be married.

This is from one of the volumes of the *Decreta*. (See Poole's synopsis also.)

So that when that monster of iniquity, Alexander VI., wished to allow the King of Portugal to marry his deceased wife's sister, he boldly took the ground, not that it was not a forbidden degree—he was not audacious enough for that—but that as Pope he had the right to dispense with the law of God. It had been taught by Thomas Aquinas and others that the Pope could not dispense with divine law. If Alexander VI. could have decided, or gotten a number of canonists to decide, that marriage with a wife's sister was not forbidden by the divine law, it would have suited his purpose exactly. But he was far too shrewd to take such a position. (The same saintly Father (Papa) gave a dispensation to Ferdinand II., King of Sicily, to marry his aunt. It has been said in palliation of this that she was “half-blood,” *i. e.* half-sister to one of his parents. A sorry defence !)

Julius II., “who obtained the pontificate by fraud and bribery . . . and possessed, besides other vices, very great ferocity, arrogance, vanity, and a mad desire for war,” gave Henry VIII. of England a dispensation to marry the widow of his brother Arthur. A plain setting aside of God's law, admittedly so, but no more intended to be a denial of the divine law than the previous dispensation of Alexander VI. had been. Julius was probably emboldened by Alexander, of whom he was the almost immediate successor, the intervening Pope having lived in office only twenty-six days.

More might be said, but it is sufficiently manifest that the Greek Church, the Romish Church, and the Anglican Church have always forbidden this marriage as incestuous.

And now in addition to all these bodies, may we not especially cite the Westminster Assembly of Divines, those wonderfully sound theologians, so deeply read in divinity and Church history, whom, as the years roll on, we admire more and more? There is Selden, the profound orientalist, and Lightfoot and Coleman are little behind him. This learned and judicious and painstaking Assembly in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey did not regard Lev. xviii. 18 as an exception to the law. They

have laid down the only principle that can be consistently carried out. "The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own." Niemeyer appends our Confession of Faith, and the Larger and the Shorter Catechisms to the Continental symbols, as the Symbolical Books of the Puritans. That European scholars unacquainted with English may read them, he gives the Latin as in most of the other Confessions. "Non licet viro e cognatione uxoris suæ ducere, quam si æque seipsum attingeret sanguine, ducere non liceret; sic uti nec fœminæ licet viro nubere a mariti sui sanguine minus, quam a suo liceret, alieno." Is it credible that any Presbyterian body can be found willing to mutilate this noble testimony? And above all, one that claims to be, and I trust *is*, a testifying Church? This great principle of LAW that has undergone the scrutiny and received the endorsement of church fathers, of councils, of canons, of schoolmen, of the Greek Church, the Romish Church, the Anglican Church, and the Presbyterian and the Independent branches of the Puritan Churches?

Above all, is it credible that the Southern Presbyterian Church in the United States, a body hitherto so conservative, so zealous for maintaining the old landmarks, so proud of its orthodoxy of the genuine Westminster type, should take the lead in this unhappy business? Dear brethren of our beloved Church, before this wretched blunder is perpetrated, forgive an uninfluential minister of her communion if he cries out against the step. Alas! we have *boasted* of our orthodoxy. The writer has quoted but too often the vehement assertion of a learned theologian of the Northern Presbyterian Church, "The hope of sound Calvinism on this continent is in the Southern Presbyterian Church." Pride comes before a fall. If the mutilation is effected, let our Assembly send on to Dr. Niemeyer, or the present editor of his *Collectio Confessionum*, or else to Dr. Schaff, for insertion in the 3d Vol. of his *Creeeds of Christendom*, a certified minute in English and Latin, that the above clause, after standing for two centuries and a third, has been abrogated by a sect hitherto noted for its conservatism and orthodoxy, the Southern Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Woe is me if this day should come.

XI. Has there, or has there not, been dissent from this Church doctrine in former ages?

Dr. Pusey says, in his evidence before the Queen's Commissioners: "There was no doubt whether the degrees were forbidden; the only question was, whether the authority of the Church replaced the Levitical law, or whether it was binding as being moral." Thus he goes on to explain that Scotus (A. D. 1301) regards all prohibitions except that of the direct ascending and descending line, parent, child, grandchild, etc., to be no part of the law of nature, but of the Church only; he teaches that Christ did not go beyond this law of nature. "In the evangetic law," says Duns Scotus, "there is not found any prohibition by Christ beyond the prohibition of the law of nature; nor did he explicitly confirm the prohibition made hereon in the Mosaic law; but the Church made persons unlawful, at one time in a remoter degree, afterwards in the fourth. . . . Of *all* affinity, there is no reason, except the statutes of the Church, making connexions unlawful." Duns Scotus was not without followers, but the great body of the authorities is against him. Observe: he did not deny that Lev. xviii. and xx. forbade marriage with a deceased wife's sister, but that the Levitical law was binding on Christians—which has been answered some pages back.

XII. Did not the Romish Church (and the Greek) prohibit many degrees not prohibited in the Bible?

Answer: Unquestionably. But they distinguished between what was forbidden by the divine law and what was forbidden by the Church's sole authority. Thus the followers of Thomas Aquinas divided the prohibited degrees into three classes, viz., those prohibited, 1. By the law of nature, as parents and children. 2. By the divine law, as in Lev. xviii. 3. By the canon law of the Church. The schoolmen and canonists said that the Pope could dispense in the third class with the laws of the Church, but not in the two first, "because it would be to dispense with a law not his own, but another's, who expressly forbids it." This point could be abundantly substantiated, but it will suffice to give the canon of the Council of Trent, which may be found in Streitwolf's Collections, Vol. I., p. 90, or in Schaff's second volume

Creeds of Christendom: "Si quis dixerit eos tantum consanguinitatis et affinitatis gradus qui (in) Levitico exprimuntur posse impedire matrimonium contrahendum, et dirimere contractum; nec posse ecclesiam in nonnullis illorum dispensare, aut constituere ut plures impediunt, et dirimant, anathema sit." "If any man shall have said that those degrees only of consanguinity or affinity which are expressed in Leviticus, can hinder from contracting a marriage, or dissolve it when contracted, and that the Church cannot dispense in some of them, or ordain that more (degrees) shall hinder or dissolve, let him be anathema." This translation is almost identical with Dr. Schaff's, being a trifle closer to the Latin. Thus he renders "*plures*" *others*, which is perhaps smoother English than *more* (degrees). We prefer the more literal here. In this canon the Council of Trent emphasises the distinction between the scriptural and the ecclesiastical degrees, and affirms the right of the Church to add to the scriptural prohibitions, and a right to annul even *some* of them.

This was in Session xxiv., Nov. 11, 1563, sixty years after Alexander de Borgia had given a dispensation to Emmanuel to marry another daughter of King Ferdinand. The Romish Church has never pretended that the prohibition of marriage with a wife's sister was a mere ecclesiastical law. It forbade first cousins, second, third, possibly fourth cousins to marry. But St. Augustine distinctly maintains that the prohibition in the case of first cousins even, is non-Levitical. And so others taught. So ill-informed is the assertion that the prohibitions of our Confession were a mere matter of canon law.

One hardly knows which to be most astounded at, the infinite daring of the Council of Trent, or its infinite shrewdness and tact. It dares to claim the right to dispense with God's laws, but only with *some*. Pray, which ones are dispensable, most excellent prelates œcumenical? Did you mean to shield Julius in his allowing Henry VIII. to marry his brother's widow? Or Borgia, in allowing the king of Portugal to marry his wife's sister? Dr. Pusey thinks the former, because there had recently been a quarrel over the Henry VIII. case. Who can tell what that *nonnullis* (some) means?



It is remarkable, however, that after affirming under anathema the Church's power of dispensation, it insists on the necessity of using this power very rarely even in the second degree. "Let a dispensation never be granted in the second degree, except between great princes and for a public cause." *A fortiori*, then, the Council discouraged (if it did anything) a dispensation to marry the sister of a deceased wife, which is an affinity of the first degree. "Fagnan, 'the most esteemed of the Italian canonists,' regards these marriages as absolutely prohibited by the Council of Trent." He says that this is evidently implied by the Council's decrees, as just stated. In fact, only seven such dispensations were given in more than a century; in one of these the first wife fell dead on leaving the church; in two others the dispensation was given after the marriage of the parties to prevent trouble. In others still, something else was the matter, and so the practice which Basil shrank from with horror, gradually slid into use.

XIII. How are we to account for the special prohibition of marriage to a wife's sister during her life-time? Does that not imply that such a marriage would be permissible after the death of the first wife?

Answer: 1. An English bishop has wisely said, "The silence of Scripture is inspired." To which it may be added, the silence is often as hard to interpret as the speech. The passage nowhere says that after the first wife's death it is lawful to marry her sister. In such a case the devout student of Holy Scripture ought to have had a plain affirmation, and not a dubious implication. Details, too, are frequently difficult of interpretation when the general principles involved are abundantly clear. This is true of parables; and in the interpretation of a parable how absurd it would be to insist on understanding some minor specification in a way which would run counter to, or even overthrow the manifest intent of the passage as a whole? A truly dangerous method! So in the interpretation of a law. For instance: in the tenth commandment the wife is introduced, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife. In the fourth she is omitted, Thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, etc. It will be remembered by all

Hebraists that the Hebrew verb has both a masculine and a feminine form; also the pronoun thou (אַתָּה) is masculine. Both the verb and the pronoun are masculine in this fourth commandment. Now it might be asked, Why is the word *wife* included in the specifications of the tenth and omitted in those of the fourth? Particularly when daughter and maid-servant *are* mentioned? Imagine a man's seriously requiring his wife to work all day Sunday on the strength of this omission! And demanding of her a satisfactory reason why the wife's name was omitted in the fourth commandment before he shall excuse her from toil on that day!

Whether we can or cannot explain the prohibition of marriage to a wife's sister during her life-time to our own or other people's satisfaction, is a secondary question. Surely *no explanation can be right* that brings this clause into flat contradiction to other requirements of the law. One reason for the specification may have been the fact, recorded in Genesis, that Jacob had married two sisters. If you will marry two wives, do not take sisters. Again, the temptation to marry a wife's sister, while not so common in the Oriental family circle as in ours of the present day in Europe and America, was more frequent than that of marrying entirely outside of the family. Jealousies, strifes, animosities before as well as after the new alliance, were likely to spring up, and the purity of domestic intercourse to be endangered. Therefore never marry your wife's sister at all, under any circumstances; *least of all*, during her life-time, to vex her, to uncover her sister's nakedness beside her.

(2) An illustration may set this in a clearer light. The writer once heard it said, in a debate on secret societies, that the Free Masons bound their members never to violate the person of a Free Mason's wife or sister. The inference drawn, or strongly hinted at, was that this fraternity did not disapprove of unchastity toward the wives of other men, not Masons. Now, whether the premise were true or not, does not matter. As an inference, it was most unjust and most illogical. Any of the ordinary Masonic manuals for sale in the bookstores would correct the mistake. What would St. John the Baptist and St. John the Evangelist,

their two patron saints, say to such a charge? That it is simply preposterous. "Every well governed lodge is *furnished* with the *Holy Bible*, the *square*, and the *compass*; the *Bible* points out the path that leads to happiness, and is dedicated to *God*; the *square* teaches us to regulate our conduct by the principles of morality and virtue, and is dedicated to the *Master*; the *compass* teaches us to limit our desires in every station, and is dedicated to the *craft*." (Webb's "Free Mason's Monitor.") This is set forth in the very first degree. In the charge at initiation into this first degree, the Entered Apprentice is directed to esteem God as the chief good, and to follow the golden rule in dealing with his neighbor. "The all-seeing eye of God . . . pervades the inmost recesses of the human heart;" which might have been said by good old Bishop Ken. In a word, numberless teachings by word and by symbol, confute the charge of any connivance at lewdness. But since fellow Masons are required to nurse sick members, and to sit up with them at all hours of the night, if Masonry *does not*, Masonry *ought* to throw around the wives and daughters of the brotherhood a sacredness similar to that with which our Creator has girded about the family circle. So that its teaching would be like this: Be pure to all; but especially be on your guard, on your honor, on your conscience, toward those to whom your relations may be most intimate and confidential. I am informed that the Odd Fellows have a similar injunction. This is as it should be.

(3) As we have largely shown, the deliberate judgment of the immense majority of students of the Bible in all the leading communions has, until perhaps these last days, uniformly been that Leviticus included marriage with a wife's sister in the prohibited degrees. Even the handful of Scotists held this, while they denied that the Levitical law was binding on Christians. Only an unwarranted inference makes it an exceptional case. Prof. Bush pronounces it "a gross *non sequitur*. The expression 'in her lifetime' is too slight to be allowed to vacate the force of all the considerations which we have before adduced in proof of the *implied prohibitions* contained in the preceding verses." Dr. Hodge says "the inference . . . is very precarious." Then let us hold fast to the steadfast faith of the Church against all precarious novelties.

(4) Prof. Bush says that "the whole law concerning incest closes with the 17th verse. The prohibition in the 18th respects altogether another subject, and is as distinct from incest as any of the other crimes mentioned and forbidden in the remaining parts of the chapter. It might indeed appear from the use of the word 'neither' at the commencement of the verse that it was intimately connected with the foregoing. But this rendering is not borne out by the original. It is the simple particle - *and* which we find in the Hebrew text, and is precisely the same word which, in the three subsequent verses, is translated respectively 'also,' 'moreover,' and 'and,' and the usual paragraph distinction might very properly have been introduced here." (Every chapter of Leviticus but two begins with "*and*." The 7th with "*likewise*," which also is  $\gamma$ , *and*, in the Hebrew.) So, too, Dr. Hodge: "All that the passage teaches is that if a man chooses to have two wives at the same time, which the law allowed, they must not be sisters; and the reason assigned is, that it would bring the sisters into a false relation to each other. This leaves the question of the propriety of marrying the sister of a deceased wife just where it was. This verse has no direct bearing on that subject."

XIV. It was intimated near the beginning of this article that the writer would discuss the second general interpretation of Lev. xviii. 18, which construes it as a direct prohibition of polygamy. We have been so fortunate as to find in the Landis Library a copy of S. E. Dwight's now rare little volume, "The Hebrew Wife." Prof. Bush styles him *Rev. S. E. D.*, but he subscribes himself at the end of his preface, "A Lawyer." An able one he must have been, for he advocates the cause of Old Testament monogamy with great power. In fact, at times he seems almost unanswerable. Then, too, he is supported by Turretine, briefly indeed, but very decidedly.<sup>1</sup> But this article has

---

<sup>1</sup> The following is the translation in Junius and Tremellius' noted Latin Bible, referred to by several writers: "Item mulierem *unam* ad alteram ne assumito: angustia affecturus hanc, retegendo turpitudinem illius *ductae* super hanc in viti ipsius." (Hanover, A. D. 1624. Likewise, do not take one woman to another, to affect her with anguish by uncovering the nakedness of the former brought upon the latter in her life.

spun out to such a length—notwithstanding the omission of much matter which we would fain have introduced—that we cannot enter into the discussion now. We merely state that at present we incline to our long held opinion, that polygamy was tolerated by the Almighty in Old Testament times; but it must be admitted that there is much force in the argument adduced for the contrary opinion. “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s *wife* ;” singular number. This seems to have been overlooked by Dwight; it is not at all favorable to polygamy.

But as to our present discussion, suppose that polygamy *was* forbidden by the Old Testament throughout, and that Lev. xviii. 18 means, Thou shalt not have two wives at the same time. Then the inference, against which we have been contending, utterly falls to the ground. The sacred writer is not treating of a wife’s *sister* at all. “One woman (or wife) to another ;” not “a wife to her sister.” If this was what Moses intended, the inference vanishes in the air.

XV. A respected brother told us not long ago that he was once travelling in a private conveyance with Dr. Nathan L. Rice, and they discussed this question by the way. Dr. Rice warmly maintained the view advocated in this article. At last his companion said to him : “We are going to dine to-day with a Presbyterian elder, who has married his deceased wife’s sister. Now would you go to his house and accept his hospitality if he had married his own sister? And Dr. Rice was silent!” Dr. Rice surely needed not to be silent. There are *degrees* of impropriety in human actions. No one would like to go and dine on social terms with a man just out of the penitentiary, where he had been confined for a term of years for grand larceny, embezzlement, or burglary. But if we are never to dine with a man who has ever driven a sharp bargain, or asked or received more for a piece of property than he conscientiously thought it was worth, or pleaded usurious interest on a note, or bought property, real, personal, or mixed, for less than he believed to be its value, or taken all the law allowed him, when it allowed more than was just, our dining list will have to be curtailed. And if we are never to dine with any man who daily sins against God, we shall never

dine out at all, and nobody can ever dine with us. But does any one propose, therefore, that we shall obliterate the answer to Q. 142 in the Larger Catechism, "What sins are forbidden in the eighth commandment?"

We should not judge harshly of laymen who have not thoroughly examined the subject, and who are told, alas! it may be by authorised teachers of the word, that the Scriptures do not forbid this kind of union.<sup>1</sup> All such persons, too, may take what comfort they can get out of the well known fact that the Talmudic party, far the most numerous sect or school of the Jews, allow this marriage. Yet the strict constructionists, the Karaites, forbid it. The Talmud is the body of Jewish tradition (the Mishna), and the commentaries thereon (the Gemaras). Our Saviour said: "Full well do ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. Laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men." This very mass of tradition was in existence and in high esteem among the Pharisees in our Saviour's time, though the Mishna was not formally completed by Rabbi Jehuda until toward the close of the second century. If this gives any aid and comfort to the opposers of almost the whole Christian Church, let them have it. Another lamentable encouragement has been found in the civil laws. We live in the day and (we blush to say it!) *the land* of divorces. Whom God hath joined together man now puts asunder. The same general laxity might be reasonably looked for in the civil law of incest. It is notorious that such laxity does exist in the laws of our States; and this will, though it should not, affect the judgments and the conduct of Christian people. Let all these circumstances mitigate our condemnation as much as they ought; but let them not determine our organic law.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For instance, from the Synopsis Criticorum Sacrorum: Fagius says: "The sense, therefore, is, do not take any woman for a wife together with her sister to afflict her by lying with her sister, she, the sister of (thy) wife, being present or alive; for the sister of a dead wife it was lawful to marry. As if he had said, Do not take two sisters at the same time (*simul*) for wives. The wife being dead, however, you will be able to take her sister." Vatablus agrees with this.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the following incident may throw some additional light on

XVII. To remove this passage from our Confession will be to open a flood-gate that we may never be able to close. The first step is to license intermarriage with a wife's sister; the next, intermarriage with a niece. Why not? It is so often said that a wife's sister is the very woman to put as a step-mother over one's motherless children. Now the same argument has been actually employed to recommend marriage with one's niece. Who will be kinder to a sister's defenceless child than her dear uncle? Marriages of this sort, it is stated, are very common in some parts of Germany. Ah! whither do we tend?

Is it the special *rôle* of the Southern Presbyterian Church to open this gate? Is this our mission? Have we "come to the kingdom" for such miserable work as this? In the years before the war the orthodox men of the North felt that they could always trust in the genuine Presbyterianism of the Old School Presbyteries and Synods of the South, while the advocates of a modified Calvinism stigmatised us as "the most straitest sect" of Augustinians. Out of the bosom of our Church sprang such theologians as John H. Rice, Baxter, and Speece, Nathan

this part of the subject: In 1836 Dr. Wm. B. Sprague visited Berlin and saw a good deal of Neander. In the course of the conversation Neander said he had no doubt that the King of Germany was a truly pious man. "I expressed some astonishment at that, from having seen it stated in a French newspaper that I had taken up, that he attended the theatre on the Sabbath. 'But,' says Neander, 'I suppose you know that the same views of the Sabbath are not entertained in Germany as in England and America. I do not entertain the same myself.' I replied that I was aware of that; but that I did not suppose that those who professed to be evangelical Christians would attend the theatre on the Sabbath. To which he replied, "I would not go to the theatre any day of the week; but there is nothing that I would do at any time, that I would not do on Sunday, if convenience required it.'" So far, Dr. Sprague. Now we all admire the great Church historian, Neander, so learned, so philosophical, so humble, so generous. But are we ready to expunge from our Confession what it says concerning the Christian Sabbath? Yet the Lutheran, and most of the Reformed Churches of the Continent of Europe, are a much better paternity for a church doctrine or usage than Alexander Borgia; and their arguments, though wholly unsatisfactory to us on the Sabbath question, are weighty when compared with any we have seen adduced for marriage with a wife's sister.

L. Rice, Breckinridge, and Thornwell, with other good men and true. Help, Lord, for the godly man ceaseth; the faithful fail from among the children of men. Our Southern Church has been a separate organisation for less than twenty-five years. Can we not stand alone for one-quarter of a century, and without tinkering at the Confession of Faith? Grand old symbol! May some humble members of our communion be gathered to their fathers in peace ere thy hallowed doctrines are set aside by her sons! And may a communicant of full forty years standing, to whom the honor of his Church is very dear, be pardoned, if what was begun as a brief, has expanded into argument, or warmed into expostulation.

The subject might be discussed to much greater length if need were; and it would give the writer pleasure to quote largely from the able argument of Edward Badelay, Esq., in the case of *The Queen vs. St. Giles-in-the-Fields*, in the Court of Queen's Bench, June 15th, 1847. The following points and facts may interest readers of this article. Long before the Canon Law found its way into England the marriage under discussion was positively prohibited, as by a Canon of King Ethelred, "a Statute or a Canon among the laws of Canute," by a canon submitted to (and accepted by) his English clergy, by Egbert, Archbishop of York, by the Council of Oenham A. D. 1099, by the Council of London in the time of Lanfranc and William the Conqueror, by a Council at Westminster in the time of Henry I., by the Constitutions of Salisbury, in the time of Archbishop Stephen Langton, by the Constitutions of Richard, Bishop of Durham, and by the Constitutions of the time of Henry III.

In fact, the writer of this article does not happen to know of any Council of the Christian Church, on any continent, or in any age, that has ever upheld marriage with a deceased wife's sister. If the General Assembly of our Church should uphold this marriage, it will be, of all Church Councils, œcumenical or provincial, orthodox or heretical, the first to do so, to the confusion and sorrow of some that greatly love that honored branch of the Church universal. It is true that scattered individuals have maintained the lawfulness of the union; but look at some names on



the other side, such as John de Burgh, Professor of Theology, and Chancellor of the University of Cambridge; Bishop Jewell, most fully and argumentatively; David Paræus, the distinguished Professor at Heidelberg; Lord Coke, and other eminent Judges; the profound Hebraist and Orientalist, Dr. John Gill, and the learned Dr. Hammond; High-church Pusey and Presbyterian Bonar; besides the great scholars of the Westminster Assembly—that Assembly, too, agreeing with all other Councils of ancient and modern times, so far as we know. Such things “must give us pause.”

L. G. BARBOUR.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE SABBATH.<sup>1</sup>

#### I. THE ORIGINAL INSTITUTION OF THE SABBATH LAW.

“Thus the heavens and the earth were finished and all the host of them. 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. 1–3.<sup>2</sup> Here are three facts with their logical and moral connexion:

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was the basis of a sermon preached before Fayetteville Presbytery by the Rev. K. M. McIntyre, and is published at its request.

[EDS. S. P. REVIEW.]

<sup>2</sup> The textual theme of this passage is the seventh day. As a sermon develops the truth contained in a particular passage of Scripture, giving the sense and causing the people to understand it, therefore what now devolves upon the preacher, in reference to this passage of Scripture, is to cause the people to understand what it is that God says, in this passage, concerning the seventh day.

What is said of the creation is by way of introducing the subject of the seventh day, and of indicating the connexion of the seventh day with the fact of the creation.

One thing that is said is that “God blessed the seventh day and sancti-

First fact: God finished the work of creation in six days.

Second fact: God rested the seventh day.

Third fact: God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it as a day of rest for man.

fied it." The development of the truth contained in this statement would develop:

I. The original institution of the Sabbath law.

Another thing that is said is that "God *rested* the seventh day . . . and blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, *because* that in it he had *rested*." The development of the truth contained in this statement would develop:

II. The nature of the rest required by the Sabbath law. For the statement is to the effect that the sanctifying of the seventh day was a setting of it apart unto *rest*, and *the rest* of which God's was the example and standard.

Another thing that is said is that "Thus *the heavens* and *the earth* were *finished* . . . and on the seventh day God . . . rested, and blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested." The development of the truth contained in this statement would develop these two points: First—

III. The perpetuity of the Sabbath law.

For one point in the significance of the connexion of the Sabbath law with the fact of the creation is, that since the Sabbath law and the fact of the creation are logically and morally connected, and since the fact of the creation is a permanent factor in man's religion, therefore the Sabbath law is a permanent institution.

The development of this statement would develop, second—

IV. The place of the Sabbath law in God's moral government.

For in the same way in which the seventh day, as first instituted, is connected with the fact of the creation, the first day, as now sacred instead of the seventh, is connected with the fact of the redemption. And the change, in reference to redemption, is suggested (O. T. Scriptures, germinal) by the fact that what was to God the seventh day was to man the first day, thus pointing to another work to be done by God and man united, the significance of which work was also to be included in the sacred day, which day, in order to show that it includes the significance of this united work, is changed to the first day of the week. But these two facts—the creation and the redemption—determine man's religion, and since the Sabbath sums up the religion of both these facts together, therefore the Sabbath law sums up man's religion (this is the place of the Sabbath law in God's moral government), and the rejection of the Sabbath is atheism. Then it only remains to enforce upon the conscience—

V. The sacredness of the Sabbath obligation.

Logical and moral connexion of these facts: *Because* God finished the work of creation in six days, *therefore* he rested the seventh day.

*Because* God finished the work of creation in six days and therefore rested the seventh, *therefore* God blessed the seventh day as a day of analogous rest for man.

Illustrative proof of this connexion of these facts: Let it be admitted that God's rest of the seventh day consisted in his complacent recognition of his own moral excellence manifested in his work of creation. Then, since the principle of moral rectitude requires this recognition, therefore God's rest, this recognition is a logical and moral necessity. That is, moral rectitude would not have been complete in God without this recognition. Hence, *because* God finished the work of creation in six days, *therefore* he rested the seventh—occupied himself the seventh in the complacent recognition of it. And since the principle of moral rectitude in God is the standard of moral rectitude for man, therefore the observance of this rest is a logical and moral necessity for man. Hence, *because* God finished the work of creation in six and rested the seventh, *therefore* God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it as a day of analogous rest for man.

This sanctifying and setting apart, at the creation by the Creator, of the seventh day, as a day sacred to God, and a blessing to man, is a distinct divine enactment and divine announcement of a divine law for man, binding him, as man, religiously to observe it as a day of religious rest, after the example of God. The Sabbath, therefore, is a divine institution and is distinguished as the first institution that God gave to man, and man's first day on earth was spent in observance of it.

It is significant in this connexion that, reckoning from the beginning of the creation, this consecrated day was to God the seventh day of the week, yet reckoning from the beginning of man's existence in the world, it was to man most naturally the first day of the week. In this double reckoning, the one pointing to the seventh day as the Sabbath, the other suggesting the first day of the week as the Sabbath—in this we may see, in the original institution of this ordinance, a kind of foreshadowing of

another and greater work than that of the creation, in recognition of which God and man shall unite in fixing the first day of the week as the day of religious rest in honor of both works. This greater work of God, in union with man, has been finished, and, in recognition of it also as very good, the day of holy rest has been changed, and, by the example of the apostles, fixed on the first day of the week. So that as in the original institution of it, the Sabbath, as a religious ordinance, had its special significance in reference to the work of creation, so in the change of the day, from the seventh to the first day of the week, it has its special significance in reference to the work of redemption. Thus the Sabbath law has its origin in relation to the two great facts which determine man's religion, viz., the creation and the redemption.<sup>1</sup> Whoever can see the true origin of the Sabbath law, and the true religious significance implied in the observance of it, cannot fail to feel the obligation to observe it to be preëminently sacred—to observe it, not as a condition of life, but as a manifestation of life in union and communion with God.

## II. THE NATURE OF THE REST REQUIRED BY THE SABBATH LAW.

God rested on the seventh day, therefore it is appointed to be a day of like rest for man. What God did on the seventh day is the reason for what man is required to do; is the example and standard of what man is required to do. The nature of God's rest of the seventh day, then, determines the nature of man's rest. God's rest of the seventh day includes or consists of two elements, a negative and an active: the negative consisting of his ceasing from the work of creation on the seventh day; and the active con-

---

<sup>1</sup> We say in reference to the redemption, as well as to the creation, for man cannot be properly said to have entered upon his career and destiny until these four facts have occurred: 1st, The creation, with which the Sabbath is originally connected. 2d, The covenant, with which marriage was originally connected. 3d, The fall, an outcome of the covenant. 4th, The redemption, (or the appointment of Christ to the federal headship of the covenant,) the outcome of the covenant after the fall. These four facts resolve themselves into two, properly: the creation and the covenant. But since the redemption is the final outcome of the covenant, we generally speak of what is involved in the covenant fact as the redemption.

sisting of his complacent recognition of his own glory manifested in his work.

As to the active element of God's rest of the seventh day, it is evident that it was not an entire ceasing of all exercise of his divine energies and attributes. Such an absolute repose, in total inactivity, is as foreign to the scripture idea of rest as the opposite idea of laborious work, which taxes the utmost energies to absolute exhaustion. A mere inactive repose is at best a mere negative state. But the eternal and perpetual blessedness of God is positive, consisting in the exercise of the divine powers in a way constituting divine holiness and divine blessedness. The key to the nature of this divine exercise, which constituted the active element of God's rest of the seventh day, is furnished by the significant refrain that closes up each successive work of the six days—"and God saw that it was good." Finally, "and God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was *very good*." The idea is, that there was an interval between each successive day's work, in which interval God recognised his work of that day as good. And the rest of the seventh day was in recognition of the whole as very good. This was the exercise which constituted the active element of God's rest of the seventh day, viz., looking upon, contemplating his work of creation, and recognising therein, with complacency and delight, the manifestations of his own infinite excellency.

God's rest of the seventh day, therefore, was a particular kind of employment. It is his delight in his own moral excellence, and in the manifestations thereof, that completes our idea of the divine holiness, and at the same time constitutes our idea of the divine blessedness. This state of holy blessedness is the scripture idea of a state of rest—that is, of religious rest, as distinguished from the rest of which we sometimes speak, which has for its object the recuperation of exhausted powers. God's rest of the seventh day, therefore, was not a mere inactive repose, but a particular kind of employment, in which he was divinely holy and divinely blessed. So the rest which the Sabbath law requires of us is not a mere inactive repose, throwing away the sacred hours in mere indolence, indulging in late hours on Sabbath

morning, and in lazy drowsiness in the afternoon. Instead of this, the rest which the Sabbath law requires of us is a particular kind of employment. It provides for the free and unrestrained exercise of our religious nature, in sacred seclusion from the cumbering cares and pleasures of the world. "To-day with pleasure Christians meet to pray and read God's word." Reading God's word, meditating upon what he has done for us, in creation and providence, and hearing what he has to say to us in his word and ordinances, and expressing back to him in prayer and hymns of praise what we have to say to God—this is the staple employment of the sacred rest of the holy Sabbath. And whoever will thus observe God's holy Sabbath cannot fail to find in his own experience that the Sabbath is "the best of all the seven." Accordingly the rest of the seventh day has always been held forth to man as a type and pledge of a "Sabbath that ne'er shall end." Not only to man fallen, but before the fall, and before any covenant arrangement was entered into with man, the Sabbath has always been, under all dispensations, God's typical pledge of a higher state of blessedness and well-being than it has ever been the lot of man to experience in this world. It is an earnest and pledge of the summing up of what all the glory and blessedness of all God's works will be at the last. It has thus always been competent for man to sing those significant words:

"This world is not my home."

The setting apart to Adam and Eve of one whole day in seven to be observed by them as a day of sacred rest, doubtless taught them to sing this song and to look forward to a higher state of well-being than that in which they had been created, innocent and upright in the garden of Eden. The very existence of a Sabbath ordinance at all teaches man to look upon this world, with its temporal employments and trials, as a school of training for a higher state. And the fact that God himself should lay the example of our Sabbath rest, teaches us to expect that the essential elements of the blessedness of that higher state should be, in measure, for man, the creature in his own image, the elements which constituted the divine rest of the seventh day.

As the negative element of God's rest of the seventh day consisted in ceasing from his creating work, so the negative element of man's rest consists in ceasing from all worldly employments and amusements, and this not to recover strength from the six days of this world's worldly work. To suppose this would be to suppose that the great object to be realised from the Sabbath is the work of the six days and not the rest of the seventh. That is, that the rest is a means to an end, and not an end in itself. Whereas the Scripture idea is just the reverse of this, viz., that the highest perfection of our well-being is realised in the rest of which the Sabbath is the type and pledge. And during our pupilage in this state of training and discipline for a higher state, the seventh day intervenes as a constant reminder of our higher destiny, and as a constant realisation for us, in foretaste, of the blessedness of that destiny. We thus, every seventh day, gather up, as it were, the fruits—the results—of the six days' training and discipline, until training shall give place to perfection and earnest to fruition. In this view our rest bears some analogy to God's rest, which is given as the reason and example of ours. His rest was not to recover strength from the weariness of the six days work of creation, neither is ours in order to recover from the weariness of the previous six days of worldly work, and so be prepared to apply ourselves to the next six days with renewed strength. The rest is itself the *end reached*. It is a low and degrading view of the Sabbath to represent it as a means of recovering strength to do more work. In this low view it is sometimes stated that we can do more work in the course of a year or a life-time by resting every seventh day. This is stating what is, no doubt, literally true, and the fact shows how deep and thorough is the foundation in our nature for the Sabbath law. But to urge this as a leading reason and motive for observing the Sabbath is simply religious utilitarianism. This law of God's natural providence, whereby we can do more work by resting every seventh day, applies to only one element of the Sabbath rest, viz., the negative—ceasing from worldly employments. This part of the Sabbath rest may be observed to the entire neglect of the active element—the actual engagement in religious

employments. It is this negative element of the rest, which, by itself, may be merely secular, it is this that brings the Sabbath law especially under the jurisdiction of the civil sanction, and this element of the Sabbath rest must needs be respected by the civil authorities in order that the day may be observed as a religious rest by God's people. In this sense the negative element is a means to the religious element. Worldly rest is necessary in order that there may be religious rest. "It is urged that as there is in the United States an entire separation of the Church and State, it is contrary to the genius of our institutions that the observance of any religious ordinances should be enforced by the civil law." One answer to this is, the right of a Christian nation to make religion and not atheism the test act. This is Dr. Hodge's answer. It might be further answered, that it is the peculiarity of the Sabbath law that this law, as the State is concerned with it, is not necessarily a religious law at all. The part of the Sabbath law with which the State is concerned, is not, in itself, a matter of religion. The foundation for it is laid in the natural constitution of God's natural providence. And as every State is concerned for the temporal well-being of its citizens, and frames, or aims at framing, such laws as will secure the greatest happiness of the greatest number, and since ceasing from worldly employment for one whole day in every seven is a necessary conformity to the conditions of God's natural providence, in order to secure this happiness, therefore true worldly wisdom would fix a law requiring citizens to observe this negative rest. Such citizens as decline to observe the Sabbath as a religious ordinance, would be required to observe, and would observe, this negative rest as a matter of prudence. And the religious citizens would add the religious element, ceasing from worldly employments, as a religious duty, and in order to engage in religious employments. Thus both classes of citizens, the religious and the irreligious, would cease from worldly employments on the seventh day; but the one would observe this cessation as a part of a religious ordinance, the other only as a matter of prudence.

The fact, therefore, that more work can be done by observing this negative element of rest every seventh day, is not, of itself,



a religious motive for observing the Sabbath day; but the fact is of use as tending to confirm our belief of the divine appointment of a Sabbath rest and the perpetually binding force thereof, seeing God's natural providence provides for and supposes such a law in order to secure the greatest amount of temporal happiness.

### III. THE PERPETUITY OF THE SABBATH LAW.

We have seen that the Sabbath law was originally instituted in immediate connexion with the creation. From the creation on, we find traces of its observance all through the Old Testament history. And in the summary of the moral law given to the Jews at Sinai and written upon two tables of stone, we find the Sabbath law occupying a prominent place as the last commandment of the first table. And in the New Testament we find the first day of the week observed as the Sabbath, and called the Lord's day, in honor of our Lord's work of redemption. Thus instead of finding the Sabbath law, as first instituted, repealed, we find at every important epoch in the history of man's relation to God special mention made of the Sabbath as entering into that relation. Its institution in connexion with the creation shows that it entered into man's religion in his primitive state. Its being embodied in the Decalogue shows that it entered into man's religion as a moral creature after the fall as well as before. The change of the day from the seventh to the first day of the week shows that it enters into man's religion in Christ and under the Christian dispensation.

It is important to bear in mind that its special significance as a religious ordinance, as originally instituted, was in reference to the work of creation; and since the fact of creation, at that time, determined man's religious status before God, and since the Sabbath ordinance summed up the religion of that fact, the fact of creation, therefore this Sabbath ordinance was a summary of man's religion in his primitive state. But the fact of creation is a permanent element in man's religion. Whatever else God may do for man besides what he did for us at the creation, and whatever else man may become, as to his moral nature, besides what he was at the creation, yet the fact remains that God is our Crea-

tor and we are his creatures, and thus the fact of creation affects permanently our relation to God and remains a permanent element in our religion. And as the Sabbath ordinance was originally given as a divine summary of that element of our religion, and that element of our religion involved in the fact of creation is permanent, therefore the divine summary of it must be permanent. That is, the Sabbath must be a permanent institution.

The same argument holds as to the fact of redemption. The great signal providence of God towards us in what he has done for us in the work of redemption determines our moral relations to God as permanently as the work of creation. And the obligations arising out of the fact of redemption are moral and binding upon all men in all ages in all future dispensations. Thus, the fact of redemption added to the fact of creation enters into our religion as a permanent and fundamental element thereof. Both these facts, of creation and redemption, permanently affect our moral and religious obligations, not as two classes of obligations conflicting in any way; but the fact of redemption is added to the fact of creation and adds obligations of its own.

Now when the fact of creation was the sole element in our religion, the Sabbath ordinance was instituted as a divine summary of that religion. When the fact of redemption adds another element in our religion, the Sabbath ordinance is appointed to include this element also, as is plainly indicated by the change of the day from the seventh to the first day of the week. The Sabbath ordinance, therefore, is the divine summary of the religion arising out of both these facts together. But these two facts include all from which religious duties arise. As the Catechism says, "These two benefits of creation and redemption contain a short abridgement of religion." The Christian Sabbath, therefore, or the Lord's day, or Sunday, is the divine summary of man's religion, was thus connected with man's religion in his primitive state, and is still thus connected with man's religion in his covenant state. There is nothing, therefore, that pertains to religion at all more indissolubly and permanently connected therewith than the Sabbath.

As to the nature of the obligation to observe the Sabbath, we

remark that it is both moral and positive in very much the same sense that the Lord's Supper is both moral and positive. The obligation to remember Christ as our Saviour is moral, but the obligation to remember him by religiously eating and drinking the sacramental bread and wine is positive, resting immediately and positively upon God's will appointing it. So the obligation to recognise God as our Creator and as our Redeemer and his works of creation and providence as very good is moral; but the obligation to do this by religiously abstaining one whole day in seven from worldly employments and amusements is positive, resting immediately and positively upon God's will appointing it. The seventh portion of time is fixed after the example of God's work of creation, but this originated ultimately not in the nature of things but in the will of God, for God might have taken a longer or shorter time, and is therefore positive in its ultimate source.

In this view of the Sabbath, it may be asked how it comes to be embodied in the Decalogue. The answer is, that the fundamental principle of the Sabbath law is moral, arising out of the relation between us and God, resulting from the fact of creation and the fact of redemption. And besides this, God, in instituting the Sabbath ordinance, institutes an ordinance which meets or supplies a class of human wants arising out of *permanent facts* in man's nature and circumstances in this world. Our temporal wants and employments in this world occupy our thoughts and our energies with things other than God and the recognition of him as our chief good. In the midst of these temporal employments we have also to devote ourselves to the cultivation of the divine life in our souls. This calls for such opportunities as are furnished by the Sabbath, as public and social worship, religious instruction, the arresting of the current of worldly thoughts, cares, and anxieties, and pious meditation and communion with God, and such like things. The circumstances of our existence in this world thus give rise to the moral necessity of a portion of our time being set aside in the sense of the Sabbath; and these circumstances of our existence are permanent. That the portion of time thus set apart should be one whole day in seven depends upon God's will appointing it. But it pleased God so to dispose

our circumstances in this world as to admit of this, and to require this portion of our time to be thus set apart from worldly employments. And these dispositions of our circumstances and these conditions of our nature are permanent facts, enduring as time itself. And these provisionary or preparatory facts in God's natural providence are to become standard facts in the higher and eternal state to which we tend, and are to determine our condition in that state. So that if the Sabbath law was ever demanded by these circumstances of our existence in this world, and our relations to God, then it must be always demanded, for this state of things characterises us always in this world, and is to become standard determining in the world to come. That is, our circumstances and our nature in the eternal world are to admit of and require our whole time to be spent as one continued Sabbath. If, therefore, the other nine precepts of the law are permanent because the reasons for them are so, then the fourth commandment is so also, and is entitled to the prominent place it holds in the Decalogue as the last of the four precepts of the first table.

Here is a threefold cord not easily broken, holding us firmly to the faith of the perpetuity of the Sabbath law:

First, the perpetual force of the fact of creation as a factor in our moral relation to God. Second, the perpetual force of the fact of redemption as modifying our moral relations to God. Third, the perpetual continuance of those positive conditions in God's natural providence which continually call for and determine the positive element of the Sabbath law.

#### IV. THE PLACE OF THE SABBATH IN GOD'S MORAL GOVERNMENT.

If the account we have thus far given of the Sabbath be accepted as true, then the place which the Sabbath law holds in God's moral government is manifest. It is a token of the recognition of the relation between us and God. It is constantly represented in the Old Testament as such a token between God and his chosen people. On God's part, of his recognition of them as his people; and on their part, of their recognition of God as their God. And if the seventh day Sabbath was such a token

to the Jews, much more is the first day Sabbath such a token for Christians. There are other tokens of *certain* relations between us and God. The Lord's Supper is, in one view of it, a token. In so far as it is a token, it is a token of *special* relations between us and God. As a memorial has reference to facts, a token has reference especially to the relations which arise from the facts. The Lord's Supper is a *memorial* of certain *special facts*. It is a *token* of the *special relation* between us and God arising from those facts. So baptism is a token of *certain special* relations between us and God. But the peculiarity of the Sabbath as a token is, that it is not confined to special relations between us and God, but includes all the relations between us and God from which moral and religious obligations arise. It is therefore a summary token of all the relations between us and God.

From the view which we have given of the nature of God's rest of the seventh day, it follows that this rest of God was a necessary expression of his nature as blessed and holy. God is holy in all his works, but this would not be, unless he recognised his works with holy complacency. But it was this recognition that constituted his rest of the seventh day. The rest of the seventh day, therefore, was a necessary outflow of his nature as holy and blessed. There was, therefore, and is, the same reason that man should rest, in this sense, that there was for God's resting. If a complacent recognition of God's works as very good, is an essential element of absolute holiness and happiness, then whoever would be thus holy and happy must thus recognise God's works. But the divinely appointed token of this recognition of God's works is the rest of the Sabbath. The Sabbath rest, therefore, is an essential element of holy blessedness. No Sabbath rest, no holiness; no holiness, no happiness; no holiness nor happiness, no God—atheism.

This doctrine is recognised all through the Scriptures in such passages, for instance, as Ps. xxviii. 5: "Because they regard not the works of the Lord nor the operation of his hands, he will destroy them and not build them up." Here the refusal or failure to recognise the works of God, in the sense involved in the rest of the Sabbath, is pronounced a sin for which God would

destroy them and not build them up. Again: the refrain of Ps. cvii.: "O that men would praise the Lord for his goodness and for his wonderful works to the children of men." This is in recognition of the works of God in the sense of the Sabbath rest. In a word the observance of the Sabbath rest is nothing short of man's accepting God and delighting in God in whatever character or attitude he reveals himself in his word or works as related to man. For no human being can observe the Sabbath, as a religious ordinance, without his observance of it implying his belief of every leading fact revealed in the Scriptures. It implies that you believe in God as your Creator, and that you recognise his work of creation as very good. Your observance of the first day of the week as the Sabbath implies that you recognise God as your Redeemer, and his work of redemption as very good. And thus to believe in God and delight in God and in his works is the sum of religion. The Sabbath, therefore, is the divine summary of man's religion.

The Sabbath, therefore, or the Lord's day, or Sunday, is a token between us and God of all that God is to us, or has done for us, and of all that we are consequently under obligation to do or to be as to him. And our observance of the day implies that we recognise God in all that he is to us, or has done for us, in his works of creation and providence—implies that we recognise him and the relations we sustain to him with special delight in him and in his works as very good. So long, therefore, as God is anything to man, or man is anything to God, so long must there be a Sabbath, or Lord's day, or Sunday, as a token of this relation.

#### V. THE SPECIAL SACREDNESS OF THE SABBATH OBLIGATION.

The points to which we have thus far directed attention may be thus summed up as so many arguments showing the sacredness of the Sabbath obligation:

*First*, from the original institution of the Sabbath law in immediate connexion with the fact of creation, and as the divine summary of the religion of that fact, with the change of the day from the seventh to the first day of the week, as indicating that the Sabbath law is still the divine summary of man's religion as modified by the fact of redemption.

*Secondly*, from the nature of the Sabbath rest as an earnest and foretaste of the eternal rest of the heaven of glory.

*Thirdly*, from the perpetuity of the Sabbath law with the provisions in God's natural providence for the observance of it, which provisionary arrangements of this present state are to become the standard principle of our future state.

*Fourthly*, from the place which the Sabbath law holds in God's moral government, as a general and comprehensive token between us and God, on our part, of our recognition of him as our God, and on his part, of his recognition of us as his people.

Now, can any one suppose that a law thus connected with all God's works—creation, providence, and redemption—which permanently determine moral relations, a law therefore connected with all recognition by man of Jehovah as the true God, and with all recognition by Jehovah of any people as his, a law which has for its fundamental principle of rectitude the principle of absolute holiness, a principle, therefore, to which God's own nature, as holy, conforms; a law, therefore, reaching into and through eternity there to receive, as to man, its complete fulfilment in the eternal rest of heaven—can any one suppose or persuade himself that a law thus indissolubly connected with the moral system of the universe is not perpetually binding upon all men in this world, and binding as the most sacred of all God's holy laws, summing up as it does in itself all human obligation, the rejection of it involving the rejection of the very relations themselves from which obligation springs? This is the peculiar flagrancy of the sin of forgetting the Sabbath day to keep it holy: it implies a repudiation of God as the chief good, and a wicked denial that his works of creation, providence, and redemption are very good. On the other hand, when we observe the Sabbath, abstaining from worldly avocations and amusements and devoting ourselves to the worship of God, to the cultivation of the divine life in the soul, and the doing of good to others, we thus outwardly profess that we recognise God as our chief good and that we admire and delight in his works of creation and providence as very good. In this Sabbath ordinance, therefore, God comes especially near to us and we come especially near to God. We abstain from worldly avocations not merely because our well-being

in this world requires it, but as a token of our acceptance of God as the true God, and as our God, and in token of our delight in him and in all his works as very good.

As showing further how sacredly we should regard this Sabbath observance and how God delights to honor this observance, it is through this law, or the observance of it, that we experience the most precious blessings of God's bounty. In connexion with this we would dissent from a view of the Sabbath which is sometimes given, which loses sight of the preciousness of the blessing there is in it for us. It is stated about in this way: God gives us six days for ourselves and requires the seventh for himself, and for us to appropriate the seventh to ourselves is no better than religious theft. This statement is true in itself, but to look at the Sabbath from no higher view than this is degrading to the sacredness of the obligation. It proceeds upon the idea that the benefits of the Sabbath are all on God's side. If the neglect of the Sabbath is robbing God, as it is in a sense, it is especially robbing ourselves of the chiefest blessedness vouchsafed to us in this world, and that, too, as the earnest and pledge of our highest well-being in heaven. It is therefore entitled to be regarded by us as very especially sacred, seeing God has not only sanctified it, but blessed it, and appointed it to be a special blessing to us, encouraging us to expect special blessing from him, and he himself coming specially near to us on that day, and admitting us to special nearness to him, granting us a sweet sense of his loving-kindness, and blessing us with spiritual blessings in heavenly places, manifesting himself to us in at least precious glimpses of his glory, and receiving back from us the free response of our hearts' adoration and praise. Its periodical return every seventh day is thus a joy and a support to us for which there is no substitute. "Take from the Christian Church this very first gift of God to man, and who can conceive by what other means she can either gather or perfect God's saints? Take from a world full of sin and toil and ignorance and misery this hallowed rest, and then imagine by what possibility the human race can be extricated from perpetual degradation in this life and endless ruin in that which is to come." May we, then, learn to appreciate this

120



sacred day as the best of all the seven, that we may hail its periodical return as a joy and a delight, being joyful and glad in it, cheerfully devoting its sacred hours to the worship of God, to the cultivation of the divine life in the soul; that it may thus be a token between us and God, that we recognise him as our God, and that he recognises us as his people; remembering that the repudiation of the Sabbath is a repudiation of the very idea of a God, which is absolute atheism. All external violation of the Sabbath law, therefore, is sin in the direction of atheism. For instance, to cut wood on the Sabbath, to cook on the Sabbath, to write letters on the Sabbath, to make social visits on the Sabbath, to transact little items of worldly business on the Sabbath, to read secular papers or secular literature on the Sabbath—all such little external interruptions of the sacred rest of the Sabbath are sins in the direction of atheism. Their tendency is to break up and dissolve the divinely appointed token of your recognition of God as your God. Let us, therefore, remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.

K. M. MCINTYRE.

---

### ARTICLE III.

## A PLEA FOR EMPHASISING THE DIVINE RIGHT OF PRESBYTERY.

The *jus divinum*, or divine right, of Presbytery is not proposed as a theme for argument in this paper. Its truth as a doctrine is assumed. The writer's purpose is to call attention to its importance as a factor in the Church's growth and prosperity: an importance which he believes has been injuriously overlooked both in fact and in the discussion on "aggressiveness." It may be well at the outset merely to state the argument for the divine right of Presbytery.

1. The Scriptures recognise the existence of a Church government: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls." Heb. xiii. 17.

2. They recognise this government as of divine right and not

of human invention, because (a) authoritatively ordered by inspired men, (b) whose mission was to set in order the polity and worship of the Church as well as its creed; (c) who to this end declared that Christ had given to his Church certain officers and ordinances; (d) who define the duties and qualifications of these officers, and the right observance of these ordinances; (e) and who enjoin obedience to the one and observance of the other as Christian duties.

3. Examination shows that this divine government is Presbyterian.

Now this is what we would insist upon: *That the doctrine of divine right of Presbytery be made very much more prominent in the teaching of the Church.*

I. It is right so to do.

Whatever God has revealed, the Church should teach. God is *sovereign*. To withhold any part of divine revelation is to put upon it the seal of our disapprobation, and to treat its author with contempt. It is surely no part of the Church's mission to encourage the world in disregard of divine authority. There is a widely prevalent indisposition to respect any revelation which is not thought fundamentally necessary to salvation. This defiance of God's supreme authority is sometimes flung from the pulpit and proudly flaunted as Christian charity. Practically, the current maxim that it matters not to what Church one belongs is tantamount to saying: "If God's word has anything to say that will ensure my salvation, I will listen; but if he has any revelation about matters which are non-essential, like Church government and ordinances, I do not want to hear it. The Almighty ought not to concern himself with trifles. Such things had better be left to our discretion. The best results in worship and government are to be had not through divine revelation, but by human wisdom. I do not want to know what the Lord has to say about them." So, too, said Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin. Like Jeroboam and Jehu, such people have no use for God except as an almighty convenience. Their attitude is sheer rebellion. We insist that God's will is paramount; that his will respecting the order of the Church has been re-

vealed; that it is man's duty respectfully and carefully to consider it, and humbly and conscientiously to obey it. It is, therefore, the duty of the Church to teach the divine right of Presbytery, because it is right to enjoin subjection to God, not merely as a *gracious*, but as a *sovereign* God. Like Paul we should shun not to declare the whole counsel of God.

Whatever God has revealed the Church should not shun to teach, because God is *gracious*. In the economy of redemption God is economical of the divine resources. In grace as in nature there is no waste. He never does for us what we can do for ourselves. It was simply because man is incompetent to devise a suitable polity and worship for the Church that God has imposed them. And here it may be observed, that should any object that it savors strongly of arrogance to emphasise the divine right of Presbytery, it will suffice to say that arrogance may be justly charged to those Christian bodies which ask the world to accept a polity and worship their own wisdom has devised; but that to accept what God has revealed is humility. It is certainly humble to accept God's ordinances as wisest and best; it is assuredly arrogant to insist that mankind can do nothing better than accept the fruits of one's own wisdom. This is the attitude any Church must take which denies that God has himself instituted a government for his Church or left anything in polity or worship to human discretion. This position requires that in order to the attainment of the grandest spiritual triumphs of the Church, the wisest and best Christians should be insufferably conceited. Such a theory is self-destructive.

Grace is exhibited not only in God's doing that for man which man is incompetent to do for himself, but in doing that which is so essential to his happiness. The Church is an institution which has for its object the gathering and perfecting of the saints; an object, surely, of the gravest importance. It is impossible that God should make any unprofitable revelations: "All Scripture is profitable." Since, therefore, God has himself instituted a government for his people in this dispensation, we may feel assured that it is the wisest possible adaptation to our needs, and admirably designed to secure our highest spiritual attainments and hap-

piness. A divinely instituted polity is therefore a revelation of *grace*, and for this reason it is the duty of the Church to teach it.

In one issue, this year, of a certain weekly publication there appeared a sermon as delivered by a famous Presbyterian divine, and another by a no less famous Baptist minister. Said the Presbyterian: "As to the difference between different denominations of evangelical Christians I have no concern. If I could, by the turning over of my hand, decide whether all the world shall at last be Baptist, or Methodist, or Congregational, or Episcopalian, or Presbyterian, I would not turn my hand. But there are doctrines which are vital to the soul." Said the Baptist: "I should very strongly recommend you always to obey the prescriptions of the great Healer, 'Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it.' Do not follow a part of his orders and neglect the rest. The Lord Jesus must be received as a whole, or not at all. Say not, 'This is non-essential;' for such a speech is flat rebellion. I do not believe in any words of our Lord being non-essential. They may not be essential to our salvation, but every word of Christ is essential to our spiritual health; neither can we disregard the least of his precepts without suffering loss through our disobedience." Right manly words, and loyal! True, too! Realised by us to be true, for the Presbyterian Church has suffered and is suffering loss through her disobedience in not emphasising the divine right of Presbytery. The world deifies indifference to God's statutes under the name of "charity," but the greater number of new converts in the warmth of their new-born love and zeal are pretty sure to affect those Churches which seem most jealous for Jehovah.

It is right, therefore, to give prominence in our teaching to the divine right of Presbytery. It is the Church's sacred duty to recommend the doctrine as a *provision of grace*. What man was incompetent to do, that God has done. He has revealed a polity which, because it is his, is best adapted to edify the Christian and conserve the truth of the gospel for his posterity. We wish to note, by the way, that the custodianship of the truth for its faithful transmission to posterity is an object of Church organisation which very many people seem neither to have conceived

nor appreciated. Apparently the masses have adopted the sarcastic definition of the Church which is said to have come from a Congregationalist minister: "A society of Christians organised to hear preaching." And those ministers who, like Bishop Ryle, are preaching evangelical doctrine in organisations irretrievably committed to Romish tendencies, forget that the mission of the Church is not simply to preach the gospel, but to ensure its transmission to every creature of succeeding generations. Such ministers preach the truth to one generation, but fasten chains of error on their children's children. Fidelity to the truth of the gospel is the preacher's chief concern, but scarcely of less importance are those institutions which God has ordained for the perpetuation of gospel truth. The Church is the pillar and ground of the truth.

But suppose we fail to discover to others the beauty of the Presbyterian polity. Suppose that mental immaturity which is due to youth or defective training, fails to appreciate the beauty, interdependence, and symmetry of gospel truths as expounded by the Reformed theology, and the adaptation of a divinely given polity and worship to conserve those truths, what then? Shall we take the ground so often tacitly assumed that there is nothing more to be done? Shall we pronounce that certain classes or people or populations are "not good Presbyterian material"? Shall we repeat that other hackneyed phrase that, "People must be educated into Presbyterians"? Shall we concede so much to the spirit of rationalism? No! God devised the Presbyterian polity not for such only as appreciate its wisdom, but for all who recognise his authority. The heart must submit, though the head may not ken. The best of us on earth know only in part; and all of us are disciples. Whatever soul can understand his obligation to obey God, and can be made to see that Presbytery is ordained of God, is good Presbyterian material. God is not only gracious, but *sovereign*. The Church should proclaim his will with all authority.

What if there be leaning, dependent natures, full of unquestioning obedience and worshipful veneration for authority, shall we condemn and scorn and neglect them, because so unlike the

sturdy Presbyterian type of worshippers? Are we to turn them over to Pope and prelate and priest, and disown them for Presbyterian material? Reverence for authority is the foundation of all true religion, and that Church makes a proud and lamentable mistake which disdains the souls whose first quest is their *King*. Let the Church take such gently by the hand and lead them to Him who alone is Lord of the conscience. Let the Church show them a "thus saith the Lord" for the Presbyterian polity, and they will prove our staunchest and most loyal members. It is our duty to preach the divine right of Presbytery with "all authority."

II. And there is *need* so to do.

For, as a matter of fact, we have not the ear of the masses. This is fully recognised, for it has given rise to the discussion of what is called "*aggressiveness*." For the cause of it, a diligent search has been instituted. Some writers have referred it mainly to defects of administration. Some few have referred it to defective teaching. It has been said, for instance, that the Reformed Theology has not been sufficiently emphasised. Not undertaking to answer for any other of the Presbyterian Churches, we hardly think the Southern Church justly chargeable with this neglect. Some ministers are doubtless unwise, but scarcely any are derelict. But with respect to the divine right of Presbytery, it must be admitted that we have shunned to declare the whole counsel of God. And why may not our numerical inferiority be largely due to this neglect of an important doctrine—the doctrine, in fact, of which our name proclaims us to be the champions?

Let us ask ourselves the question: *Why should* we have the ear of the masses? Our ministers go into destitute regions to gather saints and organise churches. They are thoroughly evangelical. It looks to them like solemn trifling to preach anything else but truths essential to salvation. If they do, it is done with infinite reluctance and fluent apologies. They stand before the people and say, in the language of the Presbyterian divine above quoted: "If I could by the turning over of my hand make Presbyterians of you, I would not turn my hand. There are doctrines which are vital, and I am here as God's instrument to save souls." And they preach earnest, faithful gospel sermons, which the

Spirit blesses to the conversion of souls. What next? What do the masses say? Say some: "We have heard good Baptist doctrine;" others, "good Methodist doctrine." Say *all*: "We see no reason, therefore, why we should be Presbyterians, but there remain reasons why we should 'follow Christ in baptism,' or 'go where we can do the most good,' or 'join *the Church*.'" And very soon thereafter these same converts are asking, "What is the Presbyterian Church good for any way? The preacher himself wouldn't turn over his hand to make us Presbyterians." It is due to this training that communities may be easily found where distinctive Presbyterian preaching is regarded by other denominations as an impertinence to be resented and rebuked, though they themselves indulge in little else than laudations of their peculiar tenets and abuse of the tenets of others.

And we have not the ear of the masses, although the Presbyterian ministry is notably an educated ministry; by general consent, the most thoroughly equipped ministry. One able writer undertakes to show, not that our ministry is educated too much, but in the wrong direction, out of sympathy with the masses. This line of argument is wholly independent of that we are now pursuing. We allude to it only to say that a superior standard of education ought to give us the advantage with the liberal professions. But is such the case? Have we any such advantage? Have we our proportionate part even of the liberally educated? It is certain that a disproportionate number seem allured by prelatial pretensions. And why? We do not propose to explore all the causes, but we deem the following sufficient: The thoughts of professional men are too much preoccupied to spare time and attention to theological topics. In the matter of religion they are more disposed than most other men to let others do their thinking. The greater number yield a facile deference to a show of exclusive authority. Now with such minds the question of divine right is Alpha and Omega. We ought to recognise this fact and urge upon their consideration the irrefragable evidence that the great Head of the Church, while he subordinates ecclesiastical order to doctrinal purity, for the purpose of ensuring purity has instituted in Presbytery a government for his Church which they

are bound to respect. And yet we doubt if there is more than one in a thousand of the liberally educated outside our own pale, who have ever heard that the Presbyterian Church claims to have a government which is by divine right and therefore obligatory. Our silence has not only robbed us of advantage, but actually brought us into disrepute. How so? Because people ignorant of the real and sufficient grounds of our ardent attachment to the Church have accounted for it inadequately and in some cases maliciously. They have miscalled our affection—bigotry, because in their ignorance and arrogance it seemed to them blind and obstinate. Our tenacious adherence to divine institutions, at the cost, in former times, of liberty and life, instead of being admired as heroism, has been foully calumniated as austerity and fanaticism. Writers of fiction, whose influence is underrated by sober-minded Churchmen,<sup>1</sup> but who, nevertheless, are potent, because so generally read—writers of fiction, Sir Walter Scott in the lead, have wrought mightily and effectually to misrepresent and villify the grand old martyr Church, which kept alive the principles of civil and religious liberty; which, as Froude says, “has preferred rather to be ground to powder like flint than to bend before violence or rust under enervating temptation.” Our modest reticence has suffered even the children of the Church to be alienated, and to go down to their graves uninformed of the most glorious earthly and temporal heritage God has ever given man—a polity and worship for his Church. There is a justifiable pride which our children should be taught to feel in the gifts of God to his Church. Humanly invented rites and holy days of man’s appointment should be waved aside, as of no account in the eyes of those who appreciate the dignity of a divine institution. But that this honor is not more highly esteemed is largely due to our reprehensible silence.

And in this reprehensible neglect of the doctrine of divine right we have the explanation of another puzzling fact—the won-

---

<sup>1</sup>Of course, in this country, we use the word “Churchman” not in its narrow, British sense, to designate members of an Establishment, but in its proper, unrestricted sense—a Church member.



derful fact that, while the Presbyterian Church is among the most liberal on earth, although she alone, in her symbols of faith, recognises other evangelical communions as branches of Christ's Church visible, still she has the repute of being the most intolerant and uncharitable. Now, what is the explanation? Is it not this: that we are supposed to regard forms of government and worship as matters of indifference?—to teach that "one Church is as good as another"? In *us*, therefore, it is thought unwarrantable and unpardonable to stickle for Presbytery. Nothing but an uncharitable, partisan, schismatic temper can account for *our* pertinacious adherence to Presbytery and reprehensible repugnance to other polities! But do other communions exclude us from the Lord's table? Do other communions insist on "confirming" our members and reordaining our ministers who seek admission to their fold? Do they refuse to receive the gospel or the eucharist at the hands of our ministry for the alleged reason that their ordination is invalid? Do they denounce Protestants as schismatics while recognising the Greek and Roman apostasies as Churches of Jesus Christ? All such misbehaving arrogance the world excuses on the ground that consistency with their principles demands it. *These* may prate about *the* Church without rebuke, but to defend Presbytery against aggression and to resent arrogance is atrocious intolerance and bigotry. Why? Because the world is persuaded that we hold one polity to be as good as another, and that we are contentious not for conscience' sake, but to gratify a spirit of intolerance. That is the why. Now suppose, that while advertising the public of our recognition as sister Churches of all who preach evangelical doctrine, and the validity of their orders although unapostolic and irregular in form, we were at the same time signally and emphatically to proclaim that Presbytery is by divine right and therefore obligatory, then, we hesitate not to say, our scriptural charity in contrast with unscriptural presumption would not lack of hearty appreciation. It requires this framing to bring it out in bold relief.

Another evil: There is a growing disinclination to unite with the Church. It is alleged in excuse that people can be "as good out of the Church as in it;" that participation in Church quar-

VOL. XXXV., NO. 2—4.

rels will be avoided; that the Church is brought into disfavor by the inconsistencies of members; that the propriety of self-distrust lest one should scandalise the cause, justifies one in the neglect of Church ordinances. Now these and multifarious other pretexts would not for an instant be thought tenable if the fact were clearly recognised that submission to Church government is obligatory, because God has given his Church a form of government. There is need that we should inculcate this truth and so do our part to correct the evil.

We wish now to call attention to what is justly regarded as by far the most difficult problem we have to contend with. It is said that the Presbyterian Church is so aristocratic and so stiffly decorous in its membership and tastes that the industrious poor and reputable middle classes are repelled. In the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW for October, 1882, the author of the article "Aggressiveness of Presbyterianism" says: "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." It *is* true! We have known pastors to complain that it was impossible to persuade their people to show outsiders such attentions as would invite their attendance on the services. There is reason to fear that in some communities our people regard the Church as a *social circle* "organised to hear preaching." There seems to be an utter disinclination on the part of such to seek for accessions in the highways and hedges. They attend services, behave with decorum, maintain the pastor, but it is impossible to arouse in them any local missionary zeal. They hear the gospel and are careless who hear it not. The stranger is chilled by his frigid reception and returns no more. Visitors who are not of the same social circle are received with a stare and leave with resentment. Is this picture overdrawn? We think not; but whether our people are censurable or blameless, the fact remains that our town and city churches are generally restricted to one class of people, and it is almost hopeless to expect accessions from any

other class. This ought not so to be. Well! What is the remedy? Says one: "Our people must be carefully polite and kindly considerate of all classes." Very true! Such conduct becomes the followers of Christ; but if we are to coddle people, if we are to erect amiable Christian courtesy into a means of grace for purposes of denominational thrift, its delicate aroma will be lost and its beauty coarsely marred. Say others: "We need more piety; we need to be revived." Yes, assuredly! We do need more Christ-likeness, more sincere love of souls, more realisation of his love, constraining us to self-denying service. But all this is inadequate to remedy the evil. The fault is not wholly on the side of our people. If they were all they ought to be, the human nature of the other party would insist upon determining their Church relations on social grounds. *They, too*, regard the Church as a social circle. *They, too*, seek congenial company. They are fortified in this position by the assurance that "one Church is as good as another." And just so long as this is held to be true, just so long will the evil prevail. The only thing which will ever bring the rich and the poor in harmony in the same congregation is the conviction that God has enjoined the consciences of all men to observe a polity which is from himself.

Ah! objects one, you are relying upon outward conformity, and despairing of inward grace. Not at all! Please reflect, that the proper aliment of grace is the word of truth; that if Christians were perfect, we should need no government at all, and that it is just because we are imperfect that a government is given; that the polity and worship of the Church have been given her for the gathering and *perfecting* of the saints. In order that gracious influences may exert their full power on the hearts of men, they must be taught to reverence divine institutions. A *sovereign* will has imposed them, and with a *gracious* design. Let us not be found fighting against God, and defrauding man. While, therefore, we should be more pious, more kindly, more zealous, the appropriate remedy and only adequate remedy is to enforce the divine right of Presbytery.

Let us ask ourselves the question: Why should people of all classes and conditions of life be Presbyterians? There is no

reason except this: that all classes and conditions of men should submit themselves to divine truth; no human traditions can bind the conscience. Is it true that Jesus is the Son of God? Then all conditions of men should shun the Unitarian societies; but not for this reason need they be Presbyterians; they may choose any Trinitarian Church, and if the divinity of Christ were all of revelation, social considerations might be permitted to dictate the choice. Is it true that he who believeth *hath* everlasting life? Then Arminianism, too, is to be avoided, and the circle of choice still further narrowed, but the Christian may be determined in the choice of *any* Calvinistic Church by social reasons; there is no necessity laid upon his conscience to be a Presbyterian. And so, considerations of convenience, or congeniality, or taste, etc., may control the choice of Church relations in so far as anything in doctrine, worship, or polity is left to human discretion. But if nothing be left to human discretion, if all things pertaining to the Church are determined by divine legislation, then all classes and conditions of society are conscientiously bound to walk by the same rule. And if Presbytery has been divinely prescribed, then this constitutes a sufficient reason why men should be Presbyterians regardless of social status. Were there no other difference between us and other communions than the matter of polity, we would still have a righteous claim upon the consciences of all classes, because Presbytery is of divine right. In order, therefore, to reach all ranks of people, the Church should make very much more prominent the divine right of Presbytery. Just as superstition brings all classes of people, from kings to paupers, to worship at the shrines of Rome, so should an instructed conscience affiliate all classes in the Presbyterian Church.

What, says some one: Would you have us to be high-churchmen? No! High-churchism is exclusivism; high-churchism is schismatic. The doctrine of divine right no more unchurches other communions than the doctrine of a present and finished salvation disowns Arminians for Christians. But we would have people of every condition in life to take an interest in the Church as God has constituted it; to be loyal to it, because divine prescription makes loyalty a duty; to love it, because the gift to

them makes love a privilege with which none may interfere. We would have the doctrine of divine right preached, not apologetically, but imperatively; we would have it proclaimed with all authority.

We pass now to the consideration of evils within the Church, which are largely due to that neglect which is deplored. The first which claims our attention concerns the eldership. The office of the ruling elder does not receive that respect to which a divine appointment should commend it, simply because the divine appointment has not been sufficiently emphasised. The ruling elder is popularly regarded as a sort of vestryman, deriving his office and authority from a man-made Constitution. He may assist the pastor at the communion table and the council board. He is a sort of brake upon the ministry. He is himself a layman, representing the laity and protecting their rights against clerical intrusion. As a fellow-laborer, he is gladly welcomed; as a ruler, he is scarcely known. Should the Session attempt the management of the Sunday-school, it is a usurpation; should they interfere with the choir, it is an impertinence; should they venture to disapprove gambling expedients to raise Church funds, it is a gratuitous interference; should they condemn the round dance for its unblushing immodesty, their sentence is only an indiscreet opinion. Ruler? Indeed!

And this consequence is inevitable: when nothing is expected, nothing is done. The ruling elders themselves, it must be admitted, often fail to have any adequate idea of their functions and responsibilities. The average elder has adopted the prevalent notion that his office is adjuvant and supplemental; he is to assist the pastor in the discharge of his duty, and curb the pastor when he transcends his duty. He has not conceived of himself as an independent ruler, bearing on his own shoulders personal responsibility for the care of souls. It never occurs to him that it is his duty *severally* as well as jointly to watch diligently over the flock committed to his charge that no corruption of doctrine or morals enter therein; to visit the people at their homes, especially the sick; to instruct the ignorant, comfort the mourner, nourish and guard the children of the Church." It never occurs

to him that he is individually responsible for the welfare of the Church, and therefore he rarely burdens his mind and heart with the interests of the Church, or ventures to inaugurate any movement for the good of the Church. He will be consulted; but will not suggest. He does not expect at the hands of the people any deference as a ruler, and therefore is not so very circumspect to deport himself as becomes the dignity of his office. The inefficiency of the eldership has not infrequently, of late, been discussed under the head of "aggressiveness." Can any one doubt that whatever may be the cause or causes, the evil would be, more than by any other means, effectually and promptly corrected by a genuine revival of the doctrine of the divine right of Presbytery, restoring the office of ruling elder in the respect and affections of the people, to its proper place of dignity and authority? How serious is the evil to be corrected we realise most when we reflect that instead of one pastor every church should have three or more. Our strength would be quintupled. The Church has a divine right to that much greater efficiency of which it is defrauded by our culpable neglect of a doctrine which is not "essential to salvation"—not "vital to the soul."

And the evil is self-perpetuating. For, ignorance of the divine right and authority of the eldership, corroborated by constant experience of the eldership as it actually is in all its unsuspected inefficiency, leads to the unhesitating choice of those for the office whose qualifications are, not for work, but for air-brakes on progress. And secondly, this perpetuation of the evil is brought about by the failure of the eldership to foster zeal for good works in the growing generation. If the eldership recognised it as solemnly true that "all those duties which private Christians are bound to discharge by the law of charity," such as the duty of "praying with and for the people," the duty to be "careful and diligent in seeking the fruit of the preached word among the flock, and to inform the pastor of cases of sickness, affliction, and awakening, and of all others who may need his special attention;" that such duties "are especially incumbent upon them by divine vocation, and are to be discharged as official duties"—if the elders fully realised this, what an example to the Church! what a train-

ing of their successors! But as it is, their successors are far more likely to think their whole duty discharged in attendance on the Session and other Church Courts. We speak not of them all. Our case would not only be sad but irreparable, if these strictures admitted no exceptions. We rejoice that personally we know many exceptions. But, on the other hand, can it be truthfully denied that the indictment holds good of the class? Still, the blame does not attach wholly to them; it is due mainly to the ministry, who, because it was not "vital," have failed to emphasize the "profitable" doctrine of the divine right of Presbytery.

Another grievous result of this failure is the growing neglect of discipline. To unite with some other Church is the ready menace and resort of all parties justly amenable to censure. Quick to resent even righteous displeasure, members change their Church relations with the utmost facility, since "one Church is as good as another." There is no hesitation from fear of incurring the sin of rebellion against God who has made it their conscientious duty to obey them who are over them in the Lord, for they have not been taught to respect Presbytery as of divine right. And therefore it is that Sessions are often deterred from the exercise of salutary discipline, especially in its mildest forms, because they know that not only the persons offending, who would derive incalculable benefit from such discipline, but all the family, with the little innocent children and many connections, may be lost to the good influence of sound teaching and encouraged in alienation from the Church. And so, for fear of consequences more wide-reaching and disastrous than the offence which needs discipline, discipline is falling into disuse, and the Church is growing more and more worldly. All this, in great measure, would be avoided if the people were taught a proper respect for the divine right of Presbytery.

God has given his Church a polity which is adapted to all her needs. Man has both soul and body, and so we have in the presbyter the custodian of spiritual things, and in the deacon the custodian of temporalities. And yet it is a frequent thing in the Presbyterian Church to supplant God's deacons with trustees, who often are not even Christians. And so it has occasionally

come to pass, that godless men—in the slang of the day—have “run” a church. They have determined what preacher, organist, soprano, tenor, etc., would draw best, and make the church a financial success. Practically, they have usurped the functions of both elders and deacons, and ignored the rights of the people as well. When a church has deacons, they should be trustees before the law; and no trustees should have powers, as the representatives of the property, exceeding those which belong by divine right to the deacon. Prominence given to the divine right of Presbytery would soon reinstate the diaconate in its proper place.

Again, because our people are not familiarised with the divine right of Presbytery, our ministers are deprived of their full weight of influence and their full measure of usefulness. We do not mean to say that our ministers are not influential for good and actually useful. Nor do we mean to deny that some have so much influence as to sway their congregations at their will. We mean to affirm that there is a legitimate influence which is not available. Some pastors are men of infinite tact and magnetism and administrative ability—in a word, they are masterful men and they rule well. In fact they sometimes rule too well, or rather too much, inasmuch as their co-presbyters in the Session are but puppets in their hands. But the success of such pastors is too often wholly due to personal qualities, such qualities as give them preëminence and acknowledged leadership among their peers in Presbytery or Synod. Influential as they may be in their churches, their influence would be greater and more potent for good if the people deferred not so much to the man and more to his office. Not all men have the same gifts. Very few men have gifts which compel a prompt and ready deference, nor does the Holy Spirit make such gifts essential qualifications for the office of bishop; but he enjoins obedience to all who bear rule, because their office is authoritative. To defer to the personal will of the incumbent, while heedless of the divine will embodied in his office, is not only to dishonor a divine appointment, but very injuriously to restrict the influence of the ministry. The evils resultant from this neglect to emphasise the divine right of



Presbytery are far-reaching and so numerous as to be almost incalculable. The successor of one of these strong-willed and tactful pastors is almost sure to suffer in the respect of the congregation, because the congregation has been unwittingly trained to reverence the man and not his office. For this reason suitable material from which to select a pastor is arbitrarily limited. It is needlessly hard for such churches to be suited; they demand of the man what they should accord to the office.

Or it may be that a church has been regulated by some zealous but pragmatic sisters who never dreamed that anything was required of a pastor, for the good of the flock, but to dispense entertainment and comfort from the pulpit or at the fireside. A pastor for that vacancy must reach a high standard of pulpit and social qualifications; as to administrative ability, that is superfluous. Should the new incumbent attempt to rule in that congregation, he will raise a lively breeze. A preacher is wanted; not a bishop.

And not only a preacher, but a pastor. Yes, a good pastor is in demand. And what is a good pastor? One who visits "*officially* the people, devoting especial attention to the poor, the sick, the afflicted, and the dying"? Yes! a good pastor must do all that, but more also. If he restrict himself to *official* visits, instructing the ignorant, comforting the poor, the sick, the despondent, the afflicted, remonstrating with the erring, encouraging the weak, and prompting the slothful to every good word and work, he will have his hands pretty full, but he will not fill the popular requirements of a good pastor. A good pastor, according to the popular notion, must go to and fro and show himself genial, and social, and entertaining, and agreeable, that church thrift may follow pastoral fawning. Such is the emulation between denominations that the personal popularity of the pastor is mainly relied on as a means of church aggrandisement. Said a brother minister, on one occasion: "The Presbyterian Church cannot increase except through the popularity of the pastor." And to secure popularity it was thought that one must carefully abstain from obtruding Presbyterian doctrine on the ear of the people, and as carefully cultivate the art of pleasing by agreeable attentions. Now, popu-

larity is not to be despised. It is needful that a pastor be held in esteem by them that are without, but that esteem is not jeopardised, on the contrary, it is won and held by courteous fidelity to conscientious convictions. Nor are door-step attentions and fine flowing phrases so sure of securing a permanent hold on the affections of men as a cordial interest shown in their soul's salvation. Of course the pastor must not be unsocial, but much of his valuable time is lost to the church because it is thought that the preacher's popularity can be maintained only by agreeable, social intercourse; and that such popularity is the best reliance for attracting the worldling to the church. The nature of a manly man revolts against being put in the same list of attractions with the organ and the stained glass windows. He is an ambassador of God, with a message from God that is mandatory, and he prefers to win people to the church by faithful work in the discharge of his proper commission. He would make disciples, not to himself, but to the Lord—disciples who should say, as did Cornelius: "We are all here present before God, to hear all things that are *commanded thee of God.*" If our own people were more loyal to their divinely ordered polity and worship, they would save much valuable time and service; do more to honor the Lord, and be more successful in winning souls. "Them that honor me, will I honor," saith Jehovah.

And loyalty to a polity because it is divine, implies true piety. A church which relies mainly upon the popularity of its pastor, along with the attractions of the choir and architecture, the beauty of its maidens and the social status of its members for numerical growth, is trusting to carnal means to accomplish a carnal end. To upbuild a church which shall be admirers of the Rev. Mr. Creamcheese, and of one another, is certainly a carnal project. "While one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" But a church which relies for conversions wholly on the Spirit's operations by the word of *truth*, and for accessions to its fold, mainly upon the fact that its polity and worship are divinely appointed, shows a respect for the Lord's will as paramount which argues fervent piety and effectual zeal. Accessions to that church will be very likely of

such as ardently ask: "Lord, what wilt *thou* have me to do?" They will be the Lord's disciples, and not man's.

Furthermore, they who are actuated by carnal policy in their church relations are apt to be careless about the church membership of their infant children. The *neglect of infant baptism* is mainly on the part of those parents who, because they believe that "one Church is as good as another," prefer that their children should choose for themselves when they reach the years of maturity, and on the same policy which actuated themselves. The obvious remedy for the neglect of infant baptism in such cases is, plainly, a clear apprehension of the divine right of Presbytery.

Should anybody wonder that our non-communing members are so easily alienated from the Church of their fathers, with her grand history and long roll of noble martyrs? There is no real bond of attachment between them and the Church. They may have a preference, indeed, for their pastor, and for the congenial society in which they have been reared, but when they leave their homes for new regions their church preferences also are left behind. The future church relations of such children are determined by just those considerations which prevailed at home. We have known evangelists, while straining every nerve and husbanding every resource to build Presbyterian churches in mission fields, to be much discouraged when they received neither co-operation nor sympathy from young people of good Presbyterian families and strong home churches, because such young people despised the day of small things and associated themselves wholly with denominations of influence, wealth, or fashion. The proverb is of universal application: "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it." If the training has been worldly; if they have been attached to the Church by convenience, or congeniality, or policy, or taste, or associations, when they leave home, if not before, they will change their church relations through the same motives. But if they have been taught that God, in order to conserve the blessed truth of the gospel, has given his Church a polity and worship to which, though not "vital," yet "profitable," it is their

duty and high privilege to conform, then in vain will prove all efforts to allure them from the Church of their fathers. Is it not high time that such training should vigorously begin, that we suffer no more depletion of our young blood and energy? Let us continue to preach our evangelic doctrine, but no longer neglect our apostolic order. Let us lift high the dignity of Presbytery, the system of ecclesiastical government whose germ was planted in that authority which the first man's fatherhood gave him over his children to disciple them for the worship of Jehovah, and whose consummated glory was seen by John on Patmos when he beheld the throne of God, and about it, four-and-twenty elders on four-and-twenty thrones.

In closing this plea for emphasising the divine right of Presbytery, we can do nothing better than quote the words of the lamented Thornwell: "We dread the consequences of surrendering the *jus divinum Presbyterii*. The power of our system has never been effectually tried, and its full strength can never be developed, until our people shall be brought to feel that it is an institute of God. As long as we hesitate to trust it, or rather to trust in the Almighty Saviour who appointed it, we shall not be permitted to do valiantly for our Master and his cause."

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.

## ARTICLE IV.

## CALEB, A BIBLE STUDY. .

The two main forms of moral instruction are precept and example. By precept we are taught what is right and what is wrong. In example we have a concrete exhibition of right and wrong. These two forms of instruction, though distinct, are not independent of each other. Instruction that is complete combines both. The inspired word of God presents the best method of teaching. In the Old Testament the law of God is imbedded in the history of the chosen people; in the New Testament Christ is our teacher and our example. Between precept and example this characteristic difference is to be noted: moral precept is of universal application, while example has special force according to circumstances.

In the biography of the Bible we have the noblest specimens of our race that have ever been presented to the contemplation of the successive generations that have inhabited the earth. The supreme characteristics which testify that man was created in the image and likeness of God are exhibited by the Jewish heroes in a degree unequalled in the history of any other people. The intellect, wisdom, force, power of control, courage, and faith, existing separately, or more or less combined, and under the limitations and with the drawbacks of a fallen human nature, are so displayed by patriarchs, leaders, kings, warriors, prophets, priests, and apostles, as to vindicate man's divine original. And this without any assertion on their part, or claim for them by their biographers that they are anything more than mere human beings. They do not pretend to be gods or demi-gods, and if at any time miracles are wrought by them, they declare that they are only instruments in the hand of their God. Their recorded examples teach us that even if supremely great among their fellows, men are not gods, but to be truly great they must be Godlike.

This truth, however, if applicable only to the conspicuously great, would be serviceable to very few. But the word of God

is the sacred text book for the instruction of all classes of men of every generation through all time. And therefore in it we are taught that to be Godlike is the duty and privilege of all, and to each in his station and according to his measure the assurance is given that godliness is profitable for all things.

Of this truth, the life of *Caleb* is a striking exemplification. The entire household of Israel, when Egypt became their common home, was about seventy, besides Joseph's family and Israel himself, their common living progenitor. Of the twelve sons, all of them except tender little Benjamin had already vindicated (some of them sinfully) the vigor inherited by their descent from Abraham. The princely Joseph well represented the faith, courage, wisdom, magnanimity, and protecting guardianship of the friend of God.

The only individual mention of the sons, after their establishment in Egypt, is in Jacob's prophetic death-blessing. Immediately after the patriarch's death they come in a body to humble themselves before the generous Joseph, who will not listen to their attempted confession, but says: "God meant it for good; now, therefore, fear not; I will nourish you and your little ones."

And now for about 400 years, during which time this Abrahamic family had increased to near two million souls, no Israelite has a name upon the sacred record, until the babe is drawn out of the water, and so called *Moses*. In their degraded servitude during the latter part of their captivity there would be no opportunity for the display of signal individual superiority. This is the direful evil of slavery. Yet the native differences that inhere in humanity must have existed, though undeveloped, among the bondmen of Egypt.

It is a matter of amazement that from among a nation just liberated from a slavery so long and so debasing, so many heroes should arise, together with so many others who, though not to be classed as heroes, proved themselves competent for the difficult duties suddenly devolving upon them as subordinates under their great leader. Moses had been, by a designed providence, made acquainted with all the learning current at the court of Pharaoh, and his brother Aaron and sister Miriam, we may suppose, had,

to some extent, shared his advantages. But how had Joshua and Caleb and all the other officers, military, civil, and religious, been prepared for acting their respective parts in the control of a million and a half of people, and in laying the foundations of a social and political system, upon principles never before tried in the world? Beyond controversy, it was the work of God. He never fails to provide and suitably to equip instruments to carry out his sure purposes. This providing began in the calling of Abraham, centuries before. Heredity is the law of generations, and never has it been so strongly impressed upon any other people as upon the Jews. Its continued manifestation down to the present day is one of the great marvels in the history of the world. Stronger still than the heredity of blood is the promise of God—what could the bondage of 400 years do against it! And Joshua, Caleb, and the rest were inevitably competent. Would God send his chosen people bread from heaven, and bring water from the flinty rock, and leave them without men to rule and guide?

Caleb was a descendant of Judah, fourth son of Jacob. The suggestion, made by some writers, that he had been introduced into the tribe by adoption, is too fanciful to require notice.

Judah, though not the first-born, seems to have been the most important of the twelve brothers. It was through his influence that Jacob finally consented to allow Benjamin to accompany his brethren in the second visit to Egypt. Though implicated as Reuben was not, in the cruelty to Joseph, his was the suggestion that substituted slavery for death, and the generous bravery with which he sought to take the place of Benjamin in the prison house, gives us one of the most touching passages in Scripture. Although the family of Judah had not at the time of Jacob's death made itself conspicuous above others, the prophetic blessing of the dying patriarch, disregarding the birthright of Reuben, assigns preëminence and rule to this tribe, and connects it with the advent of the great Shiloh—

“Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee. Judah is a lion's whelp; from the prey, my son, thou art

gone up; he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up? The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be."

To the tribe of Judah was assigned the honor of always marching in the front of the army of the Israelites, when they moved their encampment. To this tribe Caleb belonged. He was not, however, its prince and captain. That post was held by Nason, whose name is enrolled among the captains of the twelve tribes, but is not signalised by connexion with any great achievement. We are not to conclude, however, that because these men have not been brought into conspicuous notice in the brief scriptural record, therefore they were not prominent characters. It is explicitly said of them: "These were the renowned of the congregation, princes of the tribes of their fathers, heads of the thousands in Israel." We extract from the valuable and very interesting volume by the Rev. A. D. Pollock, entitled *The Exode*, the following:

"Those renowned princes of the congregation who reported this census to Moses, of their several tribes, were evidently men of mark in their day. They had not, we may conclude, been idle during that first year of the Exode. It is, doubtless, to their honor, in measure, that the men of Israel, yea, that the families of Israel are disciplined like an army, and disciplined for the march of this Exode. . . . Nothing is said about how such a cumbrous camp moved in order within itself, or how it was that it moved with the same success in the mountains as on the desert plain. They are not idle words which speak of those princes as men of renown in the congregation. To them belongs the honor, I think, of the Exode's being such a short and simple story. . . . Order is heaven's own law, and quiet is heaven's beautiful and glorious prerogative. Certain it is, that in the course of a year, this remarkable people have become disciplined to surprising perfection." *Exode*, 546.

Of like purport is the following rather effusive utterance by a modern pulpit orator:

"We find that the great workmen of history are the men who grew up in stillness, but when the storm came they could stand up in fearless strength, fling back the challenge in the teeth of the world, and steal muscle from the tornado—Moses forty years by Horeb; Elijah cloistered among the rocks of Gilead; the Baptist in the wilderness; Luther in the convent at Erfurth, and the Son of God thirty years in gentle Nazareth."



These remarks are appropriate in our consideration of the character and career of Caleb. He is not mentioned until about the close of the second year of the Exode, not at all during the thirty-eight years of backward wandering, and only twice after the crossing of Jordan. But when presented to our view at long intervals, he so appears that we are sure that meanwhile he must have been observed and admired by his people. As Dean Stanley says, *He always matched his work!*

We meet with Caleb first in Numbers xiii.

The Israelites were now encamped in the wilderness of Paran, on the south of Canaan, on the borders of the Promised Land. It would seem by comparing the account in Numbers with that given in Deuteronomy that Moses had come to the people with the command: "Behold, the Lord thy God hath set the land before thee; go up and possess it, as the Lord God of thy fathers hath said unto thee; fear not, neither be discouraged." But the people hesitated, and asked that an exploration of the land should be made in advance. To this request, though having its origin in distrust of God's promise, Moses by divine direction acceded, and twelve men, heads of the children of Israel, one from each tribe, were sent forward to spy out the land and bring back a report. Of the tribe of Judah, Caleb, the son of Jephunneh; and of the tribe of Ephraim, Joshua, the son of Nun. This expedition was, necessarily, one of labor and peril. Indeed, we cannot readily conceive how twelve men could penetrate a hostile country, explore its territory and resources, become acquainted with the character of the people, and the condition of its defences, and, for forty days, remain undetected. Possibly, the enmity of the Canaanites was not yet developed and the purpose of the strangers was not suspected; possibly, the wonderful and alarming spectacle, visible from their south border, of the lofty pillar of cloud by day, and fire by night, ever approaching nearer, had overawed them, and they feared by an act of violence to bring upon themselves the anger of a people thus miraculously conducted. But of this we are sure: the power of Jehovah that had delivered, defended, and conducted Israel, was sufficient to provide for the safety of this advance corps of explorers.

VOL. XXXV., NO. 2—5.

Supposing that they were unmolested, we can well imagine how delightful to these men, who, for the greater part of a year, had been toiling in their wilderness marchings, it would be to come, in the early autumn, into an elevated region covered with grass, enriched with fruits and vines, watered by pure streams, and abounding in flocks and herds—flowing with milk and honey. Never in low-lying, fertile Egypt, had their eyes been greeted with such a vision as the fair valley of Eschol, sheltered by its vine-clad hills.

But scenes of delight were not the only objects that occupied their attention. The cities were walled and very great, and the men were of gigantic size.

What shall be the report of this important commission of twelve upon their return to Moses? Doubtless many and vehement were the consultations they held. If possible, the report ought to be unanimous. But it was not. They were compelled to bring in a majority and a minority report, and the minority report had but two supporters—10 to 2! Could not the two yield and come over? No. For these two were Caleb and Joshua. And *Judah* was a lion's whelp, and Ephraim had the prerogative birth-right in the blessing of him "who was separate from his brethren." Theirs was the spirit expressed in the modern apothegm of faith and courage: "One with God is a majority."

The report consisted of two parts—a statement of the facts observed, and the proposition based upon them. As to the statement, there was little difference of opinion:

"We came into the land whither thou sentest us, and surely it floweth with milk and honey, and this is the fruit of it. Nevertheless, the people be strong that dwell in the land, and the cities are walled and very great; and moreover, we saw the children of Anak there. The Amalekites dwell in the land of the South, and the Hittites and the Jebusites and the Amorites dwell in the mountains, and the Canaanites dwell by the sea, and by the coast of Jordan."

This recital of dangers and obstacles alarmed the people. At once they became agitated. Caleb attempted to still them, and hastened to offer the bold resolution agreed upon by Joshua and himself, notwithstanding the smallness of the minority, which

was exhausted when one had made the motion and the other had seconded it. The resolution is brief and bold: "Let us go up at once and possess it."

But the majority of 10 to 2 offered the counter-resolution: "We be not able to go up against this people, for they are stronger than we . . . and all the people we saw there are men of great stature. And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants, and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight." .

And thereupon ensued a panic in the great encampment. All the congregation lifted up their voice and cried and the people wept all that night, and madly and wickedly said: "Would God that we had died in the land of Egypt, or in this wilderness! Let us make a captain, and let us return into Egypt!"

Wonderful, indeed, seems to us this frantic fear of this God-guided and protected people. Could they forget the Red Sea—and was not the exulting song ringing in their ears, "The Lord is a man of war!" and Miriam's antistrophic response, "He hath triumphed gloriously"? Were they not daily eating manna from heaven, and drinking water from the gushing rock? And these very Amalekites, of whom they were in such mortal dread, were they not the very foes whom they had but a little while before discomfited with the edge of the sword? And under whom as their leader? This very Joshua who is now calling to them, "Let us go up at once and possess the land, for we are very well able to possess it. Fear not the people of the land. The Lord is with us. Fear them not"!

Amazing, indeed, to us seems all this. Yet let us not be too severe in our judgment. They were just out of bondage, and slaves are of necessity cowards. They had not faced the danger of battle array, for the victory at Rephidim had been gained by a select detachment. Moreover, they were poorly armed. Their weapons they gathered afterwards, mainly from defeated enemies. They certainly had no battering-rams with which to assault these great walled cities. They had to learn at Jericho that rams' horns could be substituted for them. And then, too, the tents were full of women and children. For wives and children men

freely dare to die, but the thought of exposing them to death, melts the hearts of the bravest.

The panic seems to have been universal. Where now are the princes of the tribes, the rulers, and heads of families? Swept along in the general terror. No one attempts to stem it, except Moses and Aaron, prostrate on the ground in prayer before the assembly of the congregations, and Joshua and Caleb, with rended garments, running among the people to expostulate with them for their cowardice and sin. But in vain. A cyclone is not stayed by the tallest trees that stand in its path. The tumult swells higher and higher. They are about to stone Joshua and Caleb, and most probably Moses and Aaron along with them. Moses had, once before, cried unto the Lord, "This people be almost ready to stone me."

But, suddenly, another actor appears upon this tempestuous scene. It is He "who stilleth the noise of the waves, and the tumult of the people." The glory of the Lord appeared in the tabernacle of the congregation, before all the children of Israel. God declares his wrath to the terror-stricken transgressors: "I will smite them with the pestilence and disinherit them." Now the prostrate Moses, who just before was entreating the people not to sin against the majesty of God, intercedes for those who had been ready perhaps to stone him. "Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people, according to the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people, from Egypt until now." And the Lord heard him, but announced as the doom of the transgressors that, from twenty years and up, they should not enter the land of Canaan, but should die in the wilderness. "Except Joshua, the son of Nun, and my servant, Caleb, who hath followed me fully." As an earnest of the certainty of the sentence pronounced, the majority, ten, of the spies, died by the plague before the Lord, in the presence of the people, and the people are turned backwards to their forty years' wandering in the Sinaitic Peninsula.

"Of some seven and thirty years of the Exode, there is next to nothing written. A few only of the incidents are written, and these are not dated, nor the locality of their occurrence indicated at all, so far as I can

see. A man publicly stoned to death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath day; a very large company of the people, with Korah, Dathan, and Abiram at their head, are swallowed up by an earthquake; the congregation is unspeakably annoyed and many of them perish by serpents; water is again supplied by miracle; Aaron and Miriam die. These, I think, are all the narrative facts that go upon the record in the books of Moses in this period of more than seven-and-thirty years." *Exode*, p. 603.

Some addition ought perhaps to be made to this synopsis, but unquestionably the Scripture record is very brief to cover such a space of time.

No mention is made of Caleb during this time. Yet we may reasonably suppose that in the daily requirements and recurring emergencies of this difficult and long protracted march, Moses would often need the services of able lieutenants. He knew, without searching, where he could always find two upon whom he might rely to do their part in carrying into effect the commands of Jehovah. Of Joshua and Caleb it had been established that they "fully followed the Lord." Of their character, there was no question among the people. No one thought of tampering with them. They were not to be seduced nor terrified. And to their persons was attached a mysterious awe not belonging to that of Moses himself. Of the twelve spies, only these two had stood untouched by the stroke from the hand of God. Of all the adult generation, only these two were to enter the promised land. Perhaps as the life of some of the doomed ones was prolonged beyond that of others, the fallacious hope had crept into the minds of the survivors that the sentence would not be literally executed, and that they would be spared. But as they dropped in the wilderness one by one, until the last one had disappeared, these two assured survivors would seem, in the eyes of the people, to have the halo of immortality resting on their heads. And as the encampment drew near a second time to the borders of Canaan, how eagerly would the younger men gather around these two ancients, to learn what they had seen there of giant men, walled cities, and smiling valleys that flowed with milk and honey.

The name of Caleb next occurs in Numbers xxxiv., when the Israelites are again on the borders of Canaan. Shortly before the death of Moses and the transfer of his authority to Joshua,

another commission was appointed by the order of God, for the purpose of dividing out in the land of Canaan the inheritance to be afterwards assigned by lot in portions to the several tribes. This commission was to act under the general superintendence of Eleazar, son and successor of Aaron, and Joshua, the son of Nun. At its head is placed Caleb. The absence of the names of the unfaithful spies is a dread reminder of their fate. In the list of names Caleb, who on the former occasion was designated as a ruler of the tribe of Judah, is now styled *prince*. This dignity had been held by Nashon, but he, too, had fallen in the wilderness. He was a man of renown as well as a prince and military leader of the tribe of Judah, but notwithstanding all this, he did not take his stand with Caleb in endeavoring to still the people. Not fame, rank, nor even courage, are of themselves always sufficient for supreme emergencies. The only unfailing way, is to follow the Lord fully.

The names of the surveying party were announced by God himself. In the sight of divine wisdom, he is the fit man to be intrusted with its leadership, who was not afraid of giants, nor of a majority of 10 to 2, nor of a frantic people ready to stone him. He is sure to follow the Lord fully.

The work done by Caleb and his associates, set forth by metes and bounds, is recorded in the fourteenth and several following chapters of Joshua. The actual final distribution by lot took place in Shiloh, before the Lord, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. At this division it appears that only seven tribes drew lots. The assignment to Judah presents us with a characteristic scene in the life of Caleb. It is best given in the words of Scripture, and cannot be abridged:

"Then the children of Judah came unto Joshua in Gilgal; and Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, said unto him, Thou knowest the thing that the Lord said unto Moses, the man of God, concerning me and thee in Kadesh-barnea. Forty years old was I when Moses, the servant of the Lord, sent me from Kadesh-barnea to espy out the land; and I brought him word again as it was in mine heart. Nevertheless, my brethren that went up with me made the heart of the people melt; but I wholly followed the Lord my God. And Moses sware on that day, saying, Surely the land whereon thy feet have trodden shall be thine inheritance, and

thy children's for ever. because thou hast wholly followed the Lord my God. And now, behold, the Lord hath kept me alive, as he said, these forty and five years, even since the Lord spake this word unto Moses, while the children of Israel wandered in the wilderness; and now, lo, I am this day fourscore and five years old. As yet I am as strong this day as I was in the day that Moses sent me: as my strength was then, even so is my strength now for war, both to go out, and to come in. Now, therefore, give me this mountain whereof the Lord spake in that day; for thou heardest in that day how the Anakims were there, and that the cities were great and fenced; if so be the Lord will be with me, then I shall be able to drive them out, as the Lord said. And Joshua blessed him, and gave unto Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, Hebron for an inheritance. Hebron, therefore, became the inheritance of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, unto this day, because that he wholly followed the Lord God of Israel."

How striking is the manliness with which he asserts his claim before Joshua, his old comrade, now the recognised leader of the host! The children of Israel were taking possession of the land by virtue of God's covenant with Abraham. But God, through Moses, had made a special promise of a particular portion of it to Caleb. Not to assert his prerogative, would be to under-value the divine distinction. To subject him to the lot would be to confound him with the multitude, and thus to be irreverent towards God, and to weaken the force of the lesson intended to be impressed. Joshua, with a blessing, allowed him his choice, and not a bosom in the vast assembly begrudged it to the ever faithful man who had fully followed the Lord.

The choice was in keeping with the man. Doubtless, when near half a century before he had with hasty steps traversed the land for forty days, no place had so filled him with enthusiastic admiration as the fertile valley of Hebron. "It was a winding valley, whose terraces were covered with the rich verdure and golden clusters of the Syrian vine, so rarely seen in Egypt, so beautiful a vesture of the bare hills of Palestine." [Stanley.] The ready wish may have sprung up into Caleb's heart that this might be his habitation in the land into which he then expected to enter without delay. Bitter must have been his disappointment when the backward wandering was begun. But he never forgot Hebron. We can imagine in what glowing language, in

after years, he would picture to eager listeners its attractions, never looked upon by any of the vast congregation except Joshua and himself. But he had been assured by God that he should enter the land, and the promise of Moses he might well construe as a title-deed to the fair valley whose beauties would be enhanced to his imagination by the contrast of forty years' wandering through the great and terrible wilderness.

Added to the attractiveness of its beauty was the reverential awe which overhung Hebron as the ancestral burying place of Israel. Hebron held the cave of Machpelah. Caleb had often heard repeated the charge of dying Jacob to his son, to lay him with his fathers in the cave that is in the field of Machpelah: "There they buried Abraham and Sarah, his wife; there they buried Isaac and Rebekah, his wife; and there I buried Leah."

Caleb does not refer to this; we do not suppose that there was much overflow of sentiment in his temperament, but it is reasonable to think that it was, more or less consciously, in his mind. One thing, however, he signalises: "Give me this *mountain*!" The rich, sloping valley was attractive; the towering back-ground mountain was inspiring. Mountains always are to courageous spirits. The Anakims are there! What of that? Caleb had seen them before, and he is not indisposed to renew the acquaintance under more favorable circumstances. The brave faith of the old warrior refuses to be daunted by giants and fenced cities. Give me this mountain! "If so be the Lord will be with me, I shall be able to drive them out, as the Lord said." He had followed the Lord fully before; he is ready to do it again. We will not set down to boasting or pride what he said about his undiminished strength; if there was a little touch of extra manhood in it, we pardon him. And he did drive them out, and that right speedily. For our better relish of his success, their names are given: "Sheshai, and Ahiman, and Talmi, the sons of Anak."

There lay to the south of Hebron, Kirjath-Sepher, which Caleb deemed it important to take possession of. "It is historically famous as the strong city, for the capture of which Caleb held forth the hand of Achsah as the prize. The prize was won by his gallant nephew Othniel, afterwards a judge in Israel."



*Kitto.* (Our translation makes Othniel the *brother* of Caleb. The Hebrew word has a varied use in the Old Testament, as has also the Greek word in the New.) It is a pleasing thought that the young people were already tenderly acquainted with each other, and that love for his fair cousin stimulated the hereditary valor of Othniel. Kirjath-Sepher means *Book-city*. What sort of books the Canaanites could have, we are at a loss to conjecture. Whatever their character, we may suppose that their literature was not highly prized by Caleb, for he changed the name of the city to *Debir*.

The sacred records give us no account of any further achievement by Caleb. He is still prince of the foremost of Israel's tribes, which has the assurance that the sceptre should not depart from it, until a still wider, and, at that time, incomprehensible prophetic blessing should crown and complete its history. The grand mountain of his long desire rears itself behind him, a trophy and a bulwark; the outstretching valley offers up its riches to him; he is the custodian of the sepulchre of his ancestors from the beginning; his children and children's children, settled around him, rise up to bless him; he is, since the death of Joshua, the sole survivor of the men who had known the Egyptians on the Nile, and seen them engulfed in the Red Sea; he had finished, without a single failure, the work given him to do, and, best of all, he had the witness of his own conscience, the testimony of Moses, and the declaration of Jehovah, that *he had fully followed the Lord!*

It is probable that Caleb enjoyed the tranquillity of old age, with few of its infirmities, for no inconsiderable length of time. Joshua died 110 years old; considering the remarkable vigor of Caleb, we may not unreasonably allow to him ten years more of life than to Joshua. This would equal that of Moses, and it may be divided, though not strictly, into three analogous periods of forty years each—in Egypt, in the wilderness, and in Canaan. Thus, he waited for his appointed change, and what a magnificent waiting!

In Ecclesiastes, the preacher speaks of the days of declining age as evil days, in which there is no pleasure. This is true for

many, and is necessarily true for all who, like Solomon, depart in age from the path of rectitude in which they walked when young. To teach us that it is not true of all, and never is of those who, following the Lord fully all through life, realise the fulfilment of his most sure word of promise, the example of Caleb is set before us. And in the very opening of the New Testament history, old Simeon repeats the lesson for us, as, having waited for the consolation of Israel, when he saw the Lord's Christ, he blessed God, and said: *Lord, now thou art dismissing thy servant in peace, according to thy word.*

The character of Caleb is so transparent, and his life was so consistent, that it is not difficult to enumerate his principal traits. He was strong, fearless, persistent in action, of clear perception, and sound judgment. His active energy and temperament delighted in the stir of affairs, and marked him out to all as a capable man. He was eminently practical, and lacked perhaps the power of high speculation and wide generalisation that belongs to genius. He was not ambitious, and did not reach after what was above his capacity, nor feel envy or jealousy towards those of his contemporaries who were called to higher dignities. He was content with his position and happy in the complete discharge of all its duties. These characteristics consolidated themselves in his absolute personal independence, and his unshrinking disregard of opposing numbers. He would have worked forty years with Noah in building the ark; stood beside Elijah, fronting the four hundred priests of Baal; or kneeled in company with Daniel at his windows opening towards Jerusalem.

What was the basis of all? It seems the purpose of the sacred word, by its marked iterations, to impress upon the mind of every reader the answer to this question: HE FOLLOWED THE LORD FULLY! Jehovah declared it when he suddenly manifested his glory, and announced the doom of the unbelieving and rebellious people, and both Moses and Joshua, again and again, repeat God's word. Hardly does the name Caleb occur without the addition of this glorious descriptive phrase.

We cannot, any of us, be a deliverer as Moses, or a leader into the promised land as Joshua, but we may, each of us in his ap-

pointed station in life, as Caleb, *follow the Lord fully*. If we do, as sure as God is faithful to his word, we shall dwell in a city more glorious than Hebron, and share in an inheritance fairer than the valley of Eschol.

J. T. L. PRESTON.

---

ARTICLE V.

HEBREWS VI. 1-8 EXPLAINED.

The attempt to explain this passage may seem rash to many. The sight of the text alone may move some to pass over this article in apprehension that it would "launch them on a sea of controversy which has been age after age renewed," and in what they will naturally assume is but a frail bark. But also many, we hope, will feel differently. There must be many that share the writer's dissatisfaction with the attitude of the theological world toward this text, and who scrutinise it often to see if it has not been misunderstood. These will honor a serious attempt to explain it by giving the article a thoughtful perusal. For, though they may hardly expect to find a complete solution of the difficulties they have found in the passage, they may look for suggestions that will, even by the friction of divergent thoughts, evoke clearer perceptions in themselves.

The prevalent sentiment regarding our passage is, that, taken by itself, its plain and obvious meaning implies that truly regenerate persons may apostatise from Christ so as to be past recovery and be finally lost. Those who believe in the final perseverance of elect and regenerate persons, and at the same time are precluded from having the easy recourse of many, and admitting discrepancy in the Scripture, have generally felt content with showing that, according to other Scripture, such cannot be the implication of the passage before us. They accordingly affirm that the character described in the terms of verses 4, 5 is not a

truly regenerate person, not, however, from what appears in the terms themselves, or in the context, but for the (to the text) wholly extraneous reason that other Scripture teaches in the most explicit manner that those whom God elects and renews by the Holy Spirit are his for ever. Accordingly they appeal to such passages as Mark iv. 16, 17, as explaining the sense in which we must take the descriptions of verses 4, 5. As against Arminians, it is common to add that our passage is a dangerous text for their doctrine, that one may fall from a state of grace, seeing it proves more than they believe, viz., the impossibility of one who so falls recovering again the state of grace.

With the common understanding of the meaning of our passage, the application of the rule of interpreting Scripture by Scripture, has rather the appearance of *correcting* Scripture by Scripture. For it is plainer Scripture that is applied to interpret that which is less plain. But our passage seems to lack nothing in plainness. Consequently the appeal to other Scripture is made effective more by *the number* of plain passages that teach the contrary of what our passage seems to teach plainly than by the plainness of their teaching alone. One cannot rest satisfied with such a situation; least of all a true Calvinist. Scriptural doctrine is not to be established by the *vote* of the sacred writers, or of the plain passages of Scripture, but by the *consensus* of the inspired writers. The dissatisfaction with the theological situation relating to our passage found its exponent in Luther, who so stumbled at it that he almost doubted the canonicity of the Epistle, declaring that it seemed to him to contradict all the Gospels and also the Epistles of Paul. The dissatisfaction can only be dispelled when the passage is found (not made) to express what is in evident harmony with other plain Scripture. It is the aim of this article to show that it does this.

Our passage is part of an extended hortatory digression (v. 11-vi. 20), and to be thoroughly understood, must be studied in the light of that whole context. The limits of an article like the present do not admit of all this. Nevertheless we may briefly reproduce the foregoing context (v. 11-14), by way of introduc-

tion to our passage, leaving the interpretation we give of it to commend itself by its self-evidential fitness in the progress of thought, without much of the exegetical process.

At v. 10 the apostle has, as he says (v. 11), named the great subject on which he proposes to discourse, viz., *Christ, a high priest after the order of Melchisedec*.

The discourse he gives, vii. 1-x. 18, in an unbroken and extended argument. But he prefaces it by the extended reflections that include our passage, by which he would prepare the minds of his readers for it. He first pricks their attention by merited rebuke, and at the same time intimates the kind of instruction he will use, viz., what is demanded by their dulness and ignorance (v. 10-14). He says of the subject: "Christ, an high priest, etc., concerning which we have many things to say, and hard of interpretation, seeing ye are become dull of hearing." The extended argument, vii. 1-x. 18, illustrates the "much discourse" (πολὺς ὁ λόγος) that the apostle means, while the method of the argument illustrates the difficulty of the interpretation of his subject. We see that by "hard of interpretation" he means that it is hard for *him* to represent it to his readers in a way that must be both an adequate statement of the truth and a clear explanation of it. He blames this on his readers, "since ye are become dull of hearing." This is not blaming them for ignorance of what he has to teach, but for want of quickness in learning. By "become" is implied that they were once different, and not dull of hearing. In illustration the apostle says: "For when, on account of the time, ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that some one teach you the elements of the beginning of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk, not solid food." The author does not express himself in generalities here, or indeed anywhere. This verse 12 corresponds closely to verse 11, both having two parts conjoined by "and." Verse 11 affirms that he has much to say; and, correspondingly, verse 12 mentions the need of his readers to be taught, and "the elements of the beginning of the oracles of God," as the text for the discourse that makes the discourse so "much." Again, verse 11 says, the subject is "hard to interpret"; verse 12 says the readers

"have need of milk." Saying, "Some one must teach you the elements of the beginning," etc., he intimates that it is therefore his purpose to do the needful thing by them. When he says: "For when ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again to be taught," that expresses the whole of the antithesis. It is not expressed that they need *to be taught over again* "the elements," etc., as something once learned and forgotten. This will be obvious if "teach . . . the elements," etc., is seen to characterise the "much discourse" that the apostle purposes to give. We observe, then, that vii. 1-x. 18, actually corresponds to the instruction here described, as indeed iv. 1-v. 10 has already done. The author rehearses the leading facts relating to Melchisedec (vii. 1-3), the Levitical priesthood (vii. 11 *seq.*), the high priest (viii. 3 *seq.*), the tabernacle (ix. 1-7), sanctification by blood-sprinkling (ix. 15-22); and following each of these is the interpretation illustrating his great theme, the Melchisedec high priest, Jesus Christ. Assuming, then, that by "the elements of the beginning," etc., the author describes the instruction he means to give as needful for his readers, when we further mark the nature of that instruction, we observe that it is actually founded on what is recorded in the Pentateuch, *i. e.*, "the beginning of the oracles of God." This leads us to translate, as we have done, τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, "the elements of the beginning of the oracles of God," and interpret τῆς ἀρχῆς in its simplest sense as qualifying τῶν λογίων, and not as "a descriptive adjective" to τὰ στοιχεῖα, "the first elements."<sup>1</sup> It corroborates this, that at ii. 3 the author marks a similar distinction in the New Testament revelation, repeating *it* vi. 1. That by τῶν λογίων is meant the Old Testament revelation,<sup>2</sup> is the presumption from the other instances of New Testament use of the word;<sup>3</sup> and this is confirmed by the facts of the apostle's subsequent discourse just noted.

Such being the apostle's meaning, he cannot mean that his *readers* ought to be teachers of "the elements," etc., or that they have need to learn these things over again, or that διὰ τὸν χρόνον is to be interpreted "for the time," meaning that they had been long

<sup>1</sup> As Delitzsch.

<sup>2</sup> So von Hofmann, MacKnight.

<sup>3</sup> Acts vii. 38; Rom. iii. 2; 2 Pet. iv. 11.

enough Christians to have learned these things and teach them to others. The instruction is too unique, and the Church, with nineteen centuries to learn, is still too poorly fitted to teach it for it to seem likely that the apostle would blame his readers for not teaching it to others. What they ought to have been teaching is reflected in the admonition, "Exhort one another daily, so long as it is called to-day."<sup>1</sup> That "to-day," made portentous by the "after so long a time," and the impending other day, that makes the apostle say: "and so much the more as ye see the day drawing near,"<sup>2</sup> furnished the motive and the topics for the teaching that the apostle says the readers should be imparting. Hence we translate literally: "For when on account of the time ye ought to be teachers."

Declaring that his readers are become babes needing milk, and not solid food, he interprets his metaphor: "For every one that partakes of milk is unskilled in right speech,"<sup>3</sup> for he is a babe." On the other hand he reminds them of what is becoming for adults: "But for full-grown men there is the solid food, for those who, by reason of use, have their senses exercised to discover both good and bad."

These words do not merely round off the sentiment of those foregoing by stating their antithesis.<sup>4</sup> They affirm what is the food proper for adults, as the emphatic position of *τελειων* denotes.<sup>5</sup> It is unreasonable to suppose that the following participial clause, "for those . . . having their senses exercised," etc., is merely the amplification of "those full-grown." It is not the author's way to expend words so. Such a physiological remark is too singular to be without a special purpose. It reminds those not full-grown that they may become such. This will come about by a discipline that exercises their spiritual apprehensions. The apostle means to use such discipline with his readers. He will not give them only milk, neither does he mean to treat them as full-grown, and give them only solid food. He means to lead them on to full-growth, as he says, vi. 1. To this programme the subsequent discourse, vii. 1-

<sup>1</sup> iii. 13 ; comp. x. 25.

<sup>2</sup> x. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Del., von Hofmann.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. Davidson against Del.

<sup>5</sup> Von Hofmann.

x. 18, exactly corresponds. Step by step a variety of matter is presented, with interpretation that shows what is to be rejected and what, as good, is to be retained and used. Thus the reader's spiritual sense is exercised in distinguishing good and bad. In this process solid food is given; but as one gives meat and fruit to children, teaching them, in the very act, what to use and what to reject. Nothing could better illustrate what the author does with the elements of the beginning of the oracles of God in vii. 1-x. 18. His readers were for eating the shell. He teaches them to throw away the shell and eat only the kernel.

This brings us to our particular passage, which follows closely on the thoughts just expressed with an announcement of a purpose that corresponds. This connexion is denoted by the inferential "wherefore."

- "Wherefore, leaving the word of the beginning of Christ, let us press on to full-growth."

We have just noted the logical relation of "wherefore" to v. 14. The process by which full-growth is attained dictates the course now requisite; it is "to press on to full-growth." It is obvious, then, that by *τελειότης* in our verse is meant the same thing as by *τέλειος*, in v. 14. It is the "full-growth" itself that the apostle proposes as the aim, and very properly, seeing he has called his readers "babes." This, of itself, settles the question of the present use of the first person plural, about which expositors are equally divided.<sup>1</sup> Did the apostle propose to go on to consider higher Christian truths, then he might mean: let you and me press on. But with full-growth as the goal, it is the readers that are to press on, and the apostle proposes this aim in the first person plural as offering himself to guide them.

"Full-growth" is a condition, a *status*, and it is presented here as a goal. Consequently nothing in this expression intimates whether what the apostle would impart is solid food or the contrary. In v. 14 we read: "For those full-grown there is the solid food." For those, then, pressing on to full-growth we ought to infer that something different is needed. And if babes have need of milk (v. 12, 13), then we must equally infer that for

<sup>1</sup> See Alford, Lün.



those emerging from babyhood and qualifying themselves as full-grown, something else than milk is needed. What *is* needed, according to the author, we can only infer from his own representation of how full-growth comes about. It is what will exercise the spiritual senses of his readers to distinguish good and bad (v. 14).

In leading his readers to full-growth by the proposed discipline, the author may be expected to assume a point of departure, and make such selection of matter as will best conduce to the result. Both these things he does in the most express manner. He defines his point of departure by saying: "leaving the word of the beginning of Christ." He intimates his selection of matter from which he will teach by saying: "not laying again foundation of repentance . . . and of eternal judgment." For it is erroneous to suppose, as is commonly done, that these two participial clauses mean the same thing, the latter only expressing in detail what is characterised comprehensively in the former. This confounding of what is distinct has much to do with the perplexities that have universally appeared in the exposition of our whole passage. Taking both together, as distinct, yet connected things, a reference to ii. 3 gives us the explanation of the apostle's underlying conceptions. In that passage he represents the preaching of the gospel in two parts, viz., first, that which he describes as "a salvation that took a beginning to be spoken by the Lord;" and then as "it was confirmed by them that heard," etc. The two parts so distinguished are reflected in our verse 1. The former expresses the beginning of all knowledge of Christ and interest in him as involved in his life and ministry on earth, whether we think of that life and ministry itself, or as reproduced in the accounts of the apostles and evangelists. Mark entitles his Gospel: "The beginning of gospel of Christ." We may take this as evidence that the Apostle Peter so designated the same matter when he rehearsed it in preaching. We say Peter, because of the tradition that ascribes so influential a part to him in Mark's Gospel. The latter part of preaching the gospel expressed, ii. 3, by "confirmed by them that heard," denotes the proper apostolic work that confirmed the former. The former part would remain always

VOL. XXXV., NO. 2—6.

the same.<sup>1</sup> The latter part would vary with circumstances, particularly as those instructed had heard more or less of the gospel.

Our author deals with those that have considerable knowledge. He may then dispense with the beginning of the gospel, and therefore he proposes to do so. In this there is no intimation that it is regarded as inferior knowledge; and "leaving" (ἀφέντες) does not mean rising to superior things, or forgetting these things. It is only the usual word by which a speaker waived the present consideration of anything for any reason whatever.<sup>2</sup> And, in fact, we find that the eternal Sonship, the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, are assumed at every step of the subsequent discourse, vii. 1-x. 18.

The apostle, intimating his selection of matter, does it negatively, "not laying again foundation of repentance from dead works," etc. This is natural. The matter he chooses instead will, when presented, show what it is. What he declines to use is mentioned, we may suppose, because such matters were the staple of apostolic instruction, and their treatment might be expected. The preference of other matter of discourse than the topics mentioned, expresses no judgment of the intrinsic or even relative importance of either. It only intimates that what is waved aside suits the author's present purpose less than what he actually uses. Thus it is a great mistake to assume, as is commonly done, that the apostle intimates that what he is about to impart is of the nature of solid food, compared with the word of the beginning of Christ and the things mentioned in relation to the foundation. It must be a relief to most minds to escape such an inference. For it is by no means plain how the subjects treated in the subsequent discourse are deeper or higher than the Christian truths that must be denoted by the terms of our verses 1, 2. On the other hand, it is impossible to regard such matters as follow in this Epistle as milk or elementary matter. They are divine truths that demand the best exercise of a robust spiritual understanding.

The mistaken assumption just referred to may be supposed to be justified by the expression, "not laying again foundation,"

---

<sup>1</sup> Comp. xiii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Del.

by which the apostle is understood to characterise the following things mentioned as belonging to the foundation, and intimating that what he will proceed to is, relatively to that, superstructure. But it is the mistaken assumption that precludes the reader from rightly interpreting *μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι*. It is common for us in English to use the metaphor of a foundation with reference to the notion of a superstructure. This use is common also in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> But it is common to use the word foundation without involving the notion of a superstructure, as when we say well founded in truth and morals, meaning firmly established and steadfast. And in the New Testament this notion of a foundation (*θεμέλιος*) occurs as much as the other.<sup>2</sup> The foundation represents steadfastness, immovability; while laying foundation expresses doing what imparts such steadfastness. Such, we suppose, is the author's meaning here; and this marks another coincidence of thought with ii. 3, besides those already noted. For there the second part of preaching the gospel is represented as "confirming" the first "unto us." Moreover this confirming and being steadfast is a notion of frequent occurrence in our Epistle.<sup>3</sup> And this being so prominent a concern to the apostle, we are led to notice that when he says, "not laying again foundation," this does not express that he does not mean to attend to founding his readers again. His subsequent instruction actually does this,<sup>4</sup> and it is his purpose to do this,<sup>5</sup> for the "boldness" of which he makes so much, is the effect of being well founded and steadfast. But what the apostle means is, that he will not lay foundation in the way expressed by the terms that follow. Reflecting on those terms, we observe that they are just such topics as the apostles used in developing the whole doctrine of Christ and confirming believers in Christ. And our author, who here mentions "the word of the beginning of Christ," says also that Jesus is "the author and perfection of our faith."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *E. g.*, Ephes. ii. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Luke vi. 48, 49; 1 Tim. vi. 19; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Heb. xi. 10; 1 Peter v. 10; Ephes. iii. 18; Col. i. 23.

<sup>3</sup> *E. g.*, iii. 6-14; vi. 16, 19; xiii. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. x. 19-23.

<sup>5</sup> Comp. iii. 14; iv. 16.

<sup>6</sup> xii. 2.

Following *θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι* are various nouns in the genitive, "of repentance," "of faith," "of a doctrine of baptisms," etc. These do not, as is commonly supposed, designate the materials of which the foundation is composed. They are subjective genitives<sup>1</sup> that express the efficient means of giving foundation, i. e., establishing. Thus *θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ* means what God has founded, i. e., made firm.<sup>2</sup> And the rich man's "foundation against the time to come,"<sup>3</sup> might, by the same construction, be called a foundation of doing good, and of munificence in good works, and of willingness to share what he has; the things in the genitive expressing the efficient means by which "he lays up in store that good foundation." So in our verse "repentance," "faith," etc., are the efficient means of founding believers.<sup>4</sup>

As our author mentions the various topics that follow only to express his purpose of saying nothing about them, we can know nothing about them beyond what is plain in the names themselves, as interpreted from other sources. It therefore hardly pertains to the exposition of our passage to dwell on them. These names conveyed definite notions to the readers. They do not equally so to us, as is manifest from the different explanations of them by expositors. Yet only one of the terms is very perplexing, viz., *baptisms*.

The apostle says, "of doctrine<sup>5</sup> of baptisms." We are led by the logical sense of the things here enumerated, and their relation to "laying foundation" as construed above, to take "of doctrine," as the genitive directly connecting with "foundation," and the following substantives in the genitive, "of baptisms, and of laying on hands, and of resurrection, and of judgment," as dependent on *διδασχῆς*.<sup>6</sup> By "doctrine" here is meant the same notion as by "doctrines," xiii. 9. The apostle here means doctrines derived from and illustrated by the things designated in the terms following, in the same fashion as he actually proceeds to impart doctrine

<sup>1</sup> See Winer Gram., p. 186.    <sup>2</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 19.    <sup>3</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. *ἐμβαλλε χεὶρὸς πίστιν*, "give a promise made by the hand." Kühner Gram., II., p. 287.

<sup>5</sup> W. & H. and Lach. read *διδασχῆν*, instead of *διδασχῆς*, that is common to other editors.    <sup>6</sup> See in Alford.

from the consideration of Melchisedec, the Levitical priesthood, etc. By "a doctrine of," etc., therefore, the apostle does not refer to the *loci communes* of Christian instruction, such as his readers were familiar with, or at least had been taught. A definite notion like that would require the article, τῆς διδαχῆς. He means such doctrine as *he* would impart were he proposing to "found" and "confirm" his readers by considering such matters as follow, instead of those he actually chooses to discourse on.

The things mentioned: "baptisms, . . . eternal judgment," are by their very names, especially as they are conjoined with "the word of Christ, repentance from dead works, faith on God," to be understood of Christian things, and not as some suppose,<sup>2</sup> of Old Testament matters, nor of Old Testament and New Testament matters combined.<sup>3</sup> Not even "baptisms" has this reference.<sup>4</sup> What is meant by this plural is obscure; but it may refer to the frequent observance of the ordinance, it being required of every one that believed that he should also be baptized.<sup>5</sup> Discourse on this (not merely the significance of the ordinance itself, but also the need of every believer to be baptized), say after the fashion of Rom. vi. 1-14, would, *mutatis mutandis*, serve admirably to found believers in "faith on God," and convince them that they are redeemed from "dead works," as in Rom. vi. the consideration of baptism shows how believers must "reckon themselves to be dead unto sin and alive unto God in Christ Jesus."

The chief interest, in commenting on the terms used in our verse 2 would be to show, by appeal to other apostolic epistles, especially those of Paul, how the topics named are actually used to confirm disciples that were tempted to let go their hold on Christ for the fallacious confidence of dead works, or the like. Like the appeal just made to Rom. vi. this would help us, if not to conjecture how the author might have used them for the benefit of his readers, at least to see a propriety in mentioning them to say he will not use them, but will pursue another course. But omitting this, confident that the mere suggestion will be enough to re-

<sup>1</sup> Comp. θεμελιώσκει, 1 Pet. v. 10; and βεβαιούσθαι, Heb., xiii. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Com. MacKnight. <sup>3</sup> As Tholuck in Lindsay. <sup>4</sup> Against Lueneman.

<sup>5</sup> So von Hof.; comp. Calvin.

mind others of the illustrations, we would emphasise that from this it appears again how far the apostle is from intimating that the things he chooses not to consider are milk for babes. They are actually treated in the New Testament in a fashion to make them every way the peers of those matters the author prefers for present treatment. In some circumstances, and with readers of a certain kind, he would recur to them. This he proceeds to say in verse 3: "Also this will we do if God permit."

Our interpretation of "not laying again . . . eternal judgment" (verses 1, 2), makes it natural to take τοῦτο, "this," as referring to that way of founding the readers.<sup>1</sup> Other considerations confirm this construction. For τοῦτο refers to the nearest antecedent, unless it is evident that a more remote "is mentally nearer."<sup>2</sup> And in verses 4-6, which give the reason for adding, "if God permit," by showing a situation wherein God may not permit, the point of the representation is in the words, "impossible to renew to repentance," which reflect the expression, "lay a foundation of repentance." Thus there is a close logical connexion, as if the author said: We will lay again the foundation of repentance from dead works, if God permit; for it is impossible to renew some to repentance as they are. Moreover, with reference to the common construction that takes τοῦτο to refer to "let us press on to full growth," we may ask why should God not permit one to do that?<sup>3</sup> Our verse, then, expresses a purpose of doing in the future what for the present may not be done. That is, the apostle will do it if God permit. And here, from the nature of the case again, we must understand the first person plural to mean the apostle alone.

As for those to whom this conditional purpose relates, it is evident that they are others than the readers whom the apostle actually addresses: first, from the representations that follow; then, because they are mentioned in the third person; and, finally, from the express language of verses 9 *seq.* to that effect.

The strange condition, "if God permit," is not the mere *Deo volente* of common discourse.<sup>4</sup> There is reason for apprehending

<sup>1</sup> So von Hof.; see others in Alford. <sup>2</sup> Winer Gram., p. 157.

<sup>3</sup> Von Hof.

<sup>4</sup> Against Davidson.

that God will not permit what the apostle would do. How this may be appears in the representations of verses 4-8, connected by "for." But we should pause to notice, as very important to the understanding of what follows, that it is here implied that what the apostle is ready to do *God may permit*. This antecedently determines the sense in which we are to understand the affirmation, "it is impossible." The "impossible" comes with an antecedent qualification that restricts it to what is actually expressed, and restrains us from taking it without limit. We may, for the sake of precision, so far anticipate as to say that the "impossible" is restricted to the situation where one who has fallen away from Christ is doing what is tantamount to crucifying the Son of God; and if the impending judgment of God shall visit the transgressor while in that situation (verses 6-8).

It is important help to understanding the representations that follow (verses 4, 5), if one bears in mind the preceding warnings of our Epistle. At ii. 2, 3, the apostle deals with his readers as the covenant people of God under a dispensation ministered by angels. That dispensation is one of a word of God that was attended with transgression on the part of his people. The present situation is thus described: "The word spoken by angels became steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward." Under that, then, only such recompence was to be expected. But the apostle and his readers had the word spoken by God's own Son (i. 2) that offered escape from this by a gospel of salvation. Hence the apostle says: "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" Having represented something of this Saviour to the point (iii. 6) where he represents Christ as our high priest, just as he does at v. 10, where our context begins, though less amplified as a subject, the apostle pauses to give a warning and encouragement, having much in common with our v. 11-vi. 12. He treats the readers, as at ii. 2, 3, as under the dispensation ministered by angels, except as they are escaping by faith in Christ (iii. 6). In the words of the Psalmist, he appeals to a particular instance, and the typical one, of the operation of that dispensation and its recompence of transgression, viz., the embitterment in the wilderness. He repre-

sents that unbelief in his readers would be the same transgression as in that ancient case, and leave them exposed to the same fate (iv. 11). Examination of iii. 7-19 shows that the transgression is represented in terms that equally cover the ancient case and the case of those that have the offer of Christ's salvation. This can be no accident. It is the production of skilful authorship. The author studiously identifies the two situations in this way. He thus makes the dread realities of the past, as a manifestation of the will of God, press upon the present with stern and awful threatening. In our present passage the author's warnings pertain to the same subject, and he moves in the same sphere of thought. But there is progress. At ii. 3 it was the danger of neglecting salvation. At iii. 7 *seq.* it was the danger of falling away through unbelief. Here is represented the situation of one who has actually fallen away. Here, not the falling away is the impressive part of the description, as at iii. 7 *seq.*, but what one has fallen from. But the author maintains the same manner of description, viz., he describes in terms that cover both the ancient and the Christian situation, in order to show, as at ii. 2, 3, that the character described is exposed to that just recompence of the word spoken by angels, and the more so because he despises the only salvation from it.

What we have just represented can only be justly appreciated by a careful study of the foregoing chapters of our Epistle. Its chief use for interpreting the words we are about to consider, is the coloring the representations receive from the fact that they are stated in terms suited to cover the transgression in the wilderness and the case of those to whom the offer of salvation through Christ has been made. Yet without this the interpretation of what is represented is not difficult.

The apostle describes persons of whom he affirms it is impossible to renew them to repentance in the following terms: "Those having been once enlightened, and having tasted the heavenly gift, and having become companions of a Holy Spirit, and having tasted a good word of God and powers of a world to come."

These participial clauses we construe as follows:<sup>1</sup> the article

---

<sup>1</sup> With von Hof.



τοῖς belongs to φωτισθέντας alone, and does not extend to the following participles. This is necessitated by the ἅπας, "once," which is a proper qualification of "enlightened," but is unsuited to qualify matters of experience described by "tasted," "become companions of a Holy Spirit." Enlightenment, when given, is a thing done, whose effects remain; tasting involves repeated application. Moreover the τε, by which the following participial expressions are adjoined to φωτισθέντας, denotes that they are not co-ordinated with it,<sup>1</sup> but added as expressing notions involved in the fact of having been enlightened. And this τε, with the two following participial expressions conjoined by καὶ—καὶ, leads up to the adversative καὶ παραπεσόντας (verse 6)<sup>2</sup>

So construed, the most significant term of the sentence is, "those having been once enlightened." By φωτίζειν is meant simply "to inform," or "give intelligence," so that what one was ignorant of he is made to know,<sup>3</sup> or where he was in the dark, he is made to see light. What one was made to know is not expressed,<sup>4</sup> because the matter involved is a thing understood. "The knowledge of the truth" is what is meant. The whole tenor of the Epistle, as well as the present context and x. 26 seq., makes it plain that the apostle has particularly in mind the truth that the offering of Christ provided the blood of the covenant wherewith we are sanctified. What one sees is henceforth to him a visible thing;<sup>5</sup> thus the author appropriately says, "once enlightened." And this is said preliminary to expressing what the persons are doing, viz., "crucifying," etc., (verse 6,) in order to signify that what they do is against light and knowledge. So that it is simply doing violence to our text to represent of these persons that their enlightenment was again "swallowed up by the previous darkness."<sup>6</sup>

To the "enlightening" the apostle *adjoins* by τε—καὶ—καὶ three other experiences that attended it. The first is, "and having tasted the heavenly gift." It is misleading to suppose that this expresses something subsequent to the experience denoted by "having been enlightened." Influenced thus, expositors have named a variety of things as intended by "the heavenly gift," *e. g.*, remission of

<sup>1</sup> Winer Gram., pp. 434, 435. <sup>2</sup> So von Hof. <sup>3</sup> Comp. Ephes. iii. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. x. 32. <sup>5</sup> Comp. Davidson. <sup>6</sup> Against Del.

sins, joy and peace, the Lord's Supper.<sup>1</sup> It is not a different thing from what is denoted by "enlightened" that the author means. In Ephes. iii. 7-9 the apostle names the gospel "of which he was made a minister according to the gift (τὴν δωρεάν) of the grace of God which was given (τῆς δωρεῆς) unto him according to the working of his power (τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ)," as that by whose preaching he was to "enlighten" (φωτίζειν) all men. And in our verse<sup>2</sup> "the gift" has the same meaning with reference to the "enlightening,"<sup>3</sup> and expresses that the knowledge of the truth was a gracious gift; while "heavenly," as is always the meaning of *ἐπουράνιος*,<sup>4</sup> expresses that it was a matter revealed from God, and not before or by other means known on earth.<sup>5</sup>

The chief notion of the clause before us, and what constitutes the progress of thought, is expressed by "having tasted." This denotes a practical experience that *verifies* the knowledge received. It is thus the Apostle Peter uses the same expression: "If ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious."<sup>6</sup>

The next trait is, "and having become companions of a Holy Spirit." So we translate *μέτοχος*, "companion,"<sup>7</sup> as we would do also at i. 9; iii. 14. The word occurs again in our Epistle iii. 1; xii. 8; and in Luke v. 7. In all these, "companion" or "partner," gives a good meaning, while in most of them no other is admissible. In the LXX.<sup>8</sup> this is the common meaning. Where *μέτοχος* is joined to a genitive substantive, denoting a person, "companion," is the necessary meaning. It is only because there is a mystical communion between Christ and believers, and the Holy Spirit and believers, that we find it possible to understand *μέτοχος*, when combined with those names, as meaning "partaker," in the sense of receiving an impartation of themselves. In any other personal connexion that meaning would be impossible, *e. g.*, *μέτοχος ἐγὼ εἰμι πάντων τῶν φοβουμένων σε*.<sup>9</sup> Thus, though "partakers of the Holy Spirit," in the sense of receiving the self-impartation of

<sup>1</sup> See in Alford. <sup>2</sup> Comp. Lindsay. <sup>3</sup> Comp. Jno. iv. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. Jno. iii. 12, 13. <sup>5</sup> Comp. Ephes. iii. 5, 9.

<sup>6</sup> 1 Peter ii. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Wickliffe translated the *participes* of the Vulgate "partners."

<sup>8</sup> See Schleusner Lex. *sub voc.* <sup>9</sup> LXX., Ps. cxviii. 63.

the Holy Spirit, is correct, both as to notion and expression, we may doubt whether the expression of our clause is intended to denote that. Certainly we are justified in taking it to express the notion, "companions of a Holy Spirit," if we find elsewhere the evidence that this was a familiar notion. Of this there is evidence enough, but this article cannot produce them in full.<sup>1</sup> The leader of Christians is the Holy Spirit. Taking, then, the apostle's meaning to be that the persons described became "companions of a Holy Spirit," we suppose that here, as at iii. 14, where he says, "we are become companions of Christ," he intimates a parallel with those in the wilderness who were led by the Spirit, and thus were his companions, as they were the companions of Moses, their human leader. Saying "a Holy Spirit," without the article, he leaves the word "Holy" emphatic, as laying stress on what kind of a Spirit attended them,<sup>2</sup> and thus enhances the sin of having fallen away, and of what they are now doing, "rebellating against and vexing that Spirit."

The next trait is, "and having tasted a good word of God and powers of a coming world." What is said on "having tasted," as it recurs above, applies here. Concerning the expressions before us we have no hesitation, such as is expressed by others,<sup>3</sup> in understanding that they are chosen with reference to the experience in the wilderness. Taken with the foregoing expression relating to the leading of the Spirit, they present a close parallel to Deut. viii. 2, 3, where note particularly, "remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee, . . . and he fed thee with manna . . . that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word (LXX. ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι) that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord."

In "a good word of God" we have the notion of "word of God," in the passage cited, in its fuller expression as used by the contemporaries of Moses and later generations. We find Joshua<sup>4</sup> saying: "There did not fail anything of the good words

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ps. cxliii. 10; Isa. xlviii. 16, 17; lxiii. 10-12; Hag. ii. 5; Neh. ix. 20; Jno. xvi. 13; Acts vii. 51; Rom. viii. 14; Gal. v. 18.

<sup>2</sup> So von Hof.

<sup>3</sup> See Alford.

<sup>4</sup> Josh. xxi. 43; comp. xxiii. 15.

(ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν καλῶν ὧν ἐλάλησε Κύριος) that the Lord spoke." For Joshua, "the good word of God" was the promise of Canaan, which was the better manna that sustained such life as his in the wilderness. For Jeremiah and Zechariah,<sup>1</sup> "the good word of God" meant another thing suited to their time, but still a promise. Our author says: "A good word," without the article, in which we notice the skilful design by which an expression belonging to the ancient situation is modified to cover both that and the Christian situation of which he speaks. Though not "the good word," it was "a good word," of the same kind. It is a promise he means. What the promise relates to is intimated by the following clause, closely adjoined by τε: "and powers of a world to come." So adjoined, and dependent on "having tasted," the notion thus expressed forms part of the foregoing expression. The ancient parallel helps us to understand how the two notions are related. The miracle of the manna demonstrated the truth of that word of promise that was the real livelihood of those in the wilderness. By that, and other works of power, they tasted the good word; in other words, they had the proof of actual experience to assure them and make them steadfast to the end. The persons now described had also "a good word of God," similarly demonstrated as reliable by their "tasting powers of a world to come," to which that promise referred. By "powers" the apostle means miraculous confirmations of the Holy Spirit as at ii. 4. By "world (αἰών) to come" is meant the same as "world (οἰκουμένη) to come" (ii. 5), but regarded here temporally as an "age," and not as "the inhabited earth."

"This world to come is not only an object of promise. Its marvellous powers are tasted even here. They are a prelude and foretaste vouchsafed already of that future redemption which is still in progress. The world to come has not yet appeared, but is already present as the hidden background of the world that now is, waiting for its manifestation, and perpetually breaking through the crust that confines it."<sup>2</sup>

Having thus described the previous condition of the persons referred to, the apostle adds the adversative: "and having fallen

<sup>1</sup> Jer. xxix. 10; Zech. i. 13. <sup>2</sup> Del.

away." The word *παρὰπίπτω* does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament. But it often occurs in the LXX., especially to render *חָטָא*, meaning "to transgress," "trespass."<sup>1</sup> It occurs most frequently in Ezekiel,<sup>2</sup> with its cognate noun *παράπτωμα*. And it is at least remarkable that we find it in a context that represents precisely the same severe truth expressed in our passage. "But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity . . . shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he hath trespassed . . . shall he die (*ἐν τῷ παραπτώματι αὐτοῦ ὃ παρέπεσε . . . ἀποθανεῖται*)."<sup>3</sup> Nor ought we to overlook how, in a similar connexion, Ezekiel uses imagery resembling the comparison of our verses 7, 8. "Son of man, when the land sinneth against me by trespassing grievously (*γῆ ἣ ἐὰν ἀμάρτη μοι τοῦ παραπεσεῖν παράπτωμα*), then will I stretch out my hand upon it, and break the staff of the bread thereof."<sup>4</sup> "They shall go out from one fire and another fire shall devour them." "And I will make the land desolate because they have committed a trespass (*καὶ δώσω τὴν γῆν εἰς ἀφανισμόν ἀνθ' ὧν παρέπεσον παραπτώματι*)."<sup>5</sup> It does not seem likely that these coincidences of thought and expression, beside the mere use of the word *παρὰπίπτω*, should have escaped the notice of an expositor like Grotius, and of others since.<sup>6</sup> Yet, though they have been made no account of by others, we cannot resist the conviction that they influenced the apostle in writing our present context. We may refer to these passages, not only to settle the meaning of the word *παρὰπίπτω*, but also for illustration of the truth that our passage represents. As for "having fallen away," it means a turning away from God's revelation in Christ, as the Jews in Canaan turned from God to the idols of the country. It is, in fact, apostasy.<sup>7</sup>

Of the persons so described, the apostle affirms: "It is impossible to renew them again to repentance." He says, *again*, not in antithesis to the *once*, (*ἀπαξ*,) ver. 4, which we have seen does not extend to all that which must be "renewed" in those that

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Grotius. <sup>2</sup> Ezek. xiv. 13; xv. 8; xviii. 24, 26; xx. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Ezek. xviii. 24. <sup>4</sup> Ezek. xiv. 13. <sup>5</sup> Ezek. xv. 7, 8. <sup>6</sup> Comp. Lindsay.

<sup>7</sup> See Grotius.

have fallen away; but because "renewing" would be a deed that would repeat a former deed, seeing they had already been what that deed would make them. By "renew" (*ἀνακαινίζειν*) is not meant "regeneration."<sup>1</sup> It is not an accident that the author uses this word, and not *ἀνακαινοῦν*.<sup>2</sup> The former must be viewed as a synonym of *ἐπιστρέφειν*, "to turn one," as in Lam. v. 21. The latter is a word of Paul's coining, to denote the Christian truth of "the redemptive activity of God, corresponding to the creation of man, which, by putting an end to his existing corrupt state, constitutes a new beginning." "Closely combined with *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, *ἀνακαινίζειν* denotes a restoration out of the present state of the sinner into which he has fallen by his sin, in the direction of a change of mind thereby achieved. The change of mind must be a return from the wrong way, which it is the sin of the sinner to have taken, and return to the way he left."<sup>3</sup>

We must note that the apostle does not say, "it is impossible for them to repent." It is common to discourse on this passage as if he did, or, at least, as if this were involved in what is affirmed. But nothing of the kind is affirmed, and the context precludes our supposing it to be involved in what is said. For the apostle has said, "this we will do, if God permit," and the present representations show a situation where God may (not will) not permit. If God permit, then, the apostle will labor with them, for then it is possible for them to repent. Thus he says, "it is impossible to renew them again to repentance," with reference to what he and others might do for their repentance.

Why this is impossible is expressed in the following clause: "The while<sup>4</sup> they crucify to themselves the Son of God and put him to an open shame." We need not take the *ἀνά* in composition as meaning "afresh." It means "up," and expresses the lifting up on the cross when one was crucified.<sup>5</sup> The rendering, "afresh," rather mars than enhances what is said. For the persons referred to did not before crucify Christ, and so their present doing would not for them be doing the same thing over. Crucifying him that had been crucified would be doing it again, and

<sup>1</sup> With von Hof.; against Alford, etc. <sup>2</sup> von Hof. and Cremer Lex.

<sup>3</sup> von Hof. <sup>4</sup> Version 1881, margin. <sup>5</sup> Grot., von Hof.

for that reason needs no "afresh" to express it.<sup>1</sup> It is *ἐαυτοῖς* that is emphatic, and the double point of what is affirmed is, that "they hang him up on the cross, where for their part they would have him";<sup>2</sup> and that it is the Son of God whom they so crucify, by which glorious name is not only indicated the greatness of the crime, as an outward fact, but also that he whom they crucify is known to them as such, for they have been enlightened. Doing so, "they put him to an open shame;" "they expose him to view as one who got his dues when he was crucified. For by turning their back on him, they declare him to have deserved what the Jews did to him, and repeat the act as far as it is now possible to do so."<sup>3</sup>

What is thus stated, with present participles, must not be taken as exegetical of the act expressed by the foregoing aorist participle, "having fallen away." Not only does the difference in tense forbid it, but also the intervening *πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν*, especially as our present participles follow the latter as accounting for what is there predicated. It is not the past act, viz., that they fell away (aorist), that makes the impossibility of renewing to repentance; but the present doing in the situation to which falling away brought them.<sup>4</sup> This doing itself, apart from its aggravated wickedness, made it impossible; for it is the preaching of Christ crucified that effects repentance, and those that are themselves crucifying him cannot experience *that* power of the cross. There is, indeed, a subjective condition in such persons that makes repentance impossible. But in the case here presented, it amounts to this: that it is impossible for them to be influenced in opposite directions by the same thing at the same time. While they are crucifying Christ, the cross of Christ cannot crucify them to the world or dead works.<sup>5</sup>

Delitzsch, opposing this interpretation as given by von Hofmann, objects "that it amounts to the identical proposition, that it is impossible to renew to repentance persons that have once fallen away, so long as they do not repent."

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Davidson. <sup>2</sup> von Hof. <sup>3</sup> von Hof.; comp. Grot.

<sup>4</sup> So Harless in his "Christliche Ethik," 4te Aufl., p. 130 *seq.*; von Hof.; Farrar, "Early Days of Christianity," Chap. xviii., §3.

<sup>5</sup> Gal. vi. 14.

But this is gratuitous mystification. It would have some color if the affirmation were: "It is impossible for them to repent." But as the present representation relates to what others may do for their repentance, it has none. "Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone;"<sup>1</sup> may that, too, be resolved into the identical proposition? Moreover, we are to bear in mind that repentance here is a particular notion, defined by the representations of verses 4, 5. It is renewal to that condition there described, and from which the persons referred to have fallen. That is impossible while they are virtually crucifying Christ.

But their doing gives reason to fear that nothing may be done to renew them to repentance, because of its aggravated wickedness. For the apostle has said, "if God permit;" and it is more important, *as it is ultimately all-determining, how God may be affected* by what the persons are doing, than how *they* are *subjectively* affected. And the apostle proceeds (verses 7, 8) to represent the part of God in the situation described. This he does by a simile that is almost a parable.<sup>2</sup> "For the land which hath drunk the rain which cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for those for whose sake it is also tilled, receiveth blessing from God; but bearing thorns and thistles, it is worthless and nigh unto a curse, whose end is for burning."

It is commonly supposed<sup>3</sup> that this parable is prompted by Deut. xxix. 22, 23. But in view of what we have presented above, there is more reason for supposing that it is prompted by Ezek. xiv. 13; xv. 7, 8; or we may recognise the influence of both passages. From Ezek. xiv. 13, we see that our *γῆ* means an inhabited "land," and is therefore not to be translated "ground." The same is indicated also by the large tracts of "rain" and many inhabitants (*ἐκεῖνοις*). Thus it cannot be the owners that devote the land to burning, as might be the case with a single estate. Nothing can be further from the author's thought than the notion of burning over ground for improving it.<sup>4</sup> It is God that sends the rain, who also devotes the land to destruction. What is expressed in the first part of the parable is, that "the land brings forth to those for whose sake it is tilled," and the

<sup>1</sup> Hos. iv. 17. <sup>2</sup> Comp. Davidson. <sup>3</sup> See in Alford. <sup>4</sup> Against Stuart.



καὶ γεωργεῖται calls attention to their labor as added to the influence of the rain, and thus as deserving this return. On the other hand, that "God blesses" the land, denotes the interest *he* has in it, looking for it to be what his rains were intended to make it. The correspondences to these traits of the parable are: those that receive the gospel; God that sends it; the teachers that impart it, such as, *e. g.*, the apostle who writes.<sup>1</sup> In the second part of the parable, understanding the land to enjoy the same frequent rain and good tillage, we must understand that it is God who determines whether the land is to be cursed or not. For the one that blesses must also be the one to curse. Paraphrasing, then, the parable in the terms of the realities it is meant to illustrate, it expresses that those who enjoy the advantages described verses 4, 5, and yield the proper fruit to such as the apostle, shall receive God's blessing. But those who with the same advantages, not only yield no good fruit, but the very opposite, *viz.*, apostasy, "are worthless and nigh unto a curse, whose end is for burning." With the majority of expositors,<sup>2</sup> we understand "whose" (ὅς) to refer to the "land," and the meaning to be, if *actually* cursed, then the land is destined to burning, *i. e.*, a destruction fearful and complete as burning.<sup>3</sup> Being "nigh unto a curse," however, denotes that the judgment impends,<sup>4</sup> yet has not actually fallen; and thus it is not certain that burning is the end of that land. In other words, it is not certain that the persons described verses 4-6 are irretrievably lost. It is a situation that allows the apostle to say, "if God permit." The judgment is near.<sup>5</sup> It is a question of time. If it falls while those persons continue as they are, then God will not have permitted. They will receive "the judgment and fervor of fire that is to devour the adversaries."<sup>6</sup>

In reference to the controverted topics concerning which our passage has held so important a position, we may sum up as follows:

Persons enlightened and experienced in the gospel as described verses 4, 5, may apostatise.

<sup>1</sup> So Alford. <sup>2</sup> See in Alford. <sup>3</sup> Comp. x. 27. <sup>4</sup> Comp. ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμού, viii. 13. <sup>5</sup> Com. iii. 12; iv. 11-13; x. 25, 36, 37; xii. 25-27. <sup>6</sup> X. 27.

In that state of apostasy they may be the subjects of efforts to renew them to repentance, thus they must be regarded as persons that may repent.

If, having apostatised, their doing is such as to make them active accomplices of those that crucified Christ, then it is impossible to renew them to repentance. Yet this is no absolute impossibility, consequent on what they have become, as that they are subjectively hardened, and by the will of God already reprobate. It is first, because, while actively and actually crucifying Christ, they are rejecting the very truth that effects repentance; and secondly, but chiefly, because God may not permit anything to be done for their repentance, or grant them opportunity for repentance.<sup>1</sup> This is a question of judgment and time. They are "nigh unto a curse," and a "burning" destruction is the end of those that are cursed. Yet God may permit. In which case they are to be treated as those that may repent. The apostle stood ready so to treat the persons described, did God permit.

Therefore, the sin represented here is not the sin against the Holy Ghost.<sup>2</sup> Did the apostle describe a case where he knew the will of God is that repentance cannot be, he could not propose to labor for that repentance.<sup>3</sup>

Our passage represents that such as are described verses 4, 5, may fall away and be finally lost. The much debated question is: *Do verses 4, 5, describe regenerate Christians?* Many affirm that it is obvious that they do. Some<sup>4</sup> that so affirm this, think it so obvious, that they are ready to regard those that affirm the contrary as past reasoning with. For the most part, expositors have taken one view or the other, according to their dogmatic convictions.

In determining this question, let us remember, as has been shown, that the apostle identifies the Christian situation that he describes with the situation in the wilderness, as he does in the representations of iii. 7-19. And, further, he identifies it with the situation with which Ezekiel dealt xviii. 24. If it has not

---

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Acts xi. 18.    <sup>2</sup> Against Delitzsch.    <sup>3</sup> Comp. 1 John v. 16.

<sup>4</sup> *E. g.* Del.; Alford.

been made plain in the foregoing exposition that the apostle does so, *we* are still justified in detecting for ourselves that the situations *are* identical. In the wilderness, the subjects of gracious promise, of miraculous help, and who had also committed themselves to divine guidance, and fed on the promises, actually fell away and were destroyed. In Ezekiel, the righteousness which if persevered in would have been the righteous man's life, is made no account of if he turn from his righteousness. He shall perish. Thus our passage presents nothing peculiar; but represents the dealings of Providence in harmony with all the rest of Scripture.

Furthermore, in regard to the situation the apostle describes, he gives himself what must be the answer to the above question. Of those in the wilderness, whose situation he identifies (iii. 7 seq., and here,) with that of apostate Christians, he says: "The word of the report did not profit those not mingled by faith with those that heard." Whatever disagreement there may be in explaining this sentence as a whole, there is no disagreement in believing it affirms that it was want of faith in those that perished that made the promise unprofitable to them. This want of faith is affirmed of them with regard to their situation of highest privilege, and when their conduct was such that, had they persevered in it, they would have obtained the promise. The apostle, then, represents that they might have all that, and be all that, and yet be without faith. We accordingly understand the same to be true of the characters described verses 4, 5. The author expressly says: "But we are not of them that shrink back unto perdition; but of them that have faith to the saving of the soul."<sup>1</sup> This is an explicit denial that those who fall away from Christ and are lost, ever had saving faith. Its application to our passage is exact, seeing it concludes the passage x. 26-39 that has much in common with ours. It is conclusive in reference to the question relating to our verses 4-6. The persons described as falling away had not faith unto salvation. Our Epistle does not express anything on the doctrine of regeneration, and has, therefore, no expression of the relation of faith and regeneration.<sup>2</sup> This, of

---

<sup>1</sup> X. 39. <sup>2</sup> Comp. Riehlm. "Lehrbegriff," etc., p. 710.

course, is not to be taken advantage of, one way or other. But it is taking no advantage of this silence to draw from other New Testament Scripture that *does* define that relation. That teaching is everywhere clear and consistent: where there is no faith unto salvation, there has been no regeneration. With this agrees the language of our author: "Without faith, it is impossible to be well pleasing to God."<sup>1</sup>

The absence of precise expression about regeneration in our Epistle is due to the situation that evoked it, and the consequent aim in writing. It is written to disciples in peril of falling away from Christ. The proof of being truly Christian that the apostle demands for the situation is thus expressed: "We are companions of Christ if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm to the end."<sup>2</sup> The same continues to be the criterion that the apostle urges to the close of the Epistle. We meet it immediately after our passage, verses 11, 12.

SAMUEL T. LOWRIE.

---

#### ARTICLE VII.

#### THE FINAL PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS, VERSUS CARNAL SECURITY: PSALM xxiii. 6; 1 COR. ix. 26, 27.

"They whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved." Confession of Faith, Chapter XVII., Paragraph 1. To this doctrine is furnished as proof-texts, amongst others, Phil. i. 6: "Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." John x. 28, 29: "And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither

---

<sup>1</sup> xi. 5.    <sup>2</sup> iii. 14; comp. iii. 6.

shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all: and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." 1 John iii. 9: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." Cf. 1 John v. 16-19. 1 Peter i. 5, 9: "Who are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time. . . . Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." Rom. viii. 28-39; 1 Cor. iii. 21-23; Jeremiah xxxii. 40. Besides these explicit assertions of Scripture, this doctrine may be unanswerably confirmed by arguments based upon: I. The Immutable (1) Nature, (2) Decree, (3) Covenant, (4) Promises, (5) Oath of God. II. Infinitely perfect satisfaction of Christ. III. All-prevalent and perpetual intercession of Christ. IV. Eternal indwelling of the Spirit of Christ. V. Illustrations of Scripture, (1) marriage covenant; (2) day and night; (3) heavens and earth; (4) moon and stars; (5) mountains; (6) waters of Noah; (7) light.

Notwithstanding this array of Scripture texts and scriptural arguments, there are objections to this doctrine. They may perhaps be summed up as follows: I. The certainty of the end renders useless the means, (1) hence the doctrine of final perseverance leads to licentiousness; (2) hence the exhortations and warnings of Scripture are a flat contradiction of this doctrine. II. The sins of believers recorded in Scripture (*e. g.*, Noah, Samson, David, Peter, etc.,) as well as certain explicit texts (*e. g.*, Ezek. xviii. 24; Matt. xiii. 20, 21; 1 Cor. iii. 17; ix. 27; Heb. vi. 3-6; 2 Pet. ii. 22) present positive proof in contradiction of the doctrine which denies the possibility of the total and final fall of the saints. III. This doctrine, even if it could be supposed to be true, should not be preached, for it would then be useless, if not positively harmful.

Our effort in the present article shall be to defend the doctrine of the saints' perseverance against the charge that its logical and practical tendency is to encourage carnal security, or, as it is sometimes stated, to produce licentiousness.

Now, the logic of an objection is, when well sustained, simply

an unanswerable argument on the other side; it is the same thing as a *reductio ad absurdum* in mathematics; it is the subjecting of the previous demonstration to the *dictum*, "All truths are in harmony, no truth can be contradictory of any other truth," in order to show that the conclusion reached by the direct argument is contradicted by the test submitted in the indirect argument. Although, therefore, the objection is an indirect argument presented in disproof of the previous conclusion, yet is it none the less powerful as a test of truth; because, when it is a genuine objection, it reduces the former conclusion to a self-evident absurdity.

Let us look at the force of this objection:

No Scripture doctrine encourages carnal security;

This doctrine encourages carnal security;

*Ergo*, This is no Scripture doctrine.

We admit the major, must disprove the minor, or admit the conclusion. It is not to be lost sight of, however, that the Arminian assumes the minor, and is utterly unable to prove it, being forced, instead of proof, to reiterate it in every varying form, thus giving us in the place of argument a simple begging of the question. So far, therefore, as the mere logic is concerned, it is a simple yet all-sufficient reply to this objection to affirm its negation: this doctrine does *not* encourage carnal security; and now let us have your proof that it does.

It is not at all remarkable that the Apostle Paul supposes this very objection to be made against the doctrine of "justification by faith without the deeds of the law." Not remarkable, because, according to the apostle's argument in Romans viii. 1-39, he bases his train of reasoning for the perseverance of the saints on the doctrine of justification by faith: "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God." (Rom. v. 1.) There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," etc. (Rom. viii. 1.) Then, proceeding by a rigid chain of reasoning, no link of which is lacking or can be broken, he arrives, verse 28, at this conclusion: "And we know that *all* things work together for *good* to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose." This is as strong

an assertion of the doctrine we maintain as the language of man can frame. But, having made such an astounding statement, he proceeds immediately to confirm it against every doubt, every objection, and every sophistry, by another equally rigid and infallible chain, verses 29–39. With Paul, therefore, the doctrine of free grace, justification without works, and the doctrine of God's preservation of every believer from final and total apostasy, are linked in indissoluble harmony. They must stand or fall together. These two doctrines being therefore essentially one, we would expect to find essentially the same objection against one as against the other, arising naturally in the fruitful soil of our total depravity—our natural Arminianism: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" (Rom. vi. 1, 2.) This, then, is substantially Paul's answer to the objection we are considering. We cannot hope to improve upon this inspired reply; but we shall endeavor to make our contribution, however feeble it may be, towards the defence of this doctrine from the above-mentioned objection.

1. In the first place, then, we reply: that the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints led to no such evil consequence—*caral security*—in the experience of David. Psalm xxiii. 1–6: "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want" (*cf.* John x. 1–30); the exact equivalent of Rom. viii. 28. "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever," the exact equivalent of Rom. viii. 36–9. The result in David's case is just the opposite of that which this objection asserts. Assured that "goodness and mercy"—God's saving grace, that mercy which endureth for ever—would "follow him all the days of his life," his conclusion, logical and practical, was, "I will dwell in the house of the Lord [not in the tents of wickedness] for ever."

2. It was not so in Paul's case. Assured that "all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's" (1 Cor. iii. 21–23), his logical and practical conclusion was: "I therefore so run, not as

uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." (1 Cor. ix. 26, 27.)

3. Both David and Paul spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; therefore the Spirit sees no contradiction between Ps. xxiii. 6, Rom. viii. 38, 39, 1 Cor. iii. 21-23, and 1 Cor. ix. 27; on the contrary, he shows by these and many similar passages that there is the closest harmony between the highest assurance of success, and the deepest mortification of the lusts of the flesh.

Since this last passage is claimed by the Arminians as one of their great strongholds, let us examine it carefully.

1. Paul may have reference to himself as a minister and an apostle. This is the idea in verse 1, "Am I not an apostle?" the support of the minister, verse 6, etc.; the woe which would rest upon him if he preached not the gospel, verse 16; the reward which awaited him if he did this preaching willingly, verses 17, 18. Thus he would assert that, notwithstanding his high privileges and official position, there was nothing in this to preserve him from apostasy. This we grant; have no call to deny; nothing in our doctrine asserts that apostles as such, or ministers as such, are preserved from totally and finally falling. Judas would be a glaring case in contradiction of such a position.

2. The term translated "castaway" does not necessarily mean *apostate*. It occurs eight times in the New Testament; is never a single time translated *apostate*, but six times "reprobate," once "rejected," and here "castaway" [Revised Version, "rejected"]. (*Γενομένου* in Matt. xxvii. 34, means to taste, *i. e.*, to touch lightly, momentarily, with the lips and tongue, and not to drink; but in Heb. ii. 9, it means to exhaust the cup of God's penal wrath. The text therefore must always be subordinated to the context.) The term may have reference, not to himself as a professed Christian, but to his work as a minister. This the whole context (chapters iii., viii., ix.) and the technical terms used, belonging to the Grecian games, would seem to demand. (See iii. 13-15; viii. 11; ix. 22, etc.) Thus he would assert that he practised



the most rigid mortification of the lusts of the flesh, lest his labors in the gospel ministry should prove a failure—his work be rejected—*ἀδόκιμος*. This we understand to be Calvin's view, see *Com. in loco*, p. 311: "Some explain. . . . But it will suit better," etc. Owen is clearly pronounced in favor of this interpretation. Dr. Hodge: "Perhaps the apostle means to adhere to the figure and say, 'Lest having acted the part of a herald (*κηρύξας*, v. 27), (whose office at the Grecian games was to proclaim the rules of the contest and to summon the competitors or combatants to the lists) he himself should be judged unworthy of the prize.' As, however, the word is so often used for 'preaching the gospel,' he may intend to drop the figure and say, 'He made these strenuous exertions, lest, having preached the gospel to others, he himself should become (*ἀδόκιμος*) a reprobate, one rejected.'" Now let it be noticed, first, that Dr. Hodge admits the propriety of the view of Calvin and Owen, on the supposition that "the apostle means to adhere to the figure," *i. e.*, of "the Grecian games." But, secondly, on the supposition that "he may intend to drop the figure," he gives the meaning "reprobate" to *ἀδόκιμος*, thus making it refer to the eternal perdition of the apostle personally. Now, what reason does Dr. Hodge give for supposing that the apostle uses the word *ἀδόκιμος* as meaning "reprobate"? This: "He may intend to drop the figure." What reason does he give for supposing that "the apostle may intend to drop the figure"? This: "As, however, the word (*κηρύξας*) is so often used for preaching the gospel." Now to this argument it seems a sufficient reply to say: the context must always dominate the text. The whole context (from verse 24 to the very word in dispute—the next to the last word in verse 27) bristles with the technicalities of the Grecian games; forbidding, therefore, the idea that the apostle intended "to drop the figure." Doubtless this concession was, on Dr. Hodge's part, the result of an excess of candor; and a desire to show (as he immediately proceeds to do) that even this interpretation is in perfect harmony with the everlasting security of the saints.

There are three words—merit, reward, gift—which being accurately defined and steadily kept in view, will greatly assist us

in the right understanding of this and of other similar passages of Scripture. (See Calvin's Institutes, Book II., Chapter 17; III., 15, 16, 18.) Sometimes in ordinary use these words are used interchangeably. Yet each has its own distinct signification. Webster clearly discriminates between "gift" and the other two; but seems to recognise little or no distinction between "merit" and "reward." The faithful laborer *merits* his penny a day. If for supreme excellence, something, in addition to the penny, is offered, as a stimulus to the highest exertion, this is *reward*. "Anything, the property of which is voluntarily transferred from one person to another without compensation, is a *gift*." It is evident, upon a moment's reflection, that whilst "gift" is at the farthest remove from "merit" (the merit is compensation, the gift is without compensation), "reward" partakes somewhat of the nature of both, from the fact that in itself considered, it is not strictly compensation; for the reward for a day's highest excellence may be only one-hundredth part of what a day's work is really worth, or it may be one hundred times more than a day's wages; and in itself considered it is not strictly without compensation, inasmuch as it is something over and above the day's wages, for the extra exertion. Still, it must be borne in mind that he who receives a fair day's wages is fully compensated for his day's work, though it has been rendered in the highest style of excellence, and though no extra compensation in the shape of "reward" has been offered.

In the creature, as respects God, there can be no merit. Christ alone, being the co-equal and co-eternal Son of God, could merit. All that he did by way of obedience to the precept and to the penalty of God's law, was over and above any claim which that law could originally have upon him. Being absolutely free from all obligation to the law of God, he, in the freedom of his own sovereignty, placed himself under the law in covenant for his people, in order that he might merit for his people. Thus he became "the end of the law for righteousness [merit] to every one that believeth." Adam being a creature could not merit; he could never by the utmost stretch of his abilities do any more than the infinitely righteous claim of God's law already and per-

petually demanded. A million ages of perfect obedience could do no more than secure for him, and for him alone, a million ages of perfect happiness. But when God graciously offered Adam in the covenant of works, in consideration of perfect obedience, rendered during a limited period, eternal life, perpetual adoption, and everlasting confirmation in holiness, not for himself alone, but for his posterity, then Adam could (through the grace of God) secure the reward. See Thornwell's *Collected Writings*, Vol. I., pages 264–267. In Rom. vi. 23, Paul says, "For the wages [merit] of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." We by sin earn eternal death—it is the debt due to us by the justice of God for our faithful work in the service of sin; Jesus, by his free and perfect obedience to the law in its precept and penalty, earns eternal life for his people—it is a debt due to Jesus by the justice of God: but since the Father gave the Son, and the Son gave himself, eternal life becomes to his people the gift of God through Jesus Christ, seeing it is voluntarily bestowed upon them without any compensation for it being rendered by them to God. Since, therefore, the creature cannot merit anything good at God's hands, yet may, by a provision of grace, secure a reward, so, whilst eternal life is solely the merit of Christ's obedience, and at the same time the gift of God to the believer, yet, over and above eternal life, there is a reward to the Christian—the prize of the high calling, which is the burden of the apostle's context from verse 15 to verse 27 inclusive. Concerning this prize the apostle says in verse 24, "Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run that ye may obtain." "For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward." Matt. ix. 41. To say that the apostle presents this as one particular in which the Christian differs from the Grecian game is justified only on the assumption that the apostle identifies eternal life with the reward of our successful running, whereas he identifies it with the gift of God, and the merit of Christ. In this whole context there is not a word about gift, not a word about merit, but every word is about "reward."

The apostle therefore, in verse 24—"all run, but one receiveth the prize"—is presenting a point of exact similarity and not at all of contrast.

The true test of the interpretation of this passage, 1 Cor. ix. 26-7, may be exhibited and applied by the following questions :

1. Is the salvation of a sinner of works? of works and grace? or of grace alone? "And if by grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace; otherwise work is no more work" Rom. xi. 6. It is "according to the election of grace." Verses 5, 7.

2. Is Paul in the context speaking of the salvation or loss of his own soul? or of the souls of others? "To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some." Verse 22. Cf. x. 33.

3. Is he speaking of the loss of his soul? or the loss of his work? Evidently the latter. Verses 15, 18, 19, 23-27.

4. Is the "crown" of which he speaks "eternal life"? *i. e.*, the salvation of the soul? or a position of eminence—"reward"—in the kingdom of glory? Evidently the latter. Verses 17, 18. For to make it the former is, (1) to make it salvation by works; (2) to contradict John iii. 15, 16, 36: "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" (3) to contradict Matt. xii. 30, 31, by making other sins than "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" unpardonable; (4) to contradict 1 Cor. iii. 15 (part of the context, though remote, of ix. 26, 27), which explicitly asserts, "if any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself *shall be saved*; yet so as by fire." A more complete denial of justification by works (before regeneration or after it) cannot be formulated; the apostle supposes the complete destruction, so as by fire, of all a believer's works, so that, in the day of judgment, he is left naked standing alone upon the fire-proof foundation of Jesus Christ, and yet he asserts, "He himself shall be saved."

True, it is a "crown"—of "immortal" glory, as contrasted with the "corruptible" one of the Grecian games. The crown of which he speaks he is still striving for; has not yet obtained; may fail to obtain the "prize," by being distanced by some other competitor! "I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Phil. iii. 14. But "eternal life" he already has. *Ex hypothesi* he is a believer, *ergo* already "hath eternal life;" *ergo* cannot forfeit it, for its nature is eternal; neither can he be running for it, for he already has it; it is the very *conditio sine qua non* of his running; without it already in possession, he could not "enter the lists" ("if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed," Jno. vi. 53; viii. 36; xv. 5; to say the least, to enter the lists he must be (1) living, (2) free; without faith he is spiritually dead and the bond-slave of Satan; having faith he is (1) living, (2) free—"hath (already in possession) everlasting life"). If, therefore, not already in possession of eternal life, he cannot even enter the lists, much less run the race. The "crown" therefore must be a "prize" (*βραβεϊον*), over and above, and distinct from "eternal life"; the latter he already has, the former he is striving to obtain, ix. 18.

The racer in the Grecian games did not run to obtain life; this (besides other qualifications—freedom, etc.) he already had—must have in order to enter the lists even, much more to run the race. But, having life, and having invigorated it by careful discipline, he now runs to obtain the crown—"corruptible." Now this crown is a "reward," over and above and distinct from his life. The obtaining of this crown is not the condition of his obtaining life, but his possession of life is a necessary condition of his obtaining the crown. [The perfect obedience of Adam to the end was the condition in the covenant of works of his securing the crown of eternal life, confirmation in holiness, and heavenly bliss, the consequence of failure eternal death; but Christ, having fulfilled the terms of works in the covenant of grace, secures eternal life to all his people—believers. Hence the conditions of grace are the reverse of the conditions of works.] His (the Grecian racer's) life is the "gift of God;" the "crown" is the "reward" of his successful running. If he fail to distance his

competitors, he is declared by the judges ἀδόκιμος—"rejected," verse 27.

So with the Christian. This is what Paul was doing: he was not content to "be saved, yet so as by fire"—burnt down to the foundation. 1 Cor. iii. 15. He wanted a crown to lay at Jesus' feet. He desired, if possible, to be in the front rank of the redeemed; to be, if possible, *next* to Jesus on the throne. [Matt. xx. 21-28; n. b. v. 23—οὐκ ἐστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται ἰπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. Cf. Jno. x. 28: "And I give unto them eternal life." To sit on his right hand, etc., "is not mine to give," but "eternal life I do give," clearly discriminating between the one and the other. Not a gift; certainly not a merit; what then? A "reward."] Fired by this sanctified ambition, Paul was, (1) all things to all men, 22-3; (2) ran as under the eye of a cloud of witnesses—ἀδελῶς; (3) fought not as one that beateth the air—ἀέρα δέρον; (4) but hitting under the eye—ἰπὼπιᾶζω; (5) and reducing his fleshly appetites to slavery—δουλαγωγῶ, lest to others having heralded—κηρύξας—he himself should be declared by the judges rejected—ἀδόκιμος—distanced by his competitors. The idea that a man should become an apostate simply because he was outrun in the race by another, is too absurd to be for a moment entertained. The Grecian racer, when he was outstripped by his antagonist and declared to be rejected, lost his "crown," but not his life; failed to get the "reward," but still retained the "gift of God."

Let us remark in passing that Paul's idea of a successful minister of the gospel, or laborer in the vineyard, presents three points: (1) He must build upon the true foundation—Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. iii. 11. (2) Build upon it such doctrine as will stand the test of fire, iii. 12-15. (3) The whole must be sustained and illustrated by an eminently godly life, ix. 26-7, "I therefore so run," etc.

An analysis of the text, as it lies before us in the English version, would furnish the following elements:

1. The certainty of victory—"not as uncertainly."
  2. The reality of the enemy—"not as one that beateth the air."
- There were three ways of beating the air: (1) When one prac-

tises boxing by himself and strikes at an imaginary antagonist. (2) When he makes a feint, not intending to deliver the blow, but to exhaust the opponent by his continual efforts to defend himself. (3) When intending to deliver a ponderous blow, *e. g.* on the top of his adversary's head, the nimble adversary slips away, and his would-be assailant, missing his aim, falls prostrate by the force of his own exertion. But Paul did none of this sort of fighting.

3. Duty of intensest self-denial. "Keep under my body. Bring it into subjection." Those trained for these games were previously subjected to most rigid self-denial in food, drink, clothing, sleep, etc. See verse 25—"temperate in all things." For a schedule of the training of the Christian athlete, see 2 Peter i. 5-7. 'And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, love.' For the diligence and fidelity of Paul in the practice of these disciplinary measures, see 2 Cor. xi. 23. "In labours, stripes, prisons, deaths, . . . weariness, painfulness, watchings, hunger, thirst, fastings, cold, nakedness." The term translated, "keep under my body," is very expressive, meaning "to strike under the eye, give him a black eye; beat black and blue," in relation to boxers; again, the term translated, "bring it into subjection" is no less expressive, refers to wrestlers, and "signifies to trip and give the antagonist a fall, and then keep him down when he was down; and having obliged him to acknowledge himself conquered, make him a slave." The Greeks in their games had racing, boxing, v. 26, wrestling, and a combination of boxing and wrestling, v. 27. But the apostle's conception seems to be of one who is running, boxing, and wrestling, all at one and the same time. By the term "body" is meant the fleshly appetites, corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; like the daughters of the horseleech ever crying, "Give, give;" like the grave and the barren womb, the earth that is not filled with water, and the fire that saith not, "It is enough." But why does the apostle single out the "flesh" as if it were the only enemy? Has he forgotten the "world" and the "devil"? By no means; rather because he has learned that it is only through the flesh that the

world and the devil can operate upon the child of God. "Deliver me from this dead body, and I shall be at once and for ever free from the assaults of the world and the devil," is the idea of the apostle. Rom. vii. 24. Hence, like a skilful general, he masses all his forces against the lusts of the flesh, knowing that if this foe is subjugated, the neck of the rebellion is broken. Apart from the "flesh," it is as true of every joint heir, as it is of the only begotten and first-born, "the prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me." "Whosoever is born of God . . . that wicked one toucheth him not." "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God."

4. The fourth element of the analysis is, the ever-present contingency of eternal ruin—"lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." The contingency of eternal ruin—not as to the event, but as to the person considered in himself. For it ever remains true, "Without me ye can do nothing:" thus there is ever a carnal possibility of apostasy, and at the same time a spiritual impossibility; for it ever remains true: "My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."

Accepting this last interpretation (though we believe the context demands the one previously given), we gather up the elements of our analysis and find the apostle teaching that the highest conditions of success rest upon him who runs with the certainty of victory, yet never loses sight of the reality of the enemy, or the duty of severest mortification of the flesh, but realises that this certainty of victory is inseparable from the straining of every nerve to obtain it. If there is anything in this synthesis of the text which denies the doctrine of final perseverance, or encourages carnal security, we frankly confess our inability to see it.

When, however, we examine more closely this analysis, we are constrained in the name of the context to protest, as against *ἀδόκιμος* meaning "castaway," so against *ἀδήλως* meaning "uncertainly." The word occurs but four times in the New Testament: *ἀδηλος*, Luke xi. 44—are as graves which appear not [are hidden]; 1



Cor. xiv. 8, the trumpet give an uncertain sound [not distinguishable]; ἀδηλότης, 1 Tim. vi. 17, nor trust in uncertain riches [seen to-day and not seen to-morrow]; 1 Cor. ix. 26, ἀδιόρατος, so run not as uncertainly [not as hidden, not as undistinguished, not as unseen]. As the word therefore naturally furnishes the sense—"not unobserved"—so the context demands it here, and forbids the sense "not uncertainly." For whilst it might be that the Grecian racer, having previously tried his strength against his competitors, or in some other way come to a knowledge of their swiftness relatively to his own, might thus start from the first with the certainty of securing the prize, *i. e.*, of distancing all his competitors; yet it must be manifest that, in Paul's case, who was running for "the prize of the high calling of God," and so was competing against the whole embattled host of God's elect, he could not, in the nature of the case, start out with the certainty of securing the prize. *i. e.*, of distancing all his competitors. Nor does he yet know; for the time has not yet come to "reward every man according to his work." But whether Paul shall secure the prize in the final award, or lose it, one thing we know: there will be no repetition in the kingdom of glory of that which occurred in the kingdom of grace—"when the ten heard it they were moved with indignation against the two brethren" (Matt. xx. 24)—for there we shall have been delivered from the flesh, the world will have been burnt up, and the devil confined in the eternal prison-house of despair; and there "if one member be honored, all the members will rejoice with it." What Paul meant to say, then, is that he was running his race, not in secret, but in full view of the assembled multitude—"compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses." Heb. xii. 1.

This being so, the first element of the analysis must be changed. "The certainty of victory" must be substituted by "under the stimulus of a cloud of witnesses." This of course would require a corresponding change in the summing up of the doctrine of the text, so as to leave out, "who runs with the certainty of victory," etc., and substitute therefor this proposition: That the highest condition of success rests upon him, who, running under the stimulus of the cloud of witnesses, at the same time realises that the

securing of the prize is inseparable from the straining of every nerve to obtain it. We have only to remember that the same context demands that we understand this prize to be promotion in glory—"reward"—prize of the high calling, etc.—not "eternal life," which is the "gift of God," and therefore rejects "apostate" as the translation of ἀδόκιμος, making it have reference to Paul's failure to win the "prize" by failing to distance *all* competitors, and not to his failure to obtain "eternal life." It must be manifest that the idea of his failure making him an apostate, was not within the remotest bound of the horizon of the apostle's thought. He could not have forgotten that he was not a slave working for wages, but a son in his Father's house.

It has been in the interest of truth, not of any creed, that this interpretation has been insisted upon. If the doctrine of the saints' perseverance be true, it must square with every part of God's word. If it be false, the sooner it is exploded the better. No one, we trust, feels this more profoundly than the writer of this article. That it has not been through the stress of argument we have sought refuge in this interpretation, will be manifest from the following:

Grant the fullest meaning of ἀδόκιμος, "apostate," and the utmost extent of the argument would be: If Paul, though regenerate, is in a possibility of final apostasy, then are all believers, though regenerate, in a possibility, etc. But Paul, though regenerate, is in a possibility, etc. *Ergo*, all believers are in a possibility of final apostasy: Yet—

Notwithstanding this possibility, Paul, being "kept by the power of God"—1 Pet. i. 5—persevered unto the end. *Ergo*, all believers—regenerated—notwithstanding this possibility, being "kept by the power of God," persevere unto the end.

This interpretation throws light on a question which has often been propounded to the writer: If every man that believes not is already condemned, and if every man that believes is already justified, what need is there for a final judgment? This at least: (1) To justify the ways of God; (2) To assign each (according to his works) to his appropriate "reward" in glory, or his appropriate degradation in perdition. "Inasmuch as ye have done it;

inasmuch as ye did it not ;” works and the absence of works—the principle of decision. Matt. xxv. 40, 45. Hence the secrets of all hearts will be revealed ; all actions, words, thoughts, emotions, motives, etc., will be thoroughly scanned and accurately weighed by the omniscient eye and the immaculate justice of God.

Let us now consider carefully this objection from other points that we may still further defend the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints.

The objection is that this doctrine cannot be of God, because it is the foe of diligence, opposes sanctification, encourages licentiousness, fosters carnal security.

1. If all the disciples of the opposite system were free from licentiousness and ungodliness, and all the disciples of this system were guilty of them, this would be a strong argument. But we see licentious disciples under both. Contradictory causes cannot produce like effects. We must therefore look farther back than the creed till we find something common to both. Indwelling sin is that common cause. Noah, whether Arminian or Calvinist, was overcome with wine ; David, whether Arminian or Calvinist, fell into adultery ; Peter, whether Arminian or Calvinist, denied his Lord with bitter oaths and curses. Our doctrine is not that they may not fall into sin, but that they cannot “totally or finally fall away from the state of grace.” “Nevertheless they may, through the temptations of Satan and of the world, the prevalency of corruption remaining in them, and the neglect of the means of their preservation, fall into grievous sins ; and for a time continue therein, whereby they incur God’s displeasure and grieve his Holy Spirit ; come to be deprived of some measure of their graces and comforts ; have their hearts hardened and their consciences wounded ; hurt and scandalise others and bring temporal judgments upon themselves.” Confession of Faith, Chapter XVII., Paragraph III.

2. Grace offered may produce license, but grace communicated never. The simple apprehension of this truth by an unregenerate man (who “receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God : for they are foolishness unto him : neither can he know them, be-

cause they are spiritually discerned," whose "carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be,") may turn this grace of our God (as they do also the other graces) into lasciviousness; of whom the Spirit (in Jude) testifies, "Who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men." But that those who are in Christ Jesus (therefore justified, in whom therefore the righteousness of the law is fulfilled, who therefore walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, who therefore are led by the Spirit of God, and are therefore the sons of God,) should continue in sin that grace may abound, thus turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, is a proposition contradicted by every thread in the warp and woof of Holy Scripture. For however this doctrine (as that of gratuitous justification) may be "unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness," nevertheless it is "unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God," (and that, too,) "unto salvation to every one that believeth." Cf. 1 Pet. i. 5; 1 Cor. i. 23-4, and Rom. i. 16. See Owen "On Saints' Perseverance," page 272.

3. As a general rule we expect that men will be influenced in their lives by the principles which they sincerely and intelligently embrace. We expect perseverance of them that believe in it—perseverance in holiness; faith and practice should correspond. It is no uncommon thing for men to profess to believe what they neither comprehend nor believe, and hence to see them deny in life what they profess in theory. It is not uncommon for men to live below their principles, and a common thing for them to fall short of their high ideal. The Calvinist's safety and happiness and usefulness consist in his exemplifying the truth of this doctrine; and every Arminian brother who raises the shout of "glory" on the banks of the river of life, as he walks the golden streets of the New Jerusalem, is an irrefragable argument for the truth that "none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." "Hallelujah! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

4. The shipwrecked crew is an unanswerable reply to this objection. Acts xxvii. 20-24. The end was fixed by an infallible

decree ; this decree was revealed to Paul ; he, as the Lord's prophet, declared the decree to all on board the vessel, verses 22, 24, 34. Yet he used all diligence and watchfulness ; insisted that the sailors should remain and work to the last as best they could under the circumstances—"Except these abide in the ship ye cannot be saved," verse 31 ; we find them sounding, fearing, casting out anchors, verses 28-9 ; the centurion and soldiers obedient to Paul's warning, verse 32 ; the whole crew at last persuaded to strengthen themselves for the final conflict with the waves by eating bread, and so breaking their fast of fourteen days, verses 33-36. Still they exerted themselves in the use of every means within their reach, calling into play all their knowledge of the sea and of working a vessel in a storm, until they brought the ship into a "creek with a shore," and so ran the ship aground, verses 39-41. Now whilst the forepart stuck fast in the shore, and the hinder part was broken with the violence of the waves, those who could swim cast themselves first into the sea and got to land, and the rest got to land, some on boards, and some on broken pieces of the ship. "And so [*i. e.*, in the use of every possible means—giving all diligence] it came to pass that they escaped all safe to land"—verses 41-44 ; *i. e.* the infallibly decreed end was brought about by the diligent use of the no less infallibly decreed means, thus illustrating the sovereignty of God and the free-agency (and hence responsibility) of man. Possibly some did not believe the decree, but they fulfilled it nevertheless ; and even when, in their unbelief, they would have resorted to their own devices for safety—devices which would have resulted probably in their own ruin, certainly in the ruin of others (verses 30-32)—they only illustrated the proverb, "Many are the devices in the heart of man ; but the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand." Others, doubtless, believed firmly in the certain accomplishment of the decree, but used the appropriate means (just as if there had been no decree ? Not exactly ; but) all the more confidently, and assuredly, in full assurance of knowledge, faith, and hope, because of their faith in the infallibility of the decree ; thus deriving strong consolation. None, so far as we can learn from the record, wrapped themselves in the infallible decree,

folded their arms in "carnal security," and so committed themselves to the sea; for the record is, some swam to shore, "and the rest, some on boards, and some on broken pieces of the ship;" and hence none were left to practise fatalism!

5. Paul's argument, in Rom. viii. 28-39, turns not (1) on the imperishable nature of faith; (2) indestructible nature of the principle of grace; (3) immutability of the believer's will; but solely upon what is outside of ourselves—God in Christ, in whom we live and move and have our being. "We do not keep ourselves; we are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." (See Hodge's Systematic Theology, III., 113.) "This perseverance of the saints depends not upon their own free-will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election, flowing from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father; upon the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Jesus Christ; the abiding of the Spirit and of the seed of God within them; and the nature of the covenant of grace; from a'l which ariset<sup>h</sup> also the certainty and infallibility thereof." Confession of Faith, Chapter XVII., Paragraph II. Just as our daily life, comfort, and progress depend upon God, yet we must diligently use all natural means for our preservation. Man cannot die till his time come—"Seeing his days are determined, the number of his months are with thee, thou hast appointed his bounds that he cannot pass," Job xiv. 5—yet there is a natural daily possibility of death, and at the same time a supernatural impossibility; so there is a carnal possibility of apostasy, and at the same time a spiritual impossibility. "If any man defile (*φθειρεῖ*) the temple of God, him shall God destroy (*φθερεῖ*)." 1 Cor. iii. 17. "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." 1 John iii. 9. If, therefore, in the sphere of natural life the certainty that man "shall accomplish as a hireling his day," does not "take away the liberty or contingency of second causes, but rather establishes" them, why should it be, that in the sphere of spiritual life, certainty takes away the liberty and contingency of second causes? Yea, rather, in the one as in the other, it establishes them: "As many as were ordained (*τεταγμένοι*) to eternal life believed." Acts xiii. 48.

6. The example of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is a living refutation of this slander upon God's glorious truth. "Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. . . . Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Matt. iv. 1, 5-7. If Satan had the effrontery to ply the Master with this temptation, how much more will he urge it upon the disciples? It never has been put in stronger, clearer language than on this memorable occasion. There stands Jesus on the pinnacle of the temple, from its dizzy height he looks down into the yawning chasm beneath his feet, Satan seizes the opportunity to press home the argument, "Thou claimest to be the Son of God; the angels have a solemn charge from God—thy God—to keep thee; yea more, not only a general charge, but a special charge, covering this very case; and farther still, thou hast a specific promise from God, whose word cannot be broken, for it is impossible for God to lie, that in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone; so it is written in the Book of Psalms. Now, therefore, cast thyself down; if thou be the Son of God, thou canst not be hurt; for it is absolutely impossible that the promise of God should fail. If thou cast thyself down and art hurt, by this I shall know that thou art not the Son of God; and if thou refuse to cast thyself down, then I shall know that thine own conscience smiteth thee as an impostor, and therefore thou durst not take the risk; but if thou cast thyself down and art not hurt, then I, and all men, shall know that thou art the Son of God: therefore, wrapping thyself in the folds of the immutable covenant, and leaning upon the decree as immutable as is the nature of God, cast thyself down." "It is written again, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'" Thou shalt not be guilty of the sin of presumption. God's absolute unconditional decree does not destroy my free agency, or absolve

my responsibility. This is all that Jesus deigned in reply. Let the disciple follow his Master, and the doctrine of the saints' perseverance will never lead to carnal security—presumption; let him follow the devil, and it will lead not only to presumption, but to perdition!

This objection, in its last analysis, is the same difficulty which always meets us, wherever God's sovereignty and man's free agency are brought into view. Jesus' exposure of the sophistry of this objection is such that none of our adversaries are able to "gain-say or resist."

7. Perseverance is a duty as well as a grace. It is a doctrine of (1) grace to encourage the diligent and the despondent; (2) of duty to stimulate the indolent; (3) of warning to guard the presumptuous. See Hodge's (A. A.) Commentary on the Confession of Faith, page 320.

Let us take a glance at 2 Peter i. 1-12. He addresses believers—those "that have obtained like precious faith," etc., verse 1. Invokes in their behalf, "grace and peace multiplied," verse 2. They already have grace and peace, but he wishes these graces multiplied. Grace and peace being the multiplicand, what shall be the multiplier? "According as his divine power hath given us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue; whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, vs. 3, 4. Now, just let any man undertake to work out in his head or on paper, this sum in multiplication: Grace and peace  $\times$  divine power, which hath given unto us all things, = what? Can we say less than = final perseverance of the saints? Can we be satisfied with this? Is it not manifest that this is simply the least that can be said—the lowest result? Can it, under any circumstances, be put down thus: Grace and peace  $\times$  divine power = Total and final Apostasy!!!? Would it not be infinitely more reasonable to write this:  $1,000,000,000 \times 1,000,000,000,000,000 = 0$ ?

But let us go back for a moment to 1 Pet. i. 1-9, in order to get still more light on the *status* of those whom the apostle is addressing in "this second Epistle;" for it is evident (from 2 Pet.



iii. 1) that both Epistles are addressed to the same parties. These, then, are the points: "Elect—verse 2—begotten again—verse 3, to an inheritance, incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you—verse 4, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, etc.—verse 5, yet believing, etc—verse 8, receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls—verse 9." *N. B.*: the inheritance is kept for them in the hand of God, whilst they are kept for the inheritance in the hand of God. Who can pluck the inheritance out of God's hand? Who can pluck them out of God's hand? So much for perseverance, as the gift of God's grace. But we have said it is a duty as well as a grace. This will be abundantly evident by simply reading this chapter from verse 11 to the close of the Epistle: "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." Leaving, however, this luxuriant and tempting field, let us return now to 2 Pet. i. 1–12. Verses 1–4, as we have seen, present us a sum in multiplication, in the dialect of inspiration, which proves beyond the possibility of honest doubt, that final apostasy on the part of a true believer is an absolute impossibility. Yet notice well the very next utterance of inspiration: "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue (rather courage, ἀρετήν); and to courage knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness love. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, *i. e.* near-sighted (τυφλός ἐστι, μυωπάζων), and hath forgotten (λήθην λαβών) that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall (οὐ μὴ πταίσῃτε ποτε); for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," verses 5–11.

Time would fail should an attempt be made to unfold elaborately the points of this passage. Only a few of the more prominent ones can be touched on and that briefly.

1. The apostle saw no reason, though they were elect, begotten again, believers, kept by the power of God, had already received the salvation of their souls, why they should not be exhorted and encouraged to the greatest diligence and utmost stretch of energy. Nor did he see any reason why he should fail to stir them up in remembrance of these things continually—"always," v. 12. Surely the elect believer, to whom grace and peace are multiplied, according as his divine power, etc., and to whom, therefore, eternal life is as fixed a certainty as the immutable nature and oath of God can make it, in the discharge of the duties enjoined in verses 5-7, will find all his days and all his nights so occupied as to leave no time for indolence, presumption, or licentiousness. In the logic of inspiration, therefore, the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, instead of being the foe of diligence, the refuge of carnal security, and the hotbed of licentiousness, is the bosom companion and the sworn friend of "all diligence."

2. The apostle having in both Epistles once and again contemplated them as believers, never for an instant supposes that they may lose their "faith," so, when he comes to exhort, his first point is, Add to your "faith."

3. Look at the gradation: first faith, then courage, lastly love—to God with all the heart and mind and soul and strength, and to your neighbor as yourself.

4. Note the strong expressions of the passage: "Doing these things," verse 10—that is, adding to your faith "courage," etc., and so making "your calling and election sure," *i. e.*, by the witness of the Spirit with our spirit, Rom. viii. 16. Ye shall never, never (*οὐ μὴ*) fall (*πταίσῃτε*) a single time (*ποτε*).

"Fall"—literally, "stumble," "trip," "strike your foot against any obstacle." Ye shall not do even this a single time. "I say then, have they stumbled (*ἐπταίσαν*) that they should fall?" (*πίσωσι*) Rom. xi. 11. The word, therefore, which the apostle, under the Spirit's guidance, selected in the tenth verse to express the mind of the Spirit, is precisely the word which includes stumbling, in order to exclude falling; excluding therefore the idea of apostasy (*παραπεσόντας*), the word selected by inspiration for Heb. vi. 6.

5. The idea of "final apostasy" therefore is not in the mind of

the apostle at all. How could it be, seeing he is contemplating them strictly under the category of elect, believers, etc.? Man may make such mistakes, but inspiration never. His course of argument goes to show, (1) What will take place if they add these things to their faith, viz.: "Ye shall neither be barren [fig-tree] [or idle (laborer in the vineyard)] nor unfruitful [branch] in the knowledge," etc., v. 8; see 2 Pet. iii. 17. 18; but, on the contrary, "ye shall never a single time trip," v. 10; see James iii. 2-10. "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," v. 11. (2) What will take place if they fail to add these things to their faith, viz.: "But he that lacketh these things is blind"—not total blindness, however, for that would imply a total fall; hence the apostle immediately modifies *τυφλός* by *μυωπάζων*—*myopia*—near-sightedness, which he farther expounds by the phrase *lethe* (*λήθη*) taking of the "purging of his old sins." What does this mean? that he has totally and finally lost his "purging" (*καθαρισμός*)—regeneration, justification, adoption, and sanctification? The apostle does not even hint such a thing. He has not lost his sight, only impaired it by his "lack of these things;" once he could, with the piercing gaze of an eagle, look into the very face of the Sun of righteousness and read his title clear; but now, he is winking, blinking, near-sighted, he is afar off from Jesus, and cannot pierce through the clouds to read, as once he could, his title clear. Yea more, so far from his calling and election being sure, as once it was in a joyful vivid experience of the Spirit's concurrent testimony with his spirit, when the candle of the Lord burned brightly in his soul; now he has lost not the purging, but the memory of the purging. Not merely his vision is dimmed, but complete oblivion has taken the place of memory. He has gone down in consequence of his indolence from the heavenly heights of full assurance to the land of forgetfulness, the depths of despair, and the very jaws of perdition. His Father God, who loves him with an everlasting love, and cannot deny himself—"O Ephraim, how can I give thee up?"—has taken in hand this indolent, erring, backsliding child, and whilst hiding from him the smiles of his reconciled counte-

nance, and blotting out from his memory the recollection of his pardon and acceptance in the Beloved, now shakes him over the very mouth of the pit and flames of hell, until he shall learn that a pardoning God is still jealous for his own holiness. Well did Peter remember when, because he failed to add to his faith "courage," he "went out and wept bitterly."

This, then, is the course of Peter's argument: to stir them up to diligence—all diligence—by vividly portraying to them the consequences (1) on the one hand, if they were found "doing these things;" (2) On the other hand, if they were found not doing—"lacking these things." He evidently has in his mind two classes of Christians: first, the perfect Christian—diligent to the utmost in all things; secondly, the indolent, halting, stumbling Christian—a burden to himself, and a "stumbling-block" to others. Where, this side of glory, shall we find the perfect, the ideal Christian? Nowhere. Christ is our model. Where shall we find examples of the halting, stumbling Christian? Everywhere—in the pulpit and in the pew. Alas, alas, tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Ashkelon!

No wonder Peter adds verses 12-15: "Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, though ye know them, and be established in the present truth. Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me. Moreover I will endeavor that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance."

Whoever else may doubt the propriety of preaching this doctrine, Peter did not; nor did he believe he could ever preach it too much, either before or after his death.

Whoever else may deny the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, Peter proclaims it from the housetops in thunder tones, in language that cannot be mistaken, and in arguments that cannot be refuted.

Whoever else may teach that this doctrine lulls the Christian to sleep in the lap of indolence and breeds carnal security, Peter makes the saints' perseverance the ground of his exhortation to "all diligence."

JAS. L. MARTIN.

## ARTICLE VII.

## MARRIAGE BETWEEN NEAR OF KIN.

WILL THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH ABANDON HER LAW  
AGAINST MARRIAGE AMONG NEAR OF KIN ?

“Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden in the word ; nor can such incestuous marriages ever be made lawful by any law of man, or consent of the parties, so as those persons may live together as man and wife. *The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own.*”

We prefix to our discussion the entire Section on the subject of the marriage of kin, with the paragraph italicised which it is proposed to expunge from the Confession of Faith. We wish the reader to have it before his eyes and mind at the same time, that he may see manifestly that the arguments employed against this paragraph apply with equal cogency against the whole Section. The only texts of Scripture touching the subject of this Section are contained in the eighteenth and twentieth chapters of Leviticus, 1 Cor. v. 1, and Mark vi. 18. It is claimed that Mark vi. 18 cannot be applied to this subject on the ground that Philip, whose wife Herod had taken, was yet alive ; that these chapters in Leviticus do not relate to marriage. We see no reason why it may not, with equal propriety, be claimed that the father, whose wife a son had taken, was yet alive also ; and that would leave the entire Section without scriptural support. In that event we should be bound to expunge the entire Section, or abandon Form of Government, Chapter 2, Section 1, paragraph 3, which says : “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 away." *Apropos* to this, we refer the reader to Book of Discipline, Chapter 3, § 1, the latter part of which we here quote: "Nothing, therefore, ought to be considered by any court as an offence, or admitted as a matter of accusation, which cannot be proved to be such from Scripture, *as interpreted in these standards.*" No matter what the Bible condemns, if its condemnation does not exist in our standards, a guilty party cannot be disciplined under the limitation which we have emphasised. We are, therefore, in a fair way to open up the flood-gates to every species of incest, and to get the Church hopelessly corrupted. To see the greatness of this peril all any one has to do is to look the fact squarely in the face that 1 Cor. v. 1 is the only passage of Scripture left by the advocates of change to sustain this Section, and that the same arbitrary assumptions applied to the other texts would, if applied to it, take it away also; and, when it goes, the entire Section falls; and then in the Southern Presbyterian Church a man may, with impunity, marry his own widowed mother, or sister, or daughter! If not, why not? After we have published to the world that in our opinion these Scriptures do not relate to marriage at all, and it is acknowledged by all that none other Scriptures do relate to it; after we have repudiated all legislative power or ecclesiastical authority to bind the conscience from incest; upon what authority shall we discipline offenders? We beg the thoughtful reader to answer to his own mind the question, Why not expunge the whole Section now? If these Scriptures do not relate to the matter of this Section, it ought to go; it has no right to be placed in our Confession of Faith; it is an unjust, unauthorised human abridgment of our liberty. The authorisation of marriage within all degrees of affinity and consanguinity is no enterprise of ours; and we propose, with God's help, to take our sling and stone and enter the contest, because we believe "the battle is the Lord's."

It is granted by all that among the immediate descendants of Adam, and, most likely, among his descendants of two or three generations, marriage was contracted by brothers and sisters; and here emerges into view the question about the absolute immorality of such unions. Levirate marriages were of special

divine appointment, and it is no more improbable that God enjoined an immorality therein, than that he necessitated it in the original constitution of things, or commanded it when he said: "Be faithful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." The law of propagation, or *modus propagandi*, is as truly a positive institution on the part of God as any other appointment he ever made; that is, he was not bound, morally or physically, to employ the existing method, any more than he was bound, morally or physically, to create the universe. But supposing the purpose to create, or to institute, a law of generation, his moral perfections guarantee that neither shall involve an intrinsic moral evil; that the law shall not be intrinsically immoral, or, in its normal operation, necessitate an immorality on the part of the agents.

The purpose to people the earth from one original pair carries with it as much the necessity of marriage among brothers and sisters of the first generation from Adam, as among members of any subsequent generation, even the present; hence, the supposition that celibacy is a special virtue, is a monstrous reflection on Him who made man male and female, built in their bodies the powers of propagation, and enjoined the duty upon the unfallen couple; and God did these prior to the fall, unless we gratuitously assume that sin originated the practical seminal functions and plan of propagation. As we are compelled to reject any hypothesis that implicates the divine character, we are led to seek the cause of the present immorality of marriages among near of kin in some superinduced circumstance subsequent to the fall, and not absolutely insurmountable; in a state of things such that while it remains such unions are intrinsically evil; but which, when changed, admits them as innocent. May it not be, it is modestly inquired, that as sin has so infinitely and horribly marred the law of propagation, and superinduced upon Eve and her daughters such extensive suffering in general, so, as a special curse upon the race, inflicted at some subsequent period, in consequence of sin, God has blighted; among near of kin, the human body to such a degree that their progeny are frequently monstrous; and, then, that he forbade such unions, thus making his physiological and moral law forbid the same thing? We do not predicate some sub-

sequent special sin, like building the tower of Babel, but some evil that could not exist till after some multiplication of the race. Undoubtedly, under the providence and government of God, the confusion of tongues was brought to pass for the purpose of scattering the race. May not a similar confusion of families by intermarriages have also, under God, a purpose? The inflexible operation of intrinsic moral righteousness cannot have place where something is at one time essentially immoral, and at another time certainly innocent; and the only possible solution of the facts here presented, is that between the periods marking the purity or impurity of such unions, a special physical curse has been put on them; and that thus a change in the thing itself gives rise to a change in its moral quality; and so a change in the law in reference to it. Right and wrong being themselves absolutely immutable, when we find anything right at one time and wrong at another, it is a demonstration that a moral change has occurred in it. We see only one way to evade this, and that is to deny absolutely that marriage among near of kin is, in any instance, an immorality. We might rest the argument there, but we can sustain our position from analogous cases. The confusion of tongues furnishes an exactly parallel case, and the curse of Canaan is not dissimilar. The overthrow of the cities of the plain, and of the old world, and of Jerusalem, and the wandering Jew of to-day, are all examples of special curses. Nor would such a confusion of families be a whit behind that of tongues in practical importance: (*a*) As a curse, 1. To break up the original families. If these prohibitions were submitted to universally, the confusion of tongues would not be more effective in sundering tribal ties than it would be in scattering families. 2. To make mankind feel all the sorrows incident to such a breaking up of our homes. (*b*) As a blessing, 1. To curb man's almost invincible proneness to selfishness. 2. To avert family pride and haughtiness among the more fortunate of earth toward their humbler but worthy brethren. 3. To extend charity to all by necessitating unions among various families. 4. To facilitate political comity and civic polity. Thus, like labor, it is at once a curse and a blessing—that by which the race lives, and that by which it suffers.



Sterility and the propagation of monstrosities are undoubtedly the result of a curse, and special barrenness, such as is threatened in Lev. xx. 20 and 21, is a special curse inflicted for a special reason; and this gives us a concrete instance of the very law we assert to have originated. But, in the application of that law to the case in question, pure justice demands that the physical possibility of obeying the command, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth," (unless we limit it to Adam and Eve,) without violating intrinsic moral righteousness and a divine command, shall exist, prior to the infliction of the blighting curse upon the functions of reproduction, among near of kin, in consequence of which physical blight a physiological and moral law unite in condemning unions among them. The multiplication of the race created that physical possibility, whereupon the blight of the generative functions, within these degrees of affinity and consanguinity, followed. The external moral command depends on the internal physical fact. Turretin aids us thus: "*Commodius alii se expediunt distinguendo jus naturale primum et absolutum, quod in natura ipsa Dei immediate fundatur; et secundarium, quod fundatur in natura rerum, et locum tantum habet in certo rerum statu, ut lex prohibens furtum supponit rerum divisionem: talia conjugia repugnare quidem posteriori juri naturali in certo rerum statu, seu natura constituta, post generis humani multiplicationem . . . sed non repugnare juri naturali primario et absoluto; alias Deus qui seipsum non abnegat, de eo nunquam dispensare potuisset, nec talem conjunctionem, nequidem sub mundi initium, vel instituisset ipse, vel probasset.*" Loc. undecim., Q. 2, paragraph 30. Natural death, as an illustrative instance in point, may serve to show the point of this distinction. After the fall the universal reign of death seemed a moral necessity; and, if the state of things superinduced by the fall had not been subsequently modified from another cause, death would have remained an absolutely universal monarch; but, in consequence of redemption, the state of things was so changed that Enoch and Elijah were exempted from death. Absolute moral right cannot be changed; but it does not follow from this that intrinsic justice, depending upon a given state of things, may not cease to have

VOL. XXXV., NO. 2—9.

place when the given state of things is changed; or, as in the sunlight the shadow cast by a body will exist only so long as the body shall exist, even so an intrinsic immorality, conditioned by a certain state of things, will exist only so long as that state of things exists; or as marriage among near of kin, as an intrinsic immorality, is conditioned by the physical blight of their generative functions, so in all cases where this blight exists, this union is an immorality; but it does not follow that God may not have deferred inflicting that blight till after the multiplication of the human race, and, in the case of the *Levir*, suspended its operation; thus making the Levirate marriage and that of the immediate children of Adam morally righteous. However, Calvin and a few other learned men have urged that רֵבִמָּה in Deut. xxv. 5, denotes a proximate member of the tribe to which the deceased belonged, who was not within the degrees of affinity or consanguinity prohibited in the Levitical law. Turretin says: "Si latius extendetur ad cognatum proximum extra gradus prohibitos, ut non improbabiliter volunt non pauci viri docti, et Calvinus imprimis, nec vox רֵבִמָּה repugnat, quæ cognatum aut affinem quemlibet significat, qualis erat Booz ad Ruth Moabitidem, sublata erit omnis difficultas." The learned J. D. Michaelis limits the Levirate law to men who were not already married. Book 3, Ch. 6, § 98. But our solution meets the demands of this law equally with those of the original constitution and command, and we may safely pass all other explanations by. In passing from the consideration of this point we call attention to the fact that, in our view, the Levirate law is an exception to the general rule, requiring divine intervention and authority for its existence and execution.

We wish here to utilise the physiological law signalised, a few years ago, in this REVIEW, by the gifted and polemical pen of Rev. Wm. Stoddert, D. D. He undoubtedly has proved that the prohibition *in re* and the prohibition *in verbis* sustain an apt and close relation to each other; that the one in law flows from the one in fact, as an effect flows from its cause. While we are thankful to him for his contribution towards the elucidation of so intricate a subject, we think he failed in the vital matter of see-

ing that the law *in verbis* is only the shadow, of which the law *in re* is the substance; and that no matter how truly, beautifully, and eloquently the substance may be depicted, and its causative relation to the shadow demonstrated, the question still recurs, What object had God, the Creator and Judge, in view, when he arranged the physiological facts so that unions, under the given conditions, or within the prohibited degrees, should be fruitful of the physical evils he mentions? He seems to reason as if these physical causes were not the product of the divine will; that they exist independent of God; and that he has only adjusted his law to the existing facts, and forbidden the use of them; whereas the true view is, he himself is the source of these physical causes, and instituted them as a prohibitory measure, with a final purpose. It is the marring vice of nearly all modern physical science, that ignoring the origin of secondary causes, and a final purpose, it simply ties sequences together, and assumes that its task is done, and well done. Our view, on the contrary, supplies an adequate rational end for the law *in re*, and assigns to the law *in verbis* the office of seeking to realise that end.

Having disencumbered our subject from the burdens usually put upon it from the facts of the original constitution of the command to Adam and Eve, and of the Levirate law, we now take up

I. The question whether the Levitical laws relate to marriage or not. This is the main question at issue. The scope and extent of the law will follow in a separate head. We affirm that the eighteenth and twentieth chapters of Leviticus, while containing more, embody prohibitions against incest, and, by implication, define the scope of legitimate and rightful marriage. Such is our view, for which the following are some of our reasons:

(a) Upon the supposition that they do not, we could read thus: "None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover nakedness, *unless you are married!*" "The nakedness of thy father, or the nakedness of thy mother, shalt thou not uncover, *unless you are married!*" "The nakedness of thy father's wife thou shalt not uncover, *unless you are married!*" "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife,

*unless you are married!*" "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter, *unless you are married!*" "Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind, *unless you are married!*" "If a man shall lie with his uncle's wife . . . they shall die childless, *unless they are married!*" These laws certainly regulate some form of sexual intercourse. But it is exceedingly unnatural and unreasonable to suppose that they were meant to regulate only the irregular and not the permanent sexual relations. Fornication was already forbidden; absolutely and universally forbidden. For what good does the law now specify a partial prohibition? If the sexual union between next of kin is criminal and mischievous when incidental, it is also criminal when permanent. If *marriage* is not here regulated, the law is objectless.

(b) If only illicit intercourse were intended to be forbidden, then might not the Israelite, reasoning on the common and familiar principle that what is not forbidden is allowed, conclude that such intercourse among parties of whom the female was unmarried and not near of kin, was not immoral? Why, where the female is unmarried, limit the prohibition to those near of kin?

(c) In our humble opinion, if the proposition had been made to a Hebrew to marry a Hebrewess, with these prohibitions denying him licit intercourse, in the civic sense, he would not have entertained the proposal.

(d) The contrary view offers no adequate reason for the existence of this portion of the Bible. We present the reader with a summary of the reasons offered on the other side, which we take from the October (1883) number of this REVIEW, p. 688. 1. "It is not for us to explain the repetition of laws." On the contrary, we affirm that it is for us to explain the reasons of repetitions. Does the infinite God rehearse his laws in mortal ears for his own entertainment? or their amusement? Does not his solemn reiteration of them impart to them special emphasis? Repetitions are not meaningless; and if they teach a lesson, it is our duty to study it. Even the familiar "verily, verily, I say unto you," has its lesson. 2. "There was, no doubt, sufficient reason." Most certainly, and it abides to-day. 3. "The sanctity of do-

mestic intercourse." 4. The Hebrews, being in tents, were especially exposed to debauchery. 5. The prospective operation of the evil example of the Canaanites. We group the last three, as they are exceedingly inconsequential and non-germane. If we were not dealing with so sacred a matter as changing our Confession of Faith, we should pass by all such arguments. To see the enormity of the folly of such reasons, we turn back and quote from the same document: "The passages in Leviticus . . . are a section of the civil law, and . . . are no more binding on Christians than is the law forbidding the eating of swine's flesh . . . still such prohibition is not of force now," pp. 684-5. "The paragraph or section of laws, is a series of special prohibitions of illicit intercourse," p. 687. Now, we cannot see that the sanctity of domestic intercourse, during the Mosaic dispensation, was a whit more important or imperilled than before or since; and yet these laws are limited to that period! We cannot see that a horrible crime among some Hebrews should be allowable among others; that what is left unforbidden, where the female is unmarried, and the parties are not near of kin, may be innocent in a civic point of view, while what is forbidden is so great a crime! We fail to see why adultery by a man with an unmarried aunt was so criminal then, and not before or since; and not then, if the woman were only a cousin! We beg the reader to observe that that at which these laws are aimed, on the hypothesis of the restless advocates of change, is not adultery, for the law against it is not civic and temporal, but something else; something that was horrible only in a Hebrew, only in some Hebrews, and only for the Mosaic period! And, to crown all, when that something is specified, it in substance existed before, exists yet, and is essentially moral in its nature, and cannot pass away! Such are the uses assigned to these sacred laws of God.

(e) The opposite view not only eviscerates these laws of all good, but positively degrades them. They become a mere recital of abominations, actual or possible, without having even a valuable historical reference, much less a present use. They are not only not "profitable for doctrine," contrary to 2 Tim. iii. 16, but positively injurious. We cannot admit this.

(f) Leviticus xviii. 18, relates undoubtedly to marriage. Both those who affirm, and those who deny, that it relates to polygamy or bigamy, admit that marriage is intended. This shows that the inspired writer had marriage before his mind while writing; and the connexion between taking a wife and uncovering nakedness, all the time in his mind, is here distinctly stated as parts of one whole. The forbidding of the second part carries with it the first part, and that form of prohibition was adopted, because it excludes marriage and intercourse between parties *as if* married. To forbid carnal intercourse between a man and his aunt (father's sister) is to forbid them to marry; and all these prohibitions are unconditional unless the condition is specified. If, therefore, to uncover nakedness excludes carnal intercourse, even though the parties are married, in one case, we conclude that it does so in all cases. But to take a wife, and to uncover nakedness, are used in the same sense in Lev. xx. 21. It is granted that in Lev. xviii. 18, marriage is intended or expressed. The reading is וְאִשָּׁה אֶל-אֲחֻתָּהּ לֹא יִתְּקַח. The phrase אֶל-אֲחֻתָּהּ limits the sphere of the prohibition. In xx. 21, we find יִקַּח אִשָּׁתוֹ אָחִיר in which אָחִיר limits the scope of the condition. Omitting the limiting phrases, we have left in both cases the regular formula to express marriage. The exact and literal rendering of this verse is: "If a man shall marry his brother's wife, it is an unclean thing; he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness; they shall die childless." If adultery only were meant, the penalty here specified would, instead of being a curse, have become an incentive and temptation; whereas, if marriage were spoken of, to a pious Hebrew this penalty was a source of great grief. But the writer condemns the marriage, calling "it an unclean thing," and then specifies the reason of this judgment: "he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness." The *πρῶτον ψεύδος* of modern perversions of this Scripture is in the assumption that the ceremony, *et al. cet.*, are the whole of marriage; whereas the purpose of this relation, without the least degradation of the matter, is the essence, or, as the Germans say, the contents, of it. The Bible treats domestic relations as they actually exist and in their entirety.

(g) Lev. xviii. 18, forbids polygamy: For—

1. Its reason, “*to vex her*,” demands it. It is not true that Rachel was more likely to vex Leah than was any other Jewess; and if it were true, the excess of vexing is too minute a matter to call down a law from God. A rival wife, however, would vex her. Upon what a flimsy foundation people will believe anything they want! “*Homines fere libenter id quod volunt credunt.*” (Cæsar.)

2. *The order and scope of the whole.*

The Levitical law is neither ceremonial, nor typical, nor symbolical, but social and moral; yet only the adumbratical part of the Jewish dispensation, and only the portion of that which found its substance in the militant sphere of the present dispensation, has passed away, while all the moral and social grounds for fencing off the foul corruptions of incest still exist. To limit the law to merely civic purposes is a palpable violation of the context, the text, and the language employed. The context expressly says that the obligation of this marriage law *bound the Gentiles just as much as it did the Jews*; for they incur wrath by breaking it, verses 3 and 24–28. The text condemns the acts forbidden, *because it is wickedness*, and the language employed denotes moral criminality.

The theme of the writer is, “None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him.” He amplifies by taking up the first nearest of kin, parents and children, vs. 6–8; then takes up the second nearest of kin, v. 9; then the third nearest of kin, v. 10; then the fourth, v. 11; then the fifth, vs. 12–14; then the sixth, v. 15; then the seventh, v. 16; finally the eighth, v. 17. Having condescended to the lowest improper degrees of kin within which marriage is not allowable, the writer next forbids polygamy, v. 18, then lays down a general law applying to all, and finally closes with a law against bestiality. Chapter xx. adds two items to the list (see tabulated statement below), but is mainly concerned in prescribing penalties, several of which were death. The self-evidencing light borne upon the face of this leaves no room for debate. We leave it in its simple integrity.

3. Not only do we find *the general scope* of the writer requiring that polygamy should be treated, but *also the peculiar idio-*

*matic formula* of the original designates polygamy with singular accuracy. The idea expressed in English by the phrase "one to another" was expressed by an invariable formula among the Hebrews, but they had several sets of words with which to fill out this formula. They said "a man to his brother," "a man to his neighbor," "this to that," "a woman to her sister," etc. The "brother" of the formula, "a man to his brother," might, perchance, be a brother in fact; but that cannot be learned from the formula. *E. g.*, in Egypt, when the darkness was such as might be felt, it is said the Egyptians "saw not one another . . . for three days," Ex. x. 23. The original reads, "They saw not a man his brother." So in Ex. xvi. 15; xxv. 20. "Their faces were, man to his brother," that is, face to face. In Gen. xxxvii. 19, we have a case where the parties were brothers. "They said one to another," or "man to his brother." Now, if any one should attempt to prove that these parties were brothers from the use of this formula, he would act as uncritically as would an English scholar if he should attempt the same from the phrase one to another. From the marginal reading, "Neither shalt thou take one wife to another," it will be seen that this formula is used in Lev. xviii. 18. It is precisely on the uncritical basis, above illustrated, that the word sister appears in the text. Every analogy of the Hebrew idiom proves that the marginal rendering is the only proper one. To oppose or doubt this correct rendering, as Dr. Hodge does, because the Septuagint renders literal "sister," is worthless, because the Septuagint is a very imperfect translation, and nothing is more probable than that those translators by the word ἀδελφὴν meant only fellow, as does the Hebrew. To object, as Dr. Hodge does, that this 18th verse thus become an express law against polygamy, "which the law of Moses permitted," is to go directly against the *facts* and the *logic*. Moses' law *did not permit* polygamy. It discourages it everywhere, and here expressly forbids it. That lecherous Rabbins and gross German doctors construed the passage in favor of license, is strong probable ground that we are right. But again, the rendering of literal sister is absolutely excluded by the context. In verse 16th the marriage of a deceased wife's sister is



*forbidden* under the equal and parallel prohibition of marriage of a deceased brother's wife. That the express prohibition includes the implied one, we shall prove beyond question at the proper place. Now, then, it cannot be good translation to make the 18th verse by clear inference contradict the teaching of the 16th. The 18th, then, is a prohibition of polygamy, literally a prohibition of a man's marrying two Israelitish women simultaneously (a pagan he could *never* marry in any case), and not a prohibition of marrying two literal sisters simultaneously, with an implied permission to marry the second after the first died. The unquestionable opposition of the Mosaic law forbids our taking the verse just as it stands in the text of our version, and to read literally "a woman to her sister." The verse would read: "Neither shalt thou take women, a woman to her sister," etc. Indeed, it would only make the matter worse, by implying that if a man wishes a plurality of wives he may have them, provided he should not marry sisters. The form of speech we employed is the only one free from reasonable danger.

(h) We have already shown that the Levirate law was a positive institution, extraordinary and exceptional. The object of this law was to provide an heir for the deceased brother. But the penalty attached to taking a brother's wife was that they should die childless. Only two solutions of this seem possible: 1. To limit verse 16 to the life-time of the first husband. But this will not do; because, (1) Adultery is forbidden in the immediate context, verse 20. (2) To take a woman means to marry her, and that is the thing forbidden in verse 16. (3) The woman would have two husbands, and polygamy is prohibited in verse 18. 2. That God sovereignly suspended the law *in re*, and thus at once made the law *in verbis* morally right and provided for the necessary issue. The *rationale* of this suspension has already been given.

(i) Our application of these prohibitions has enjoyed the sanction of the Christian world, Greek, Catholic, and Protestant, as fully as almost any other doctrine, and a great deal more fully than most other doctrines. The new exegesis has not been sanctioned by any commentator or theologian of note in all antiquity,

as far as we know ; while the old one is in the creeds of Christendom, with only a few modern exceptions. An effort made by a society, carried on by ceaseless agitation, (a method so effectively employed by abolitionists,) has been put forth for years in England to annul this law in a concrete case (the one apparently the most vulnerable, because the advocates of change can combine a denial of the application of the law with the denial of its existence most adroitly in this case), but still in vain. A noble House of Lords has stood between this law and the host of *lusty commoners*. But agitation is unsettling many who, apparently not aware of the vast ruinous consequences of giving up the struggle for the sake of peace, seem inclined to abandon our fort to an enemy who will not make peace with us till lust can have free course. The common approval of so many ages and denominations is no weak evidence in our favor.

(j) On the contrary, who are the champions of change? Do they give solid reasons for following them? One of them calls our doctrine a "mythological dogma of Rome and the Dark Ages." What a combination! Truly Rome and the Dark Ages synchronise; but what about mythology? "The Dark Ages" were strictly the ninth and tenth centuries; loosely they were A. D. 800-1100. But he himself finds our view away back in the second and third centuries, and tries to make oriental enthusiasm paternise it. We deny that it is of mythological origin; that it sprung from oriental enthusiasm; that it was of Papal origin; that the Dark Ages produced it; and we enter our protest against all efforts to create prejudice against any part of the Confession of Faith, or of the truth of God. Nor do we attribute any value whatever to the innuendo that the Westminster Assembly were led partly by superstition, partly by deference to the memory of a dead and almost forgotten king, to incorporate our doctrine into the Confession. The true genesis thereof is: Moses wrote it out in Leviticus, and it has been almost universally received by the devout until recently.

The alarming feature about this proposed amendment of our Confession is, that it is advocated within our own pale by arguments so reckless and rash, and by loud assertions made in the

teeth of history and impregnable facts. It is denied by our opponents that the laws of Leviticus, chs. 18th and 20th, are binding as a marriage law on the Christian Church! And this monstrous position (we can call it no less) is taken in defiance of all the creeds of Christendom; in defiance of all the Patristic and Reformation expositors; in defiance of the current of the Church-synods of the early and the later Churches; in defiance of our own Constitution; in defiance of the teaching of the whole current of the wise fathers of American Presbyterianism, such as Dr. Ashbel Green, Dr. A. Alexander, John M. Mason, the Rices, the Plumers, Thornwell, and all! What could have induced these new writers to take so rash a position? This, that the discussion had now reached a stage where the condemnation of these marriages was seen to be inevitable if God's law of marriage be allowed to stand. Again, it is falsely asserted that the Westminster Assembly inserted the law in blind complaisance to previous parliaments, and especially to that of Henry VIII. Not so. That Assembly simply followed the Scripture and the invariable law of the Churches. It is asserted that this parliament of Henry VIII. framed the law in compliance with the Romish Canon law. This is *expressly false*. That parliament framed the law in a spirit of entire opposition to the Romish Canon law, for by one enactment they repealed and swept away *a multitude* of the unscriptural restrictions of the canon law, going back for their guidance to the laws of Christendom in the primitive ages, hundreds of years before there were any Popes. Surely that cannot be a good cause which necessitates all this hardy, reckless, and ignorant rejection of the facts of history, and the conclusions of all past ages, and of the wise, learned, and holy founders of our Presbyterianism. We cannot but condemn it sternly, for these are the signatures of the most unhealthy and perilous innovation. As we have shown, its tendency is direct to strip Christ's Church of *all laws against incest*, and thus leave her conniving at infamies which paganism itself abhors.

Nor does this writer show a whit better as a critic. We quote: "If the word wife means widow" (in v. 16), "and a man is forbidden to marry his brother's widow, it follows (?) a neighbor's

wife . . . . must mean (?) his widow, and consequently a man is forbidden to marry a widow." We suppose he designed this for a *reductio ad absurdum*. If so, he evidently succeeded. We have marked by an interrogation point the places where the reduction is absurd. Nor can we acquiesce in the effort to resolve the moral law into a necessity arising out of a physical fact or physiological law other than of divine appointment. This gives the substance of the difficulty as the solution of its shadow—the law *in re* as the explanation of the law *in verbis*. From a careful study of the arguments set forth by the restless advocates of change, we find no reason to remove the ancient landmarks which our fathers have set.

(k) The contrary opinion not only implies that the Church of God has been without a divinely given law covering a species of crime esteemed as such even among heathens; implies not only that all the great and good men of every age, since the days of Moses, so far as known to us, have failed to discover the absence of any divine law; not only that they incorporated into their commentaries and summaries of Christian ethics human superstitions; not only that they tried to bind the consciences of men with unwarranted doctrines; but also that God forgot, or at least omitted, to legislate upon one of the most vital questions springing out of our earthly relations; that one whole species of crime remains to this day unprohibited, and is destined to remain so till the end of time; that members of the Church may marry among near of kin, even the nearest, and remain in good and regular standing; that God's law is not perfect, thus subverting one strong evidence of Christianity. The presumption against all this is itself almost a demonstration.

(l) The references to this law in the New Testament presuppose it. They are found in Mark vi. 18 and 1 Cor. v. 1. The *first* reads: "For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife." Now, there were three, if not four, reasons why it was not lawful: (1) Philip, the first husband of Herodias, was yet alive, *if* this be a fact. (2) If he had been dead, still, according to Lev. xviii. 16, she could not be Herod's wife. (3) Herod had a divorced wife, and bigamy was forbidden,

Lev. xviii. 18. (4) She was the niece of both Herod and Philip, and according to Lev. xviii. 12-14 could not be the lawful wife of either. Now, as a matter of fact, under the Levitical law on any view in force then, since she never was Philip's wife, John's rebuke must not have been based on the first and second reasons, save only as an *ad hominem* argument, we look to the third and fourth reasons for the main grounds of the rebuke: *i. e.*, to the one condemning bigamy (xviii. 18) and to the one forbidding marriage among near of kin (xviii. 12-14). The *second* reads: "It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife." Undoubtedly, in any view of the matter, the reference is to Lev. xviii. 11, and xx. 11, where the penalty of death implies the magnitude of the crime. Paul says: "And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you." These references stand on the Levitical law as a house on its foundation, and they all fall together.

(*m*) The gravity of the penalty demands our interpretation. Surely, the penalty of death would not be annexed to a merely civic and temporary institution! We can see why it might be assessed upon the incestuous or adulterous or Sabbath-breakers, but not why it should be upon a trivial civic institution, of short duration, and of no historical or prophetic use. It is absolutely incredible that such penalties should be attached to any other than moral laws, permanent in nature and important in character. It is vain to say that adultery covers the criminal element in incest; for, 1. It is specified in the context, xx. 10; xviii. 20, and the death penalty pronounced against it. 2. Marriage, if lawful, would obviate this penalty in some cases, as, *e. g.*, xx. 19, between nieces and nephews. 3. The law condemning adultery, does not apply to incest, except before marriage. For example, if the father, whose son had taken his wife (1 Cor. v. 1), were still living, then the son, upon the hypothesis of our new lights, was simply an adulterer; if the father were dead, then the son was innocent, marriage being supposed. But, in our own view, he deserved death in either case for incest, and in the first case,

death also for adultery. We cite this to show that there were two crimes, committable in one, yet generically distinct, meritorious, under the Levitical law, of death; and also, to show what we before have urged, that when the Levitical law has been abandoned, as support of Ch. 24, Sec. 4, of our Confession of Faith, an appeal to the seventh commandment will not do—will be in vain. It does not relate to the same subject. The question answered by the seventh commandment is, under what conditions is *intercourse* innocent; but the question answered by the Levitical law is, within what degrees of kinship is *marriage* lawful. The seventh commandment answers its question by saying: when the parties are lawfully married; and the Levitical laws answer their question by saying: between all people, naturally competent, marriage is lawful up to, and inclusive of, first or own cousins; but between parties nearer of kin than this, whether the kinship be of affinity or consanguinity, they may not marry. After the Levitical law has pronounced marriage unlawful between two parties, if they contract it then their intercourse is adulterous (for they are not lawfully married) and incestuous.

II. The second item of our theme relates to the question, Does the Levitical law condemn equally marriages between persons near of blood-kin and persons near of law-kin? Or, to state the question more exactly, Does this law extend its prohibitions indifferently to the same degrees of law-kin and of blood-kin? Much that has been said and written about the general subject; might better have not been said and written, if the parties had clearly distinguished this latter question from the former one. A man may admit that the Levitical law relates to marriage and deny that the inhibition takes no account of the distinction between kin in law and kin in blood. Some have done so. We take the affirmative, and maintain that God makes no difference between these kinds of kin in his marriage law; and our reasons are—

(a) The only actual fact accomplished by the prohibition *in re*, as well as *in verbis*, among those near of kin in blood, to wit, *the confusion of families*, which is also the only conceivable purpose visible to mortal eyes, as truly demands its application to kin in law as it does to kin in blood. The reason is as cogent

in the one case as in the other. We have shown that the purpose of the law *in re* is the very gist of the question at issue. We do not see how there can be any dispute on this point, and know of none. Nor can we see how any one can deny that the operation of this law is limited to this world, But if so, it is a plain case of *a posteriori* reasoning that God's purpose was to intertwine the families of the earth by marriages outside of near of kin. This purpose being granted, then the law demands equal scope among families closely related, without reference to the question by what kind of tie they are bound together.

(b) Germane to and confirmatory of the above is the fact that generative impotency cannot have its explanation in any merely physiologic law or physical fact without presupposing a merely material origin of souls. The immediate hand of God is differentiated out of procreation. But this is impossible, because the material part of generation is inadequate to the production of a rational and immortal soul; and because the Bible makes children a heritage from the Lord, and barrenness is declared to be a penal judgment. Lev. xx. 20, 21. This point sustains our view of the genesis of what we have called the law *in re*; for so far from that law accounting for the one *in verbis*, it itself demands (1) that its purpose shall be explained, and (2) that the finger of God shall make it fruitful or fruitless in every instance. The suspension of the penal curse of Lev. xx. 20, 21, in the exceptional institution of Deut. xxv. 5, might be argued against, on the ground that such a suspension presupposes a sort of miraculous interposition of God; but we here see God's hand is always present.

(c) The moral dangers, or exposure to temptation, is as great among law-kin as among blood-kin, with less natural restraints and stronger propensity. Take, for example, a case where a young man lives with a sister and sister-in-law; cannot any one see that the strength of temptation, whatever it may be, is the same, *pro forma*, in relation to both females, with these additional essential dangers, 1st. His natural affection for his sister will be a strong safeguard to her, while its absence will be the absence of that guaranty. 2d. The absence of any given restraint of any

propensity is, in effect, the presence of that propensity increased by the amount equal to the pressure of the given restraint. Statistics will verify this remark.

Let any one read the graphic, practical, and sagacious picture, drawn by Dr. N. L. Rice, in his argument in the General Assembly of Louisville on the McQueen case, in which he portrays the *dilemma* of the young wife with a marriageable sister, either inhospitably to banish that sister from her house, or else to take the risks of jealously beholding the monstrous growth of incestuous feelings during her own decline. The man who does not feel the full force of his presentation is impervious to common sense.

(d) The following tabulated statement of the law proves it:

PENALTY.	WHERE FORBIDDEN.				DEGREES OF KIN.
Death.	Lev. xviii.	7.			Father.
"	"	"	"		Mother.
"	"	"	"		Son.
"	"	"	"		Daughter.
"	"	"	15; xx.	12.	Father-in-law.
"	"	"	"	14.	Mother-in-law.
"	"	"	"	"	Son-in-law.
"	"	"	"	12.	Daughter-in-law.
"	"	"	17.		Stepfather.
"	"	"	18; "	11	Stepmother.
"	"	"	"	"	Stepson.
"	"	"	17.		Stepdaughter.
	"	"	10.		Grandfather.
					Grandmother.
					Grandson.
	"	"	"		Granddaughter.
	"	"	14.		Uncle.
"Bear iniquity."	"	"	12, 13; xx.	19.	Aunt.
" "	"	"	"	"	Nephew.
	"	"	14.		Niece.
					Uncle-in-law.
"Childless."	"	"	"	20.	Aunt-in-law.
"	"	"	"	"	Nephew-in-law.
					Niece-in-law.



PENALTY.	WHERE FORBIDDEN.	NEAR OF KIN.
"Cut off;"	"Bear iniquity." Lev. xviii. 9.	Brother.
	" " "	Sister.
Childless.	Lev. xviii. 16; xx. 21.	Brother-in-law.
"	" " " " "	Sister-in-law.
	" " 17.	Stepgrandfather.
		Stepgrandmoth'r.
		Stepgrandson.
	" " "	Stepgranddau'er.
	" " 11; " 17.	Half-brother.
	" " " " "	Half-sister.

A proof that the law, exhibited in the above table, applies to law-kin, where the connecting link is a female, is found in v. 17. The marriage of a (deceased) wife's daughter is forbidden. Now, a wife's sister and daughter are related to the man by identically the same link—the deceased wife; while the sister is full blood-kin to the wife, and the daughter is only half blood-kin; yet Moses remorselessly and expressly forbids marriage of the stepdaughter, aye! and of the stepgranddaughter also; and, as if to compel apprehension, specifies the daughter of a stepdaughter—law-kin of two removes, with both connecting links *females*!

This fact is as absolutely destructive of Dr. Jacobs' theory, as the fact that the number of ring-growths in a tree is a variable quantity is of the old theory that their number was the same as that of the years the tree was old. In fact, no *theory* of interpretation, other than that employed by the Assembly of Westminster divines, can be applied, candidly and intelligently, to the law in question without palpable violence either to itself or to the text. Given the text and *any other theory*, and the two cannot be made harmoniously to quadrate.

We call special attention to the fact that the law touching kin in law is co-extensive, conterminous, and commensurate with that touching kin in blood. This is itself a demonstration. It will be noticed that a specific prohibition of marriage by a grandson to his grandmother does not exist; and, consequently, that if we require a specific law for each possible concrete case, as a writer recently did, such a marriage would be legitimate; but that if,

VOL. XXXV., NO. 2—10.

upon the time-honored and sound principle that to condemn one concrete case because it embodies an evil principle, is to condemn the principle, and, by implication, to condemn every other possible concrete embodiment of that principle, then such a marriage is forbidden.

Let us see what would result from the mode of interpretation claimed by our opponents. While the letter of the law forbids marriage within degrees so remote as a stepgrandfather and step-granddaughter (v. 17), it would allow, 1. A man to marry his own daughter! 2. A brother's daughter. 3. A sister's daughter. 4. A maternal uncle's widow. 5. A brother's son's widow. 6. A sister's son's widow. 7. The sister of a deceased wife. So shocking are the results! Thus we see that the legalising of the 7th case, marriage with a deceased wife's sister, can only be reached at the loathsome price of legalising along with it six other forms of most monstrous incest. No; *there is no other rule of exposition for the law than that which the Church has always held from the days of the apostles: that, when a given degree is excluded, the equal counterpart degree is also excluded by the meaning of the law.* And so the 16th verse, with ch. xx. 21, settles the whole debate beyond all evasions and inferences: that, as a man is forbidden to marry his brother's wife, so a woman is forbidden to marry her sister's husband.

Moreover, the omission here relates to blood-kin as truly as to law-kin, thus cutting off any reasoning from the omission as it relates to kin in law only. In regard to uncles and nieces, aunts and nephews-in-law, marriage between the latter couplet is specifically forbidden, and between the former couplet entirely omitted. Now, why should marriage, where the man is a nephew and the woman an aunt, be unholy, while between two where the man is an uncle and the woman a niece, morally right? But the condemnation of marriage in the one couplet, carries that of the other. *A woman is, in this case, the connecting link*, and marriage is forbidden; whereas, in the case where a man is the connecting link, no prohibition is stated specifically. (This, for Drs. Jacobs and Stoddert.) Finally, it is only by reasoning *a minori* that we have put death as a penalty to marriage of a father to

his daughter, or of a son to his mother; for the law specifies only parents and children-in-law, *i. e.*, step-children or sons or daughters-in-law. God thus signalises marriage within these degrees of affinity as the special object of his righteous judgment.

(*e*) The condemnation of one clear instance of marriage between two parties who were of kin only in law, for the reason, or on the ground, that they are thus related, carries with it the condemnation of marriage between all persons thus related within all the prohibited degrees of consanguinity. If the divine Lawgiver had lit upon only one example, and that one the grossest, of marriage between parties related in law only, that one would have determined the rest, for it would have fixed the principle of wrong in act, and established a rule for our guidance in interpreting and applying his law. If condemning an act does not condemn the principle of evil embodied in that act, then not simply the shadow of doubt, but even the certainty of uncertainty, rests upon the vast bulk of all the specifications of the Larger Catechism. The reason given for these prohibitions is that the parties named were near of kin; the design of the law was to prohibit intermarriage among near of kin; and the specifications of law extend the prohibitions indifferently down both kinds of kinship to the same degree of kin, and then cease. Nothing short of an express statement to the contrary can weaken the demonstration. It seems to us folly to extend the proof. Subtle and insinuating doubts have been cast into many minds about the value, extent, and use of the Decalogue itself, and may be ingeniously cast into many minds on any topic, even the clearest. We learned recently of a man who bears the title "Professor," who said he could not see how three and two equal five; and we met with a man who told us that he could attach no meaning to the words "a principle of righteousness." The word of God was not given to meet quibblers. It presents the truth so that a lover of truth may see the truth, and enjoy it; and leaves it so that it becomes strong delusion to the erratic and quixotic.

In concluding our discussion, we wish to apply the principles we have elucidated and demonstrated to the specific point now pending.

*First.* The question to be acted upon is not the one argued by the restless advocates of change. They debate one point, and vote on another. We ask: If the Levitical law does not relate to marriage, as they contend, why do they propose to limit the abrogation to that of law-kin, and leave the other half of that unscriptural law standing in force? They allow folks to marry kin in law, but not kin in blood, and argue that God has never legislated on the subject of marriage among kin! and then say there is no use of appealing to the sentiments of men! The Church cannot legislate.

*Second.* The point before the Presbyteries cuts across the distinction about the "connecting link," and the fancied imparting of the male's blood to the female through the medium of unborn children, and requires liberty of marriage among kin in law absolutely without limitation. If the portion of the law submitted to the Presbyteries for abrogation be expunged, then we have absolutely no law touching the point of marriage among kin in law.

*Third.* We have shown that Leviticus, chapters 18 and 20, Mark vi. 18, and 1 Cor. v. 1, embody the principles that determine and control the world's marriage law; that these principles take absolutely no account of the distinction of law-kin and blood-kin; and that the abrogation of any part will carry with it the abrogation of the whole. Is the Southern Presbyterian Church ready for the change?

*Fourth.* The allowance of this sin by most of the State Legislatures is no guide for the legislation of the Church. She has no statute book but the law of God. She must diminish naught from it and add nothing to it. If the State has ceased to make such marriages crimes of incest, all that we are to conclude thence is, the Church has no commission to pursue them with civil pains and penalties, as she had not before. But her spiritual censures remain to her, and the recreancy of the State to godly morals is no excuse for her recreancy to her master. In Paris the State legalises brothels; in Louisiana, lotteries. Must our General Assemblies therefore legalise them?

It is said that the common opinion of civil society is leaving our Church far behind on the subject of marriages with the sisters

of deceased wives, and therefore the Church must perforce surrender her position. The reply is as plain as it is solemn. Is this world a friend to God? Did God put his Church into this world to conform to its corruptions, or to resist and reform it? Is the true strength of a Church in the favor of the world, or in the favor of God? A Church strong in the favor of this world is, in that very fact, apostate and worthless; that very fact proves that she has made alliance with God's enemy, whereas her sole mission was to war against him and conquer him. If the new-fangled exegesis and sentiment against these unnatural marriages is but a *part* of an incoming tide of license, immorality, and sensuality, then the Church has but one clear duty: to resist it and all the other parts of the flood of death with solemn steadfastness. And such, manifestly, is this new movement. It is of a piece with the other corruptions which are flowing in upon us—gaming, theatre-going, usury, mammon-worship, luxury, speculation, political corruption, collusions for gain. Whence did this usage of marrying sisters first come to plague our Presbyterian Zion? From that same quarter whence abolition, and coercion, and the union of the Church with the usurping State, and federal covenant-breaking, and Socinian Rationalism came to curse us. From that same quarter where capricious divorce now dissolves one-eighth of all the marriages formed each year, and whose social corruption is like a corrosive poison, steadily eating out the Christian family. This doctrine of marrying one's sisters is a part of the same deadly disease. We are well aware that some widowers in our Church, misguided and befogged by the miserable special pleadings, such as are now seeking to change our Constitution, have married their sisters without criminal intent. But in general the usage comes from a polluted source, and will lead to pollution.

C. W. HUMPHREYS.

## ALPHABETICAL INDEX.

## CORRECTION AND ADDITION.

MESSRS. EDITORS: On page 2 of "Alphabetical Index" in the last number of the REVIEW (Vol. XXXV., No. I.) occurs an error which I desire to correct.

The article "Asceticism" is found in Volume XXII., page 33, and again in Volume XXXI., page 470. In the Index *both* articles are attributed to G. J. A. Coulson, Esq. Only the first was written by him, the second by T. E. Peck, D. D.

Since the publication of the Index I have learned that the following articles, which appeared anonymously, are from the pen of Dr. T. E. Peck, viz.:

Church under the Patriarchs and Moses, Bird's Eye View of, Vol. XXVIII., page 415. (See Index, p. 6.)

Demission of the Ministry, Vol. XXVII, page 295. (See Index, page 8.)

Stuart Robinson's Church of God, Vol. XI., page 480. (See Index, page 30.)

J. L. MARTIN.

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. 3.

---

JULY, MDCCCLXXXIV.

---

ARTICLE I.

EVOLUTION.<sup>1</sup>

*Gentlemen of the Alumni Association:*

At the same time that you honored me with an invitation to deliver an address before you on this occasion, the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary, in view of the fact that "Scepticism in the world is using alleged discoveries in science to impugn the word of God," requested me "to give fully my views, as taught in this institution, upon Evolution, as it respects the world, the lower animals, and man." Inasmuch as several members of the Board are also members of this Association, and both Board and Association feel the same interest in the Seminary, I have supposed that I could not select a subject more likely to meet with your approval than the one suggested to me by the Directors.

I am all the more inclined to make this choice, as it will afford me the opportunity of showing you that additional study has, in some respects, to a certain extent modified my views since I expressed them to many of you in the class-room.

---

<sup>1</sup> This Address was delivered May 7th, 1884, before the Alumni Association of the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C., and is published in the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW at its request, and also at the request of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary.

As is intimated in the Board's request, I may assume that your chief interest in the topic is not in its scientific aspects, but in relations it may bear to the word of God; and therefore I will speak mainly of these relations. Not that I regard you as indifferent to science; from my past acquaintance with you, I have too high an appreciation of your intelligence to regard that as possible; for no intelligent person can be indifferent to knowledge, and especially can no intelligent child of God be indifferent to a knowledge of his Father's handiwork, or of the methods by which he controls the course of his universe. Still, on the present occasion it is doubtless the relations between science, or that which claims to be science, and the Bible, and not science itself, that should receive our attention.

Before entering on the discussion of the specific subject of Evolution in itself and in its relations to the Sacred Scriptures, it may be well to consider the relations subsisting between the teachings of the Scriptures and the teachings of natural science generally. We hear much of the harmony of science and Scripture, of their reconciliation, and the like. Now, is it antecedently probable that there is room for either agreement or disagreement? We do not speak of the harmony of mathematics and chemistry, or of zoology and astronomy, or the reconciliation of physics and metaphysics. Why? Because the subject-matter of each of these branches of knowledge is so different from the rest. It is true we may say that some assertion made by astronomy cannot be correct, because it contradicts some known truth of mathematics or of physics. But yet, in such a case, we would not proceed to look for harmony or reconciliation; we would confine ourselves to the task of removing the contradiction by seeking the error which caused it, and which it proved to exist; for we know that, as truth is one, two contradictories cannot both be true.

May it not be that we have here a representation of the probable relations between the Bible and science—that their contents are so entirely different that it is vain and misleading to be searching for harmonies; and that we should confine our efforts to the examination of real or seeming contradictions which may emerge, and rest satisfied, without attempting to go farther, when we have



discovered that there is no contradiction, if it was only seeming, or have pointed out the error that caused it, if real?

Let us test this point by examining special cases which have arisen, and with regard to which conclusions satisfactory to all believers in the Bible have now been reached.

In Genesis i. 16, the Bible speaks of the two great lights, the sun and the moon, and of the stars as if these were of comparatively insignificant size and importance. It says further, Joshua x. 13, that "the sun stood still, and the moon stayed"; "the sun stood still in the midst of the heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day." In these and other passages the Bible has been thought to teach that the sun and the moon are larger than any of the stars, and that sun, moon, and stars, having been created for the benefit of man, revolve around the earth as a centre. On the scientific side, two forms of astronomy have been presented: the Ptolemaic, teaching that the earth is the centre of the universe; the Copernican, teaching that the sun is the centre of our planetary system. Those who asked for harmony between science and the Bible found wonderful confirmation of the Bible in the Ptolemaic astronomy, and of the Copernican astronomy in the Bible. But gradually it came to be seen and admitted that, whatever might be its teachings on other subjects, the Bible was at least not intended to teach astronomy; and for centuries general assent has been given to the words of Calvin: "Moses does not speak with philosophical acuteness on occult mysteries, but relates those things which are everywhere observed, even by the uncultivated." . . . "He who would learn astronomy, and other recondite arts, let him go elsewhere." Thus it has come to be believed that all we are entitled to ask, as regards the relations between astronomy and the Bible, is that they shall not contradict each other; not that they shall agree with each other. Believers in the Bible as such are indifferent as to what form of astronomy may prevail. Calvin's belief in the geocentric system no more interfered with his confidence in the Bible than does our belief in the heliocentric system interfere with our confidence in the same sure word.

Geography furnishes another illustration of this same kind of

harmony between the Bible and science, which is not less instructive. For centuries geographers taught as science that which was claimed to be in perfect accord with the Bible in such passages as these: "They shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other"; "I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth"; "And shall go out to deceive the nations of the four quarters of the earth." So the Bible and science were thus found further to confirm each other. But, again, in process of time it came to be seen that neither the words of the Bible nor the phenomena of the earth taught what had been supposed; that the Bible taught nothing about the shape or other characteristics of the earth in these or other passages; and that the phenomena of the earth, rightly understood, did not teach that it is a four-cornered immovable plain. Here, again, it is seen that all we should ask for is not harmony, but absence of contradiction. The examination of other cases would lead to the same conclusion.

The Bible does not teach science; and to take its language in a scientific sense is grossly to pervert its meaning.

Yet it is not correct in any of these cases to say that the language of the Bible does not express the exact truth; that it is accommodated to the weakness of the popular mind, to the ignorance of the unlearned. We are often told by some defenders of the Bible that it speaks inaccurately when it says that the sun rises and sets, or that it stood still upon Gibeon. But what is accurate speech? It is speech which conveys exactly the thought intended. Now, if to say that the sun rises conveys exactly the thought intended, wherein can this expression be called inaccurate? There is no intention to explain the cause of the fact of rising. This fact exists equally, whether produced by the sun's absolute motion in space or by the rotation of the earth on its axis. The meaning is, that the relative position of our horizon and the sun has changed in a certain way; and in stating that the change has taken place, there is not the remotest reference to the cause. In passing from Europe to the United States, we say that we go westward. But we are met by the assertion, uttered in a patronising tone of superior wisdom: "Oh no; you speak erroneously;

you show that you are not acquainted with the real state of the facts; or if you are, you are speaking inaccurately for the sake of accommodating yourself to your ignorant hearers; you make a false statement because your hearers could not otherwise gain any idea from you on the subject. The truth is, that when you thought you were going westward, you were going eastward at a rapid rate; what you call your going westward was merely stopping a small part of the eastward motion you had in common with the surface of the earth." Now it would probably be hard to discuss this sage utterance in a perfectly respectful manner. But wherein does it differ from the tone of those who apologise for the "gross form" in which the Scriptures convey instruction, for their not speaking with "greater exactness," and the like? A phenomenal truth is as much a truth as is the so-called scientific explanation of it; and words which accurately convey a knowledge of the phenomenon are as exactly true as those which accurately convey a knowledge of the explanation. Science has to do almost exclusively with the explanation; it is interested in phenomenal truths only on account of their relations to each other; while the Bible speaks solely of the phenomenal truths involved in natural science for their own sake, and never for the sake of the explanation of them or their scientific relations to each other.

Admitting these principles, which are so readily admitted in their application to the cases already considered, many difficulties usually regarded as of the gravest character at once disappear. For example, in Leviticus xi. and Deut. xiv. the divinely inspired lawgiver classes the coney and the hare as animals that chew the cud; he places the bat amongst the birds; he speaks of the locust, the beetle, and the grasshopper as flying creeping things that go upon all four. Now if these representations are to be taken as scientific statements, we must without hesitation say there is here a sad batch of blunders: for the coney and the hare do not chew the cud; the bat is not a bird; the locust, the beetle, the grasshopper, and other flying creeping things, do not go upon four, but upon six. But now suppose that the words used conveyed exactly the knowledge that was intended, are they not correctly used? We understand by "chewing the cud" bringing back into

the mouth, for the purpose of being chewed, food which had been previously swallowed; but if those to whom the words in question were addressed understood by them that motion of the mouth which accompanies chewing, then they would recognise by this motion the hare and the coney as rightly characterised. So with the bat—in a scientific sense it is not a bird; it is a mammal; hence, if we are teaching natural history, we would grievously err in making such a classification. But in describing flying things which do not creep, the bat was rightly placed where it is. Two years ago the Legislature of South Carolina enacted that “it shall not be lawful for any person . . . to destroy any bird whose principal food is insects, . . . comprising all the varieties of birds represented by the several families of *bats*, whip-poor-wills, . . . humming birds, blue birds,” etc. Does this law prove that the Legislature did not know that the bat in a natural history sense is not a bird? They were not undertaking to teach zoology: they wished to point out the flying animals whose principal food is insects, and with all propriety and accuracy they did it. So “going on all four,” when used in reference to the motion of animals, may fairly be taken as applying to the prone position of the animal which is common to the quadruped and the insect, and not at all to the number of feet. In this sense the phrase with perfect accuracy applies to the horizontal position of the locust and other insects; while the important natural history fact, that the insect has six feet, and not four, is perfectly immaterial.

In all these instances I think it has been made to appear that there is no contradiction; but he would be bold indeed who would claim that there is here harmony between science and the Bible. On the contrary, is it not most pointedly suggested that any exposition of Scripture which seems to show that natural science is taught, is thereby proved to be incorrect? For this reason, I may say in passing, I am strongly inclined to disbelieve the popular interpretations of the first chapter of Genesis, which find there a compendium of the science of geology.

As in the example above given, so in all other cases of supposed contradiction of the Bible by science, I have found that the fair honest application of such principles has caused the contradiction

to disappear. I have found nothing in my study of the Holy Bible and of natural science that shakes my firm belief in the divine inspiration of every word of that Bible, and in the consequent absolute truth, the absolute inerrancy, of every expression which it contains, from beginning to end. While there are not a few things which I confess myself wholly unable to understand, yet I have found nothing which contradicts other known truth. It ought to be observed that this is a very different thing from saying that I have found everything in the Sacred Scriptures to be in harmony with natural science. To reach this result it would be necessary to know the exact meaning of every part of the Scriptures, and the exact amount of truth in each scientific proposition. But to show that in any case there is no contradiction, all that is needed is to show that a reasonable supposition of what the passage in question may mean does not contradict the proved truth in science. We do not need to show that our interpretation *must* be correct, but only that it *may* be correct—that it is not reached by distortion or perversion, but by an honest application of admitted principles of exegesis.

It should be noted that the matters respecting which there are supposed to be inconsistencies between the teachings of science and the Bible are such as cannot possibly directly affect any moral or religious truth; but that they derive their importance to the Christian believer solely from the bearing they may have on the truthfulness of the Scriptures. In the name of Christianity, belief in the existence of people living on the other side of the earth has been denounced as absurd and heretical; but how is any moral duty or any doctrine of religion affected by this belief? unless, indeed, it may be from doubt it may cast upon the truthfulness of the Bible. And with this exception, what difference can it make with regard to any relation between ourselves and our fellow-men, or between ourselves and God and the Lord Jesus Christ, whether the earth came into existence six thousand years or six thousand million years ago; whether the earth is flat or round; whether it is the centre of the universe or on its edge; whether there has been one creation or many; whether the Noachian deluge covered a million or two hundred million square

miles; and last of all, I may add, whether the species of organic beings now on the earth were created mediately or immediately?

After these preliminary observations, I proceed to discuss the main subject of this address.

Before answering the question, What do you think of Evolution? I must ask, What do you mean by Evolution?

When thinking of the origin of anything, we may inquire, Did it come into existence just as it is? or did it pass through a series of changes from a previous state in order to reach its present condition? For example, if we think of a tree, we can conceive of it as having come immediately into existence just as we see it; or, we may conceive of it as having begun its existence as a minute cell in connexion with a similar tree, and as having reached its present condition by passing through a series of changes, continually approaching and at length reaching the form before us. Or thinking of the earth, we can conceive of it as having come into existence with its present complex character; or we may conceive of it as having begun to exist in the simplest possible state, and as having reached its present condition by passing through a long series of stages, each derived from its predecessor. To the second of these modes, we apply the term "Evolution." It is evidently equivalent to "derivation"; or, in the case of organic beings, to "descent."

This definition or description of Evolution does not include any reference to the power by which the origination is effected; it refers to the mode, and to the mode alone. So far as the definition is concerned, the immediate existence might be attributed to God or to chance; the derived existence to inherent uncreated law, or to an almighty personal Creator, acting according to laws of his own framing. It is important to consider this distinction carefully, for it is wholly inconsistent with much that is said and believed by both advocates and opponents of Evolution. It is not unusual to represent Creation and Evolution as mutually exclusive, as contradictory: Creation meaning the immediate calling out of non-existence by divine power; Evolution, derivation from previous forms or states by inherent, self-originated or eternal laws, independent of all connexion with divine personal

power. Hence, if this is correct, those who believe in Creation are theists; those who believe in Evolution are atheists. But there is no propriety in thus mingling in the definition two things which are so completely different as the power that produces an effect, and the mode in which the effect is produced.

The definition now given, which seems to me the only one which can be given within the limits of natural science, necessarily excludes the possibility of the questions whether the doctrine is theistic or atheistic, whether it is religious or irreligious, moral or immoral. It would be as plainly absurd to ask these questions as to inquire whether the doctrine is white or black, square or round, light or heavy. In this respect it is like every other hypothesis or theory in science. These are qualities which do not belong to such subjects. The only question that can rationally be put is, Is the doctrine true or false? If this statement is correct,—and it is almost if not quite self-evident—it should at once end all disputes not only between Evolution and religion, but between natural science and religion universally. To prove that the universe, the earth, and the organic beings upon the earth, had once been in a different condition from the present, and had gradually reached the state which we now see, could not disprove or tend to disprove the existence of God or the possession by him of a single attribute ever thought to belong to him. How can our belief in this doctrine tend to weaken or destroy our belief that he is infinite, that he is eternal, that he is unchangeable, in his being, or his wisdom, or his power, or his holiness, or his justice, or his goodness, or his truth? Or how can our rejection of the doctrine either strengthen or weaken our belief in him? Or how can either our acceptance or rejection of Evolution affect our love to God, or our recognition of our obligation to obey and serve him—carefully to keep all his commandments and ordinances?

True, when we go outside the sphere of natural science, and inquire whence this universe, questions involving theism forthwith arise. Whether it came into existence immediately or mediately is not material; but what or who brought it into existence? Did it spring from the fortuitous concurrence of eternally-existing atoms? Are the matter and the forces which act upon it in cer-

tain definite ways eternal; and is the universe, as we behold it, the result of their blind unconscious operation? Or, on the other hand, was the universe in all its orderly complexity brought into existence by the will of an eternal personal spiritual God, one who is omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent? These questions of course involve the very foundations of religion and morality; but they lie wholly outside of natural science; and are, I repeat, not in the least affected by the decision of that other question, Did the universe come into its present condition immediately or mediate; instantly, in a moment, or gradually, through a long series of intermediate stages? They are not affected by, nor do they affect, the truth or falsehood of Evolution.

But, admitting that the truth of Theism is not involved in the question before us, it may fairly be asked, Does not the doctrine of Evolution contradict the teachings of the Bible? This renders it necessary to inquire whether the Bible teaches anything whatever as to the mode in which the world and its inhabitants were brought into their present state; and if so, what that teaching is.

It does not seem to be antecedently probable that there would be any specific teaching there on the subject. We have learned that "the Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man"; and that "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." But this does not include the principles of natural science in any of its branches. We have already seen that it certainly does not include the teaching of astronomy or of geography; it does not include anatomy or physiology, zoology or botany—a scientific statement of the structure, growth, and classification of animals and plants. Is it any more likely that it includes an account of the limits of the variation which the kinds of plants and animals may undergo, or the circumstances and conditions by which such variation may be affected? We would indeed expect to find God's relation to the world and all its inhabitants set forth; but he is equally the Creator and Preserver, however it may have pleased him, through his creating



and preserving power, to have brought the universe into its present state. He is as really and truly your Creator, though you are the descendant of hundreds of ancestors, as he was of the first particle of matter which he called into being, or the first plant or animal, or the first angel in heaven.

So much at least seems clear—that whatever the Bible may say touching the mode of creation, is merely incidental to its main design, and must be interpreted accordingly. Well may we repeat with Calvin, “He who would learn astronomy and other recondite arts, let him go elsewhere.”

It is further to be observed, that whatever may be taught is contained in the first part of the oldest book in the world, in a dead language, with a very limited literature; that the record is extremely brief, compressing an account of the most stupendous events into the smallest compass. Now the more remote from the present is any event recorded in human language, the more completely any language deserves to be called dead, the more limited its contemporaneous literature, the briefer the record itself, the more obscure must that record be—the more difficult it must be to ascertain its exact meaning, and especially that part of its meaning which is merely incidental to its main design. As to the portions which bear on that design, the obscurity will be illuminated by the light cast backwards from the later and fuller and clearer parts of the Bible. But on that with which we are now specially concerned no such light is likely to fall.

To illustrate this point, I may refer to other parts of this early record. In the account of the temptation of Eve, we have a circumstantial and apparently very plain description of the being that tempted her. It was a serpent; and we read that “the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field.” Further, it was a beast which was to go upon its belly, and whose head could be bruised. Surely, it might be said, it is perfectly plain that the record should cause us to believe that it was a mere beast of the field, a mere serpent, that tempted Eve. But to narrate the fall of man is not simply incidental to the design of the Bible; on the contrary, its chief design may be said to be to record that fall and to show how man may recover from it. Hence, from the

later parts of the Bible we learn that the tempter was no beast of the field, as seems to be so clearly stated; but it was "the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, even Satan," whatever may have been the guise in which he appeared to our first mother.

Then from the sentence pronounced upon the serpent, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel,"—from this it would seem to be clear that what we are here taught, and all that we are here taught, is that the woman's son was to crush the head of the beast, whilst his own heel would be bruised; whereas we learn from books which come after that this sentence really contains the germ of the entire plan of salvation; and that the woman's son who was to bruise the serpent's head at such cost to himself is Jesus the Saviour, who on Calvary through his death destroyed "him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Now, since in these cases, where the meaning seems to be so unmistakably clear, and where the subject matter belongs to the main design of the book, and yet where the real meaning is so entirely different, as we learn from the later Scriptures, how cautious we should be not to feel too confident that we have certainly reached the true meaning in cases where the subject-matter is merely incidental, and where no light falls back from the later Scriptures to guide us aright!

The actual examination of the sacred record seems to me to show that the obscurity exists which might have been reasonably anticipated. It is clear that God is there represented as doing whatever is done. But whether in this record the limitless universe to the remotest star or nebula is spoken of, or only some portion of it, and if the latter, what portion, I cannot tell. And if there is an account of the methods according to which God proceeded in his creative work, I cannot perceive it. It is said *that* God created; but, so far as I can see, it is not said *how* he created. We are told nothing that contradicts the supposition, for example, that, in creating our earth and the solar system of which it forms a part, he brought the whole into existence very much in the condition in which we now see the several parts; or, on the other hand, that he proceeded by the steps indicated in what is called

the nebular hypothesis. Just as the contrary beliefs of Calvin and ourselves touching the centre of the solar system fail to contradict a single word in the Bible, so the contrary beliefs of those who accept and those who reject the nebular hypothesis fail to contradict a single word of the Bible.

I regard the same statements as true when made respecting the origin of the almost numberless species of organic beings which now exist and which have existed in the past. In the Bible I find nothing that contradicts the belief that God immediately brought into existence each form independently; or that contradicts the contrary belief that, having originated one or a few forms, he caused all the others to spring from these in accordance with laws which he ordained and makes operative.

If that which is perhaps the most commonly received interpretation of the biblical record of creation is correct, then it is certain that the Bible, implicitly yet distinctly, teaches the doctrine of Evolution. According to this interpretation, the record contains an account of the first and only origination of plants and animals, and all that exist now or that have existed from the beginning are their descendants. If, then, we have the means of ascertaining the characteristics of these ancestors of existing kinds, we can learn whether they were identical with their descendants or not. If the early forms were the same as the present, then the hypothesis of Evolution or descent with modification is not true; but if they were different, then it is true. Now, not indeed the very earliest, but great numbers of the earlier forms of animals and plants have been preserved to the present day, buried in the earth, so that we can see for ourselves what they were. An examination of these remains makes it absolutely certain that none of the species now existing are the same as the earlier, but that these were wholly unlike those now living; and that there have been constant changes in progress from the remote ages of the past, the effect of which has been by degrees to bring the unlike forms of a distant antiquity into likeness with those which are now on the earth. Hence all who believe that the creation described in the Bible was the origination of the ancestors of the organic forms that have since existed, cannot help believing in the hypothesis of

Evolution. This is so obvious that it is surprising that it has been so generally overlooked.

There seems to be no way of avoiding this conclusion, except by assuming that the so-called remains of animals and plants buried in the earth are not really remains of beings that were once alive, but that God created them just as we find them. But this assumption must be rejected, because it is inconsistent with a belief in God as a God of truth. It is impossible to believe that a God of truth would create corpses or skeletons or drift-wood or stumps.

If the interpretation which I have spoken of as perhaps most commonly received is rejected, then it may be thought that the Bible speaks only of the first origination of organic beings millions of years ago, but says nothing of the origin of the ancestors of those now on the earth; but that it may be supposed that when one creation became extinct, there were other successive immediate independent creations down to the beginning of the present era. There may be nothing in the Bible contradicting this supposition; but certainly there is nothing there favoring it. And if it is rejected in favor of Evolution, it is not an interpretation of Scripture that is rejected, but something that confessedly lies outside of it.

Or, in the next place, the interpretation may be adopted that the narrative in the Bible relates exclusively to the origination of existing forms, and that it is wholly silent respecting those of which we find the buried remains. It need hardly be said that, on this interpretation, as in the last case, there is nothing in the silence of the Scriptures that either suggests or forbids belief in Evolution as regards all the creations preceding the last. For anything that appears to the contrary, the multitudes of successively different forms belonging to series unmentioned in Scripture may have sprung from a common source in accordance with the doctrine of descent with modification.

When we reach the account of the origin of man, we find it more detailed. In the first narrative there is nothing that suggests the mode of creating any more than in the case of the earth, or the plants and animals. But in the second, we are told that

"the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Here seems to be a definite statement utterly inconsistent with the belief that man, either in body or soul, is the descendant of other organised beings. At first sight the statement, that "man was formed of the dust of the ground," seems to point out with unmistakable clearness the exact nature of the material of which man's body was made. But further examination does not strengthen this view. For remembering the principles and facts already stated, and seeking to ascertain the meaning of "dust of the ground" by examining how the same words are employed elsewhere in the narrative, the sharp definiteness which seemed at first to be so plainly visible somewhat disappears. For example, we are told in one place that the waters were commanded to bring forth the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth; and the command was obeyed. And yet, in another place we are told that out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air. Now as both these statements are true, it is evident that there can be no intention to describe the material employed. There was some sort of connexion with the water, and some with the ground; but beyond this nothing is clear. Then further, in the sentence which God pronounced upon Adam, he says: "Out of the ground wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." And in the curse uttered against the serpent, it was said: "Dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." Now Adam, to whom God was speaking, was flesh and blood and bone; and the food of serpents then as now consisted of the same substances, flesh and blood. The only proper conclusion in view of these facts seems to be that the narrative does not intend to distinguish in accordance with chemical notions different kinds of matter, specifying here inorganic in different states, and there organic, but merely to refer in a general incidental way to previously existing matter, without intending or attempting to describe its exact nature. For such reasons it does not seem to me certain that we have a definite statement which necessarily conveys the first meaning mentioned touching the material used

in the formation of man's body. If this point is doubtful, there would seem to be no ground for attributing a different origin to man's body from that which should be attributed to animals: if the existing animal species were immediately created, so was man; if they were derived from ancestors unlike themselves, so may man have been. Just so far as doubt rests on the meaning of the narrative, just so far are we forbidden to say that either mode of creation contradicts the narrative. And as the interpretation suggested may be true, we are not at liberty to say that the Scriptures are contradicted by Evolution.

As regards the soul of man, which bears God's image, and which differs so entirely not merely in degree but in kind from anything in the animals, I believe that it was immediately created, that we are here so taught; and I have not found in science any reason to believe otherwise. Just as there is no scientific basis for the belief that the doctrine of derivation or descent can bridge over the chasms which separate the non-existent from the existent, and the inorganic from the organic, so there is no such basis for the belief that this doctrine can bridge over the chasm which separates the mere animal from the exalted being which is made after the image of God. The mineral differs from the animal in kind, not merely in degree; so the animal differs from man in kind; and while science has traced numberless transitions from degree to degree, it has utterly failed to find any indications of transition from kind to kind in this sense. So in the circumstantial account of the creation of the first woman, there are what seem to me insurmountable obstacles in the way of fully applying the doctrine of descent.

But it is not surprising that, even if Evolution is generally true, it should not be true of man in his whole being. Man, as the image of God, is infinitely above the animals; and in man's entire history God has continually been setting aside the ordinary operation of the laws by which he controls his creation. For man's sake, the course of the sun in the heavens was stayed; the walls of Jericho fell down at the sound of the trumpets; manna ordinarily decayed in one day, but resisted decay for two days when one of these was the day of man's sacred rest; for man's sake the

waters of the Red Sea and of the River Jordan stood upright as an heap; iron was made to swim; women received their dead raised to life again; the mouths of lions were stopped; the violence of fire was quenched; water was turned into wine; without medicine the blind saw, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed, the dead were raised; more than all, and above all, for man's sake God himself took on him our nature as the second Adam by being born of a woman, underwent the miseries of this life, the cursed death of the cross; was buried; he rose again on the third day, ascended into heaven; whence, as both God and man, he shall come to judge the world at the last day. Surely then, I repeat, it is not surprising that, though man in his body so closely resembles the animals, yet as a whole his origin as well as his history should be so different from theirs.

Having now pointed out the probable absence of contradiction between the Scripture account of creation and the doctrine of Evolution, except in the case of man so far as regards his soul, but without having at all considered the probable truth or falsehood of Evolution, I proceed next, as briefly as possible, to state a few of the facts which seem to be sufficient at least to keep us from summarily rejecting the doctrine as certainly false.

First, as to the earth, in connexion with the other members of our solar system.

Some inquirers into the past history of this system have been led to suppose that at one time the whole of the matter now composing the various separate bodies may have existed in a nebulous state, forming a vast sphere with a diameter far exceeding that of the orbit of Neptune, the outermost planet; that this sphere rotated about its axis, and that it was undergoing gradual contraction. If there ever was such a sphere, it is claimed by some of those who have most carefully studied these subjects, that, in accordance with the laws by which God is now governing his material works, just such a solar system as ours would necessarily have resulted. As the sphere contracted, the nebulous matter would become more dense, and the rate of rotation would increase and would thereby increase the centrifugal force so that at length a belt or ring would be thrown off from the equatorial region of

VOL. XXXV., NO. 3—2.

the sphere; which belt might continue to rotate as an unbroken mass, or, if broken, would be collected by the laws of attraction into a spheroidal body, which would rotate upon its own axis and would also continue to revolve in a path around the axis of the whole mass—both these revolutions being in the same direction, the axis of the new spheroid being not far from parallel with the general axis, and the orbit of revolution being not far from parallel with the plane of the general equator. This process would be repeated from time to time, new belts or spheroids with the same characteristics being successively formed. So from each of these spheroids, as it continued to contract, similar secondary spheroids might be successively formed, each assuming a shape determined by the rate of rotation. At a certain stage in the cooling, the nebulous matter would become a liquid molten mass, ultimately solid. As the solid spheroid cooled still more, it would still continue to contract, but unequally in the interior and on the exterior, and thus the surface would be covered with successively formed wrinkles or ridges.

Now, in every particular, with very slight exception, the constitution of our solar system and our earth is exactly such as has just been described. It consists of a number of spheroids, each rotating on its own axis, and revolving around a central mass; and around the several primary spheroids are others which rotate on their axes, and revolve around their primaries as these do around the sun—all having a form determined by the rate of rotation; the primaries or planets all rotate on axes nearly parallel with the axis of the sun; the planes of their orbits of revolution nearly coincide with the equatorial plane of the sun; these revolutions and rotations are all in the same direction; in the case of Saturn, in addition to revolving satellites are revolving belts or rings. Coming to our earth, it exhibits the plainest marks of having once been in a molten state; the great mountain chains, which certainly have been formed during successive periods, are just such as would be formed by the wrinkling of the earth's crust caused by unequal contraction. Hence it would seem not unreasonable to conclude that, if the nebular hypothesis has not been proved to be certainly true, it has at least been shown to be



probable. The number and variety of coincidences between the facts which we see and the necessary results of the supposition on which the nebular hypothesis is founded, are so very great that it must go far to produce the conviction that that supposition can hardly be wrong. As before intimated, the correspondence is not perfect; but the exceptions are not such as to disprove the hypothesis—they are merely the residual phenomena, which in the case of even the most firmly established principles await a full explanation.

If it should be objected that, as this scheme rests on a mere supposition, no part of the superstructure can be stronger than the foundation, and that therefore it must be supposition and nothing more throughout, I would say that this objection rests on a misapprehension of the nature of reasoning on such subjects. Let us examine, by way of illustration, the method by which the truth of the doctrine of gravitation was established. At first it was the gravitation hypothesis merely. Newton formed the supposition that the heavenly bodies are drawn towards each other by the same force which draws bodies towards each other on the earth. He calculated what the motions of the moon and the planets should be if this supposition is correct. After many efforts, he found that many of these motions were nearly what his supposition would require. Even the first observed coincidence was a step towards proving the truth of his hypothesis; and as these coincidences multiplied, his conviction of its truth was increased; until at length he and all who took the trouble to become acquainted with the facts of the case believed with the utmost confidence that it was absolutely true. But even when this conviction was reached, there were still many phenomena which Newton could not explain on his hypothesis; but these residual phenomena, formidable as they were, did not shake his confidence, and should not have done so. Now, if Newton's gravitation hypothesis was entitled to his confidence on account of the number and variety of coincidences, notwithstanding the apparently inconsistent facts, ought not the nebular hypothesis to be entitled to similar confidence, provided there should be similar coincidences in number and variety, even though there remain

•

some apparently inconsistent facts? And as the gravitation hypothesis rests upon a mere supposition in the same sense with the nebular hypothesis, ought the superstructure for that reason to be rejected in the one case any more than in the other?

It deserves to be remarked here that, after Newton had framed his hypothesis, he was led for years to abandon it, inasmuch as with the measurements of the earth on the basis of which he made his first calculations the motions of the heavenly bodies were utterly inconsistent with it.

To conclude, then, as regards the earth, I would say in the terms of one definition of Evolution—terms which have furnished to witlings so much amusement, but yet which so accurately and appropriately express the idea intended—that I think it very probable that our earth and solar system constitute one case in which the homogeneous has been transformed by successive differentiations into the heterogeneous.

In the next place, respecting the origin of the various kinds of animals and organised forms generally, it has been supposed by some naturalists that existing forms, instead of having been independently created, have all been derived by descent, with modification, from a few forms or a single one. It is known that the offspring of a single pair differ slightly from each other and from their parents; it is further known that such differences or variations may be transmitted to subsequent generations; and it is self-evident that under changing conditions the varieties best fitted to the new conditions would be most likely to survive. Now, under the operation of these principles, it is held that all the immense variety of existing forms of plants and animals may have sprung from one or a few initial simple types.

In accordance with this supposition, the earliest inhabitants of the world would be very simple forms. Among the varieties produced in successive generations some would be more complex in their organisation than their parents; such complexity being transmitted would form kinds somewhat higher in rank; these in turn would give rise to others still more complex and higher; until at length at the present day the most complex and highest would exist. All would not undergo such modifications as to

produce the higher forms; hence there would be at all times, along with the highest, every intermediate stage—though the existing low forms would differ in many particulars from their ancestors, unless, indeed, the conditions under which they lived remained unchanged.

Now, in the statement just made we have an outline of the facts made known to us by an examination of the animals and plants which are buried in the earth. The sediment in the waters all over the world sooner or later sinks to the bottom in the form of layers; this sediment contains remains of plants and animals carried down with it, and in various ways permanently preserves them. Of course only a very small part of the plants and animals could be thus preserved; still a few would be. If we could gain access to these layers and examine their contents, we would obtain a knowledge of the successive generations of the past—the lowest layer being the oldest. It happens that a vast number of such layers have been hardened into rock, and have been raised from the waters where they were formed, and so broken and tilted that we have ready access to them. Not less than nine-tenths of the dry land, so far as examined, is composed of sedimentary rocks; and of these a large part contain the remains of plants and animals which were living at the time the rocks were formed. Of course it is not to be supposed that a complete series is known of all that ever were formed; still enough are brought to view to lead to the belief that from an examination of their contents we may obtain a fair knowledge of the history of the succession of animals and plants from an early period down to the present. We cannot go back to the beginning, but we can go a long way. The outline thus obtained shows us that all the earlier organic beings in existence, through an immense period, as proved by an immense thickness of layers resting on each other, were of lower forms, with not one as high or of as complex an organisation as the fish. Then the fish appeared, and remained for a long time the highest being on the earth. Then followed at long intervals the amphibian, or frog-like animal, the reptile, the lowest mammalian, then gradually the higher and higher, until at length appeared man, the head and crown of

creation. The plants present a similar history—the first known being simple forms, like the seaweed, followed as we pass upwards through the later layers, by forms of higher and higher type, until we reach the diversity and complexity of existing vegetation. It is seen, too, that when a new type is first found, it does not present the full typical characters afterwards observed, but along with some of these also some of the characters belonging to other types. The earliest reptiles, for example, present many of the characters of the fish, the earliest birds and mammals many of the characters of the reptile; and so throughout the series. It is true there are many gaps, but not more than might be expected from the fact that the series of layers containing the remains is incomplete. When the layers show that the circumstances existing during the period while they were forming remained unchanged, then the kinds of animals underwent little or no change; but if the layers show rapid changes in climate, depth of water, etc., then the species of animals changed rapidly and frequently.

It would further follow, from the supposition under consideration, that, all animals being related to each other by descent, they must resemble each other. In the organic world every one knows that likeness suggests relationship, and that relationship usually accompanies likeness—the nearer the relationship, the closer generally is the likeness. Now, careful observation makes known to us that the various animals are surprisingly like each other. In the highest class of vertebrate animals, and also in man, for example, the skeleton, the nervous system, the digestive system, the circulatory system, are all constructed on exactly the same plan. If the skull of a man is compared with the skull of a dog, or a horse, each will be seen to be composed of the same bones similarly situated. Where the number differs, the difference will be seen to result from the growing together of several bones in one case which were separate in the others. So the human arm, the leg of the quadruped, the wing of the bird, the paddle of the whale, will be found to be formed on exactly the same plan. When the form of the animal is such as to render unnecessary any part belonging to the general plan, it is not

omitted at once, but is reduced in size and so placed as not to be in the way, and then in other similar animals by degrees passes beyond recognition. And so it is with every part. There are also the same kinds of resemblance between the lowest animals; and, further, between any section of the lower animals and those which are just above or just below them in rank. Thus we may arrange all the forms in the entire animal kingdom, from highest to lowest, according to their resemblances; and while the highest is indeed very unlike the lowest—a man very unlike a simple cell—yet at every step as we pass through the entire series we find the resemblances vastly greater than the differences.

We thus have another set of facts which plainly would follow from descent with modification.

The existence of rudimentary organs is still another fact which would follow very naturally from this mode of creation, but which seems not very likely to have occurred if each species was independently created. For example, though a cow has no upper front teeth, a calf has such teeth some time before it is born. The adult whalebone whale has no teeth at all, but the young before birth is well supplied with them. In the blind worm, a snake-like animal, there are rudimentary legs which never appear externally. In the leg of a bird, the bone below the thigh-bone, instead of being double as in the general plan, has the shin-bone, and a rudimentary bone welded into it representing the small outer bone, but not fulfilling any of its uses. The blind fish of the Mammoth Cave have optic nerves and rudimentary eyes. So in the leg of the horse, of the ox, and indeed in many parts of the body of every kind of animal, will be found rudimentary organs, apparently not of the least use to the animal itself, but of great use to those animals which they closely resemble. All these facts are just such as the doctrine of descent with modification would lead us to expect, but which seem hard to understand on the supposition that each species was independently and immediately created.

Again, the changes through which an animal passes in its embryonic state are just such as the doctrine of descent requires. All animals begin life in the lowest form, and all in substantially

the same form. Each at first is a simple cell. Beginning with this cell in the case of the higher animals, we find that, in the course of embryonic development, at successive stages the general forms are presented which characterise the several groups in which animals are placed when classified according to their resemblance to each other, ascending from the lowest to the highest. While it cannot be said that the human embryo is at one period an invertebrate, then a fish, afterwards a reptile, a mammalian quadruped, and at last a human being, yet it is true that it has at one period the invertebrate structure, then successively, in a greater or less number of particulars, the structure of the fish, the reptile, and the mammalian quadruped. And in many of these particulars the likeness is strikingly close.

The last correspondence which I shall point out between the results of the doctrine of descent and actual facts is that which is presented by the geographical distribution of animals. In this wide field I must confine myself to a few points.

By examining the depths of the channels which separate islands from each other or from neighboring continents, the relative length of time during which they must have been without land communication between them may be approximately ascertained. Where the channel is shallow, they may have formed parts of a single body of land recently; but where it is deep, they must ordinarily have been separate for a long time. For example, Great Britain is separated from the continent of Europe by a very shallow channel; Madagascar is cut off from Africa by one that is very deep. In the East Indies, Borneo is separated from Java by a sea not three hundred feet deep; it is separated from Celebes, which is much nearer than Java, by a channel more than five thousand feet deep. Now, if the theory of descent with modification is true, it should be expected that in the regions recently separated, the animals would differ but slightly; in regions separated long ago, the animals would differ more widely; and that, just in proportion to the length of separation. This is exactly what we find in the regions mentioned. The animals of Great Britain differ little from those on the adjacent continent; while the animals of Madagascar differ greatly from those of the

neighboring coast of Africa. There are few kinds found in Java which are not also found in Borneo; while on the other hand very few kinds are found in Celebes which exist in Borneo. So it is the world over.

And this is not all. When we examine the kinds of animals which have recently become extinct in each country, we find that they correspond exactly with those which now inhabit that country; they are exactly such as should have preceded the present according to the doctrine of descent. For example, lions, tigers, and other flesh-eating animals of the highest rank, are found scattered over the great Eastern continent. In Australia the kangaroo and other pouched animals like the opossum abound, but none of any higher rank. In South America are found the sloth, the armadillo, and other forms which we meet with nowhere else on the earth. Now, in the Eastern continent we find buried in caves and the upper layers of the earth extinct kinds of lions, bears, hyenas, and the like, which differ from existing kinds, but yet closely resemble them. But we find nothing like the kangaroo or other pouched animals, or like the sloth or armadillo. Whereas if we examine the extinct buried animals in Australia, we find they are all pouched, with not a single example of anything of as high rank as the lion or the bear; and if we do the same in South America, we see extinct kinds of armadillos and sloths, but nothing at all like the animals of Asia or Australia. It is equally true that wherever regions of the world are separated by barriers which prevent the passage of animals—whether these barriers are seas, or mountain ranges, or climatic zones—the groups of animals inhabiting the separated regions differ more or less widely from each other just in proportion to the length of time during which the barriers have existed. If the barrier is such that it prevents the passage of one kind of animal and not another, then the groups will resemble each other in the animals whose passage is not prevented, and will differ in the rest. All this is independent of climate, and other conditions of life: two regions may have the same climate, may be equally favorable to the existence of a certain group of animals; but if these regions are separated by impassable barriers, the groups differ just as previously stated.

In view of all the facts now presented—the way in which animals have succeeded each other, beginning as far back as we can go, and coming down to the present; the series of resemblances which connect them from the lowest to the highest, exhibiting such remarkable unity of plan; the existence of rudimentary organs; the geographical distribution of animals, and the close connexion of that distribution now and in the past;—in view of all these facts the doctrine of descent with modification, which so perfectly accords with them all, cannot be lightly and contemptuously dismissed. In the enumeration made, I have been careful to state none but well-ascertained facts, which any one who wishes to take the time can easily verify. Are not the coincidences such as must almost compel belief of the doctrine, unless it can be proved to be contradictory of other known truth? For my part I cannot but so regard them; and the more fully I become acquainted with the facts of which I have given a faint outline, the more I am inclined to believe that it pleased God, the Almighty Creator, to create present and intermediate past organic forms not immediately but mediately, in accordance with the general plan involved in the hypothesis I have been illustrating.

Believing, as I do, that the Scriptures are almost certainly silent on the subject, I find it hard to see how any one could hesitate to prefer the hypothesis of mediate creation to the hypothesis of immediate creation. The latter has nothing to offer in its favor; we have seen a little of what the former may claim.

I cannot take time to discuss at length objections which have been urged against this hypothesis, but may say that they do not seem to me of great weight. It is sometimes said that, if applied to man, it degrades him to regard him as in any respect the descendant of the beast. We have not been consulted on the subject, and possibly our desire for noble origin may not be able to control the matter; but, however that may be, it is hard to see how dirt is nobler than the highest organisation which God had up to that time created on the earth. And further, however it may have been with Adam, we are perfectly certain that each one of us has passed through a state lower than that of the fish, then successively through states not unlike those of the tadpole, the



reptile, and the quadruped. Hence, whatever nobility may have been conferred on Adam by being made of dust has been lost to us by our passing through these low animal stages.

It has been objected that it removes God to such a distance from us that it tends to atheism. But the doctrine of descent certainly applies to the succession of men from Adam up to the present. Are we any farther from God than were the earlier generations of the antediluvians? Have we fewer proofs of his existence and power than they had? It must be plain that, if mankind shall continue to exist on the earth so long, millions of years hence the proofs of God's almighty creative power will be as clear as they are to-day.

It has been also objected that this doctrine excludes the idea of design in nature. But if the development of an oak from an acorn in accordance with laws which God has ordained and executes, does not exclude the idea of design, I utterly fail to see how the development of our complex world, teeming with co-adaptations of the most striking character, can possibly exclude that idea.

I have now presented briefly, but as fully as possible in an address of this kind, my views as to the method which should be adopted in considering the relations between the Scriptures and natural science, showing that all that should be expected is that it shall be made to appear by interpretations which may be true that they do not contradict each other; that the contents and aims of the Scriptures and of natural science are so different that it is unreasonable to look for agreement or harmony; that terms are not and ought not to be used in the Bible in a scientific sense, and that they are used perfectly truthfully when they convey the sense intended; that on these principles all alleged contradictions of natural science by the Bible disappear; that a proper definition of Evolution excludes all reference to the origin of the forces and laws by which it works, and therefore that it does not and cannot affect belief in God or in religion; that, according to not unreasonable interpretations of the Bible, it does not contradict anything there taught so far as regards the earth, the lower animals, and probably man as to his body; that there are many good

grounds for believing that Evolution is true in these respects; and lastly, that the reasons urged against it are of little or no weight.

I would say in conclusion, that while the doctrine of Evolution in itself, as before stated, is not and cannot be either Christian or anti-Christian, religious or irreligious, theistic or atheistic, yet viewing the history of our earth and its inhabitants, and of the whole universe, as it is unfolded by its help, and then going outside of it and recognising that it is God's PLAN OF CREATION, instead of being tempted to put away thoughts of him, as I contemplate this wondrous series of events, caused and controlled by the power and wisdom of the Lord God Almighty, I am led with profounder reverence and admiration to give glory and honor to him that sits on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever; and with fuller heart and a truer appreciation of what it is to create, to join in saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.

JAMES WOODROW.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE EMOTIONS.

*The Emotions.* By JAMES MCCOSH, D. D., LL. D. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 12mo., pp. 256.

The works on mental science most current treat almost exclusively of the intelligence, or cognitive faculties of the soul. Locke's great treatise dispatches the subject in his chapter on *Power*, and that in the most superficial and unsatisfactory manner. Sir William Hamilton and Dr. Noah Porter close their books without teaching us anything at all about the feelings of the soul, except the mere intimation given in their preliminary divisions of the subject, that human souls have such functions. Kant, in his *Critic of the Practical Reason*, speaks of the motives of human activity, thus recognising the emotive functions of the soul, and making some profound remarks. But the main object of the treatise being to discuss the ethical judgment and sentiment, as the peculiar characteristic of rational, responsible agents, it really presents no systematic discussion of the feelings as a whole. To us the most striking trait of this work of the great philosopher is the following: he alone, of all the psychologists, recognises and establishes "the propensity to evil" in human nature on pure grounds of psychology as distinguished from theology, as one of the constitutive traits of human character; just as other psychologists recognise and prove the natural love of happiness, of power, or of applause. Of this, more in the end. Dr. Thos. Brown devotes an adequate portion of his eloquent lectures to the feelings, for which, as for the elevation and purity of his views, and the ingenuity of his analyses, he deserves much admiration. But his distribution of the subject is not logical, and he leaves much to be done for the perfecting of this branch of the science.

Dr. McCosh seems to have been moved by this belief to the undertaking of this, his latest work. Dr. Brown had distributed the feelings into three classes. 1. Our "immediate emotions;"

such as wonder, beauty, the ludicrous, love, hate, pride, humility, sympathy. 2. Our "retrospective emotions;" as regret, anger, gratitude, gladness, remorse. 3. Our "prospective emotions;" as desires, fear, and hope. The basis of this classification is the way in which feelings are related to their objects in time. The first class he then subdivides into feelings involving moral quality, as love, hate, sympathy; and those involving no moral quality, as wonder, beauty, the ludicrous. Dr. McCosh has evidently had this distribution in his eye, and in attempting to improve it, he only changes it into one still more inconsequential. His plan is to distribute the feelings into: I. "Affections towards animate objects," the subdivisions of which are, (a) retrospective, (b) immediate, and (c) prospective, affections towards animate objects. II. "Affections towards inanimate objects," the æsthetic namely. III. "Continuing and complex affections." This list suggests easily many fatal objections. The divisions do not divide. Are not all feelings, in their very nature, more or less "continuing"? The same affection is in some spirits more persistent than in some other more fickle ones. No affection is, like volitions and like many sense perceptions, momentary. Again, love is classed in the III. division, for instance. But love is as simple as any of the affections, and certainly it is one which can only be directed towards an animate object. Again, have we no æsthetic feelings towards animate objects? Do we never see beauty in a squirrel, a fine horse, a graceful child? Must the object necessarily be dead, like a star or a mountain, in order to awaken the æsthetic sentiment? And if the division into prospective, immediate, and retrospective is worth anything, does it not also extend to the II. and III. classes? Once more, the complex affections we must unquestionably find very numerous, even as various combinations of a few letters make a multitude of different syllables. The list should be very long, whereas Dr. McCosh's is very short, and must, therefore, omit a very large number of complex feelings. And surely, in a philosophic classification, the complex emotions should be treated under the heads of the simple and elemental ones which form them by combination. What chemist would treat, in a separate book, sulphur

as a simple substance, and then in another the sulphates and sulphides?

Or, if we return to Dr. Brown's less objectionable distribution, we may well inquire whether the relations of feelings to their objects in time gives us any accurate or useful ground of division. In one sense all our feelings have a *posterior* relation, in time, to the cognition of their objects; for such cognition is the condition precedent of the rise of the emotion. For instance, when Dr. Brown makes wonder an immediate emotion, and anger a retrospective one, we must ask: Did not the cognition which excited the wonder precede that feeling just as truly as the cognition of the injury preceded the resulting emotion of anger? We may admit that desire, hope, fear, do look forward to future good or evil in the sense in which wonder and resentment do not.

But if we grant that the relation in time of the feelings to their objects gives a thorough ground of division, the equally grave objection is, that this division would be fruitless. The discriminative trait selected is one which has little importance, and leads to no scientific results. It is as though one should classify fruits by their *color*, when one class would be of "red fruits," including strawberries, some cherries, currants, grapes, and apples (and excluding others of the same species), with pomegranates. What light would botany ever receive from such a classification and treatment?

So it was erroneous for Dr. Brown to divide feelings into those qualified by moral trait and those having no moral trait. Strictly no feelings are ethical in quality, except the emotions of conscience, approbation, and reprehension. But in the popular sense any feeling may become moral, or immoral, according as it is conditioned and limited. The æsthetic feelings, the bodily appetites, the resentments, the desires, the loves and hatreds, may be virtuous, or vicious, or indifferent, according to their objects and limitations. If there are some objects of feeling such that the emotions cannot be directed to them without having some ethical quality, good or bad—which is admitted—this is far short of giving us a ground of general discrimination. A profitable classification must be obtained in far other ways than these.

Before dealing with this task, let us resume the question as to the importance of this discussion of the feelings in philosophy.

Our rational consciousness reveals to us a multitude of acts of intelligence, sensitive, intuitive, suggestive, or illative, which all have this in common, that their results are cognitions. The same consciousness reveals to the slightest glance that there is a class of functions in the human spirit very distinct from cognitions: *the Feelings*. The best description of these, and of their wide difference from cognitions, is that which we read in consciousness itself. Our admiration, disgust, desire, necessarily wait on our ideas of their objects; and yet differ as consciously from the acts of intellection which arouse them as the warmth of the solar ray, felt in our nerves of touch, differs from its luminous power, felt by the optic nerves. *Feeling is the Temperature of Thought.*

Although so many of the books direct our attention exclusively to the powers of intellect, the feelings are far from being the least important or least noble functions of the soul. These writers seem to think that the whole glory of the mind is in its discriminations of thought; that here alone they can display a glittering acumen. But this quality is no less necessary to the correct analysis of the feelings than of the logical processes of mind. If any eminency is to be assumed for either department, we should incline to claim it for the feelings, as the more noble and essential functions of the soul, rather than the cognitions. For,

1st. The conative feelings constitute the energetic and operative part of every motive to action. Hence, these are, in scientific view, more important than the cognitions which occasion them. Essentially, feelings are man's motive power. Intellect is the cold and latent magnetism which directs the ship's compass, and furnishes the guide of its motion, should it be able to move. Feeling is that elastic energy which throbs within the machinery, and gives propulsion to its wheels. Without it, the ship, in spite of the needle pointing with its subtile intelligence to the pole, rots in the calm before it makes a voyage anywhither.

2d. The morality of our volitions depends upon that of their subjective motives; and these derive their moral complexion

wholly from the feelings which combine in them; for this is the active, and therefore the ethical, element. It is chiefly the feelings which qualify the motives, as praise- or blame-worthy. Hence, again: a great and noble emotion is a higher function of the soul than any mere vigor of cognition. "The serpent was more subtile than any beast of the field;" and none the less the reptile, the most ignoble of his class of animals. "Magnanimity" is made up chiefly of the grand affections, and not of keen thoughts. Disinterested love is nobler than talent. Generous self-sacrifice is grander than acute invention; the heroic will is more admirable than the shrewd intellect. Hence, again: our moral discrimination, our analyses of our own motives, is chiefly concerned with the ascertainment of the real elements of feeling which combine in them. We shall strikingly confirm this by the instances to be cited hereafter, in which we shall find the moral problem: Was the act right? or, in other words, Was the emotional part of the motive right? will turn solely upon the analysis of the feeling which entered into the motive. Indeed, the intelligent moral government of the heart will be found to turn on such analysis of the feelings, tracing them to their real ultimate principles. The maxim, "Know thyself," resolves chiefly into a knowledge of the feelings which mingle within us. It is, then, chiefly the psychology of the feelings which is the moral guide of life.

3d. The vigor of the functions of cognition itself depends, in every man, more on the force of the incentive energising the faculty, than on the native strength or clearness of the intellect. Many a man whose mental vision was by nature like that of the eagle, has been practically of inert and useless mind: the luminous ray of his spirit was dimmed, and at last quenched by the fogs of indolence or fickleness. There was not *will* enough to direct the mental attention steadily to any valuable problem. But in the man of persistent and powerful feeling, the desire has so cleared and stimulated the vision that it has grown in clearness until it has pierced the third heavens of truth. It is chiefly the feelings which make the man.

If we examine a lexicon, we find names of feelings in almost

VOL. XXXV., NO. 3—3.

countless numbers. In a single subdivision we see "pleasure," "joy," "gladness," "content," "delight," "rapture," "cheerfulness," "a merry heart," and many others. In another we hear of "expectation," "wish," "hope," "desire," "craving," "lust," "concupiscence," "coveting," "longing." In another of "uneasiness," "apprehension," "alarm," "fear," "panic," "terror." But the faculties of cognition seem to be few, and easily separated. Hence, perhaps, some infer that there can be no complete psychology of the feelings; that this department of the soul's functions must remain an ever-shifting cloud-world, whose laws are too numerous and too fickle to be comprehended. But it is hoped that this mutable maze will be found like the kaleidoscope, all of whose diversified wonders are accounted for by two plane mirrors and a few colored beads. True science can bring order out of this confusion. And the most valuable ethical and theological results will be: that right emotions will be distinguished from the wrong; and we shall ascertain the line which separates the normal affections from the unlawful.

One simplification of the subject is at once effected by noticing that they may be the same in nature and *differ in degree*. So that many of the names of emotions do but express the same feeling in different grades of energy. Thus: "concern," "apprehension," "fear," "terror," are but four degrees of the same feeling, as calmer or more intense. What else is expressed by the terms "content," "cheerfulness," "joy," "rapture," "transport"? The word "passion" is often used colloquially, and even defined in some books, as meaning the emotion in an intense degree. They tell us, for instance, that "love" has become "a passion" when it has risen to an uncontrollable agitation, absorbing the whole soul, overpowering the self-control, making the pulse to bound and the face to glow. Thus they would call "displeasure" a feeling, but rage a "passion." And they have even separated off chapters upon the discussion of "the passions." But if the intense feelings are the same, except in degree, with their calmer movements, this is just as sensible as though the chemist who promised to treat scientifically of "water," should discuss separately water in a teacup and a tub; or, after announcing "calo-



ric" as his subject, should devote one chapter to heat in a tea-kettle, and a different one to heat in the boiler of a steam-engine. This abuse of the word "passion" has another mischief: it utterly obscures the etymology of the word, and in doing so helps to becloud another division of the feelings, which is, as we shall see, the most fundamental of all. *Passio* is from *pator*, "I suffer," "I endure." Passions should mean those feelings with which I am *passively impressed*. The English Liturgy uses the word classically and correctly when it teaches the worshipper to supplicate Christ "by his most holy cross and passion" (by his *sufferings*; the feelings of pain, bodily and spiritual, which he was made passively to endure); and our Confession uses it aright when it declares God "without parts and passions;" an Infinite Monad, essentially and boundlessly active, but incapable of being made to suffer or to experience any function of passivity.

This plain and obvious view of feelings, the same in element but different in degree, explains another very frequent fallacy. The feelings, in their calmer grades, are mistaken for the rational functions of judgment, which they attend. Thus, the man whose motive is caution, or apprehension, is described as acting rationally; while he who is actuated by terror is said to act with "blind passion." But what is "terror" except a higher degree of the very same element of feeling, "fear," which appears in "apprehension"? In the true sense of the word "passion," an emotional function of passivity, if terror is "a passion," so is "apprehension." Extensive delusion also exists in the idea which finds expression in the first word of the popular phrase, "*blind passion*." It is supposed that vehement emotion usually obfuscates the intellect. So it sometimes does, doubtless. And perhaps far more often *it clarifies the intellect*. Every faculty performs its functions more accurately when it is vigorously energised. Feeling is the temperature of thought. Is the solar beam in July less luminous than on some pale wintry day, because charged with so much more heat? Facts confirm this the true philosophy. Lawyers assure us that they get their most perspicacious views of the merits of their cases from the minds of their clients who are "piping hot" with indignation and zeal. The

great orator, when in the very "torrent and tempest of his passion," enjoys flashes of intellectual vision so clear and penetrating, that he sees by them in a moment logical relations which a day's calm study might not have revealed to him. Stonewall Jackson modestly stated, that the moments when he had been conscious of the best use of his intellect were in the crisis of a great battle, with the shells hurtling over him. To our apprehension it appears fully as probable that the dull and dim grade of an emotion will mislead the reason, as the vehement grade; especially in view of the fallacy which calls the calmer grade a rational judgment. The gentle wolf in sheep's clothing will be more likely to invade the peaceful sheepfold of the intellect successfully than the raging wolf in the confessed wolf's skin.

These fallacies also greatly obscure our apprehensions of the functions and value of the feelings in the conduct of the spirit. We must learn to separate from our conception of the essence of the feelings, that supposed trait of pungency or agitation. This necessarily characterises only the more intense degrees of the feelings. The mental state may be true feeling, and yet calm and even. Again we define feeling as "the temperature of thought." Now, the temperature of a beam of light may vary in intensity, from the faint warmth of the wintry sunlight to the burning heat of the midsummer beam condensed by a lens. Yet in both rays it is caloric, not mere light. Heat is usually thought of by the unlearned as imbuing only fiery or molten masses. Yet science teaches us that there is a smaller degree of caloric even in a block of ice, for it can so radiate from that ice as to affect a thermometer. These facts are only used to illustrate the proposition so often overlooked, that there may be an element of feeling in even the calmest processes of soul, and the analogy of the cases of itself raises a probability of the truth. But it can be demonstrated, and that by the following plain and short view. There can be no subjective motive without some feeling. But, without subjective motive, there can be no action of volition. Every rational volition is from a subjective motive to an object, which is the inducement, or objective end of the action. But in order for any object to be an inducement to rational volition, it

must present itself to the mind in the double aspect of the desirable and the real. For instance, if one says: "Come with us to the hill and dig laboriously, and you shall bear home on your shoulders a heavy load of rubbish;" no one responds. The object is real, but totally undesirable. Again one says: "Run, and overtake the foot of yonder moving rainbow arch! and under it you shall find a bag of gold." Not a soul moves a step. Why not? The object named, gold, is desirable, but the understanding knows it is unreal. Again, one says: "Come with us to the mountains of Georgia, and in the known auriferous veins of that region we will dig gold." The man desirous of wealth will now move. The objective, or proposed inducement, stands to the mind in the double category of the desirable and the real. But of course if this object becomes inducement to the soul, there must be an answering correspondency between it and the soul; the subjective actions of the soul going out towards it must also be double, including both a judgment and a desire. Thus psychology confirms the verdict of common sense and consciousness. Every motive to action must involve a desire. But desire is feeling. Hence in the states of soul leading to the calmest intelligent action, there must be some feeling.

We learn thus, it is a mistake to suppose that feeling is intermittent in the soul's functions, while cognition is supposed to be constant. It is as true that the waking soul is never without feelings (in at least some calmer manifestations) as that it is never without thoughts. One phase of feeling goes, but another takes its place in perpetual succession; it is only the intensity of feeling that ebbs and flows. Indeed, were all feeling really to desert a human soul, that soul would be as truly frozen for the time into fatuity as though it were struck idiotic. Suppose a man walking along the street under the impulse of some *purpose*, wholly deserted by feeling—he would not take another step! For thought is not purpose, unless it also involves desire. With the total extinction of desire, purpose would be annihilated, and the purposeless soul would pause as certainly as though it had become fatuous. Let the eager racer, who is about to bound towards the goal, see that the gold crown upon the goal, which was his incentive,

has turned to a clod. He stops. Why should he run? No feeling, no action. If a man totally lost all feeling, what would there be left to energise his attention so as to direct it voluntarily to any given subject of thought? Nothing. The processes of thought would remain as aimless and vacillating as the movements of the magnetic needle whose polarity is interrupted. Conscious thought might die away out of the soul after the death of feeling. Certainly there would be an end of all connected thought. For the act by which the soul directs its attention is a volition, and without feeling there is no volition.

The next step towards simplifying the multifarious forms of feeling should be, to search for those elements which are simple, original, and characteristic of human nature as such. This search must result in a correct classification; and only by such a result can its completeness be verified. And,

I. At the forefront of all proper classification of feelings must stand ever the distinction between those which have an external cause, and in which the soul is passive—acted on, instead of acting—and those which have a subjective source in the soul's own spontaneity and dispositions, and which act outwardly towards their objects. Had not the popular usage so totally spoiled and perverted the classical meaning of the word *passions*, this would give us exactly the term we need for the former class. The word would express states of feeling in which the soul is subject, and not agent, where the capacity for the feeling is a "passive power," or mere susceptibility lodged in the native constitution, and not a subjective activity. But as the persistency of the erroneous usage would cause us continually to be misunderstood, we surrender the word. Let us agree to call these feelings *functions of sensibility*, or *sensibilities*.

The opposite class of feelings, where the power in exercise is a subjective and active power, and the function of emotion has a subjective cause, we will call *appetencies*. But we must remind the reader that these inward activities may pronounce themselves for or against an object. They may take the form of desires or aversions; they may reach after or repel the objectives. And the one class of feelings will be converse to the other. We de-

sire, then, when we speak of "appetencies," to be understood as meaning either desires or aversions, either of these outgoings of subjective spontaneity.

It will soon be made to appear how all-important this division is. Yet many neglect it. Dr. Porter, dividing the powers of the soul, mentions them as three powers of "Intellect, of Sensibility, of Will." So Gregory, and many other moralists. Locke, in the brief discussion of the feelings referred to, insists, indeed, upon distinguishing between the desires and the will; but declares that all desire is determined by an "uneasiness," which he evidently regards as a passive sensibility. Kant, however, with his usual accuracy, divides feeling from desire. Sir Wm. Hamilton, in his Lectures on Metaphysics, announces and defends the correct distinction, making four classes of powers in the soul: 1. Of Intellect, or cognition. 2. Of Sensibility. 3. Of "Conation," including (a) appetencies, and (b) volition. He claims, with a rather hasty self-importance, that he was the first to see and announce the true distinction. Had he been as familiar with the Calvinistic divinity (even of his own country) as with the heathen Peripatetics, he would have seen that many of them had virtually taught the correct division generations before him. For, in their habitual distribution into "*understanding, affections, and will,*" they include, virtually, under the term will, not only the function of naked volition, but also all those of subjective conation. When, for instance, the Calvinist speaks of the "corruption of the will," he means rather the conative movements preceding volition, than the mere power of volition itself. This distribution really meant to say, then, that the soul has three classes of powers: 1. The intellective. 2. The susceptibilities (passive powers). 3. The conative, or active, divided into (a) the appetencies, and (b) volitions. So that they really set forth the all-important distinction between the sensibilities and the appetencies.

It is true that the two opposite forms of feeling often, nay, usually, concur; both are usually present together. It is also true that the impressions on the sensibility are the *occasions* (not causes) of the rise of appetencies, or subjective desires and aversions. But none the less is the distinction just and fundamental. For,

*First.* Consciousness requires it. In the rise and continuance of a sensibility, I am conscious that, so far, I am only subject, and not agent; passive, and only impressed from without. I call into exercise no more spontaneity or self-hood as to experiencing or not experiencing the sensibility than the man unwittingly assaulted from the rear with a bludgeon has, as to the pain resulting from its stroke. And consequently, I feel no more responsible. But when I begin to harbor an appetency, though it be not yet matured into volition, I am conscious of self-action. I know that this action of soul is an expression of my own spontaneity. This appetency is the *Ego* tending outwardly to its objective. Its presence is as truly an expression of my free preference as is a volition. I feel thus only because *I incline*, or have the disposition, to feel thus. Whereas before, my sensibility was uttered in the passive verb, my appetency is uttered in the active transitive verb. Let the reader consider any actual instance. Suppose it to be that of the man causelessly assaulted with the bludgeon. The first consequence of the blow, which is reported in the man's spirit, is the grief or distress answering immediately to the physical affection of the bruised nerves. In this the soul is as involuntary and passive as a stone in falling. Next thereafter may arise in the spirit of the injured man the warm appetency or desire to retaliate the pain—active resentment. Or, this may not arise. If the sufferer is choleric, it may arise; if he is meek, or if the blow came from one he loves, it may not arise, but in its place will come a tender grief and a generous desire to render good for the smiter's evil. If the desire to strike back arises, its *occasion* will be found in the passive sensibility of grief or distress inflicted on the spirit by the blow; but the *cause* of the resentful appetency, or of the tender forgiveness, must be sought in the subjective feelings of the man struck. Let another instance be found in the complex feeling called the "appetite" of hunger. This includes, first, an involuntary sensibility, the uneasiness of want; and next, a voluntary desire, reaching forth to the food set before the eyes. But let us suppose that, at this moment, one informs him, "This food contains arsenic." The appetency instantly subsides, although the uneasiness of want

continues. A third instance may be found in the feeling of wonder. This, in its first movement, is a passive sensibility, excited by a novel object. It is, however, the immediate occasion of the active appetency of "curiosity," or the desire to know.

*Second.* This distinction is essential to explaining our conscious free agency, consistently with the certainty of volitions. The true doctrine here is undoubtedly the Augustinian: that *motives* regularly *cause volitions*. But now, if we confound passive sensibilities with spontaneous appetencies, and call the former "motives," that doctrine becomes inconsistent with our conscious free agency. If my impulse to strike back at my assailant is a passive sensibility, it is caused by his blow, as truly as the bodily pain. In the producing of that pain I had no more agency than the stone has in dropping when its support is removed. If that impulse was cause of the volition to strike back, then the whole series, feelings and act, was determined for me by a causal necessity, without my consent, by the assailant when he struck me. I was no free agent, but a sentient puppet. The last movement, the act of retaliation, was determined by the other's blow, as really as the movement of the hindmost link in a chain, whose foremost link is drawn forward by another hand. But if we make the proper distinction between sensibility and appetency, if we perceive aright the objective source of the one, and the subjective source and true spontaneity of the other, we are able to refute that fatal inference. It is this truth which dissolves the whole fallacies, both of the materialistic fatalist and the advocate of the contingency of the will. Grant with Hobbes, Condillac, and the Mills, that appetency is but "transformed sensation," or transformed sensibility, and every act of man is physically necessitated, like the movements of the successive links of the chain. But the Pelagian, seeing whither this fatal argument leads, sought to break it by denying that motives do cause volitions. He exclaimed: The feelings do not causatively determine the will, but the will is self-determined, and essentially *in equilibrio*, and always competent to emit the volition which is contrary to the strongest motives. Only thus can you save man's true free agency. But the Pelagian is here contradicted by conscious-

ness, by theology, by the absolute divine prescience of volitions, by experience, and by a thousand absurd consequences of his denial. *Motives do determine volitions. But what are motives?* This vital question cannot be answered without the just distinction between sensibilities and appetencies. Passive sensibilities never are motives—at least to responsible rational volitions—but only non-efficient occasions of those subjective appetencies which are the determining motives. And man is free in his volitions because he is spontaneous in those motives which determine them; not because there is any such monstrosity in his spiritual action as this function conformed to no law, even of his own subjective reason or disposition, and regulated by no rule, even of his own subjective constitution. Thus the errors of the two extremes are resolved at once, and the consistency of the true moderate doctrine reconciled with our conscious free agency.

II. The next fundamental point is, to ascertain the conditions under which feelings arise in the soul. One condition is obviously the presence, in thought at least, of some idea or judgment as object of the feeling. He who feels must have something to feel about. It is equally obvious that it is *some cognition*, some idea or conclusion presented either by sense, memory, association, imagination, or reason, which furnishes that object before the soul. It is an injury which excites resentment; in order that it may do so, the injury must be either seen, felt, or thought. The object of parental love is the child. This affection can only imbue the mother's spirit consciously as the child is present either before her eyes or her thought. Hence the maxim, that the soul only feels as the mind sees. Cognition is in order to feeling.

The other condition is, if possible, more important, though not so obvious. In order to feeling, there must be in the soul a given *a priori* disposition or *habitus* as to the object. And this is true both of the sensibilities and the appetencies. As the rise of bodily pain from a blow or stab is conditioned on the previous presence in the flesh of living nerve-tissue, so the previous presence in the soul of a given susceptibility is the condition prerequisite to the excitement of a given sensibility by its object. The blow did not put the nerve-fibres into the flesh; it found them



there. So, the presence of the object in thought does not create the susceptibility or sentiency of soul, but finds it there. The parallel fact is true of the appetencies. Unless the soul is naturally and previously qualified by a given disposition, or tendency of inclination for or against the given object, seen in cognition, this could not be the object of appetency or aversion. The racer would not, and could not, emit desire for the clod set upon the goal; he could and would for the gold crown. Now, did the clod and the metal, or either of them, propagate this difference in the man's desire? That is absurd; they are dead, inert matter; objects of desire or aversion, not agents. It was the native, subjective disposition of the racer's soul which determined the desire towards the golden crown, and away from the clod, when the two objects were presented in cognition. This is plain.

But from this it follows that if a given disposition is native to the soul, no object naturally indifferent or alien to that disposition can have any agency whatever to reverse it. This must follow by the same kind of reasoning which proves that, if the horse pulls the cart, it cannot be the cart which pulls the horse. What is it that has decided whether a given object shall or shall not be an inducement to this soul? It is that soul's disposition which has decided it, and decided it *a priori*. Then, an object which the soul's disposition has already decided to be alien or indifferent cannot influence that disposition backwards. The effect cannot reverse its own cause. If, then, we have ascertained a native disposition of souls, we have gotten an ultimate fact, behind which analysis can go no farther; a fact which is regulative (not compulsory) of human spontaneity, and through the spontaneous appetencies, of the will. Let an instance be taken from the class of feelings called appetites. We ask the child: Is this drug sweet or nauseous? If on experiment the native taste pronounce it nauseous, that is the end of the matter. Of course, the child may still be forced by manual violence to swallow it. The child may even elect freely to swallow it; may even beg eagerly to be allowed to swallow it, if it sees that the evil drug is the only choice except a more evil sickness or death. But that child will not freely eat that drug *for the sake of enjoying it*, nor will its

natural repugnance be in the least changed, but rather confirmed, by having the drug forced upon it. Let an instance also be taken from the spiritual dispositions. Is the human soul so constituted as to find an intuitive pleasure in the applause of its fellows, and pain in their contempt? If experiment uniformly reveals this, what would or could be the result of this appeal: "Come, my friend, and embark yourself in this laborious train of efforts. They cannot possibly procure for you any good or advantage, except that of being despised by all your fellow-men. Come, undergo these toils, solely to win that contempt." Every one knows that the appeal must totally fail, unless the man were a lunatic; and all except lunatics would think us lunatics for attempting to make it. Now, the hearer is, in this refusal, perfectly free, and yet his free refusal is absolutely certain. Why? The *a priori* constitutive law of disposition has settled the matter: that being well abused cannot be, *per se*, an inducement to a human soul; the native disposition is to find pleasure in the opposite—in applause.

III. From this simple view it results that the feelings, both sensibilities and appetencies, will present themselves *in pairs*. We shall meet with a given feeling and its reverse. The second essential condition of feelings, as we saw, was the previous existence of a native disposition. Now, the disposition which has decided a given object to be an inducement, will of course regard the opposite object as one of repulsion. The taste which has elected the sweet will *ipso facto* repel the nauseous as evil. Or, the disposition which recognises the approbation of fellows as the good, will *ipso facto* reject the obloquy of mankind as *per se* an evil, however one may endorse it for the sake of some other higher good. The pair of results in each case does not disclose two dispositions, but only one, acting according to its own nature oppositely towards the two opposite objects. In the compass it is the same molecular energy which causes the upper end of the needle to turn towards the north pole, and to turn away from the south. It is so of the soul's native condition of spiritual electricity: the one disposition discloses two opposite actions, either of sensibility or of appetency; the soul is affected, in virtue of

one disposition, with two sensibilities, or two appetencies, pleasure or pain, desire or aversion, towards the pair of opposite objects. Eminently is this true of the moral emotion: approbation of the virtuous and reprehension of the wicked, are the dual expression of the one, single right disposition of conscience.

Thus all the feelings may be shown to go in pairs, as Pleasure and Pain, Wonder and Ennui, Sublimity and Disgust, Beauty and Ugliness, Love and Hatred, Gratitude and Resentment, Beneficence and Malice, Fear and Bravery, Pride and Humility, Approbation and Reprehension, Self-satisfaction and Shame. And the whole list of *Desires*, whether for continued existence, power, money, fame, ease, has its counterpart list of Aversions, for death, weakness, poverty, reproach, sickness. Thus our analysis is at once simplified, and the number of cases to be reduced is diminished by one-half.

IV. This seems the suitable place to refute two kindred (or we may say, virtually identical) theories, which boast of a still greater simplification, and have infused boundless fallacies into the science of ethics. These writers say: Give us two feelings only, the sensibilities to *pleasure* and *pain*, and we have all the elements necessary to account for the multiplicity of human emotions. An object happens by chance to affect us a few times with pain or pleasure. We remember the effect of its presence. This memory of the experienced pain or pleasure is supposed to be sufficient to generate subsequent aversion or desire towards that object. Desire, then, is only rational self-calculation, proposing to itself to seek the same means in order to repeat the feeling of pleasure.

Hartley had applied his favorite doctrine of *association* for virtually the same purpose. The Mills, father and son, and even the witty Sidney Smith, heartily adopted the scheme. The "associational philosophers," dazzled by the power association evidently has over our ideas, and the wonders which this faculty works in suggestion and imagination, were led to suppose that they could account for all the higher functions of the reason by association; without postulating for the mind any of those *a priori* cognitions and judgments, which were so obnoxious to this

empirical school. They thought they could account for memory as a mere result of associated ideas. Our most fundamental judgments of relation were to be explained as a sort of trick the mind got into by seeing two ideas associated in a certain way, of supposing them necessarily related that way. Our belief in the tie of cause and effect, they said, was nothing but a habit of expecting a consequent to follow a given antecedent, simply because they had been so often associated so. What wonder that these men thought they could also account for all the marvels of emotion with the two simple elements of experienced pain and pleasure, and their magician association? Thus: Experienced pain has been associated with a given object a number of times. Afterward the sight of the object, by the law of association, suggests those former pains, and this is the genesis of the emotion of *fear*. Other objects caused pleasure. By the same power of association their presence suggested that former pleasure, and that gave birth to *desire*. Or if the rational faculty joined to the association a probable expectation of attainment, that was *hope*. The sight of the kind mother, by the associative tie, suggests to the boy or girl the many personal pleasures of which she had been the source, from the first remembered draught of nourishment out of her generous breasts to the last ministration of relief or enjoyment; and that string of associations constitutes *filial love* and *gratitude*. We see a person suffering; the association which the spectacle revives of our former suffering, gives us a gentle pain, and that is *sympathy*!

Now, in refuting this notable scheme, it need not be denied that our feelings do fall within the wonderful tie of association, nor that this faculty has a potent influence in combining and modifying the emotions. But elements must *exist* before they can combine; and the associative faculty, whose whole power is to procure the reproduction of ideas or feelings before connected, has no power to generate. The chief plausibility of this scheme is derived from its success in accounting for *fear*, as only remembered pain associated with its cause. But when we take another step in their process the plausibility vanishes. If their plan is correct, should we not account for all our aversions precisely as

we account for our fears? But then aversion and fear should be the same, but they are often widely distinguished.

But the more thorough and obvious refutation is to remark, that the whole trick of this analysis is in assuming that there is one pain and one pleasure only. But pains and pleasures are many and diverse. Some are animal, some spiritual. Is the pain of a stripe from the rod quivering in the animal nerves of the gross and selfish child the same with the pain of conscience awakened in the spirit of the ingenuous boy by the tears of the mother, who, while she disapproves, is too loving to strike? Can the one pain be analysed into the other by any jugglery of the associations? No. This Hartleian scheme thus begs the question at the outset, by confounding, under the names of pain and pleasure, functions of feeling widely distinct and equally original.

The fact substantiated under our II. head equally refutes it. As soon as we ask the question, Can any object whatsoever occasion in man's spirit any feeling whatsoever? the negative which common sense at once pronounces to that simple inquiry, gives us the material of this argument. Did the clod occasion the same joy and desire in the racer's mind as the golden crown? May a heap of rubbish be possibly the object of an æsthetic pleasure as the rainbow may be? Can a human spirit be pleased at being talked about abusively, as well as by being talked of approvingly? Of course not. But why not? The answer is as simple as fundamental: that there must exist, in the sensitive spirit, a capacity or specific disposition, establishing a relevancy of the soul to the specific class of objects. And that disposition must exist as a subjective law of the soul previous and in order to the result, the rise of the different feeling. It would be as reasonable to say that the rivulet generated the spring, as to assert that the feeling implanted the disposition and capacity, whose pre-existence is in order to the rise of the feeling. Hartley has missed then and totally overlooked the main fact in the problem. Since pains and pleasures are many, and are naturally distinct, it is vain to talk of a plan by which one pain and one pleasure may generate many other coördinate and equally original pains and pleasures.

Association, least of all, can work this effect. For the very

nature of this mental process is to connect ideas and feelings by some tie of pre-existence together in the mind—resemblance, contrast, causation, or logical relation—so that the *one idea shall reproduce the other*. That is all. But mere reproduction does not transmute. The suggested idea merely arises such as it was when cognised before, save as it is now thought in some new connexion. Hence, all these theories which seek to make association the generator of different mental states from those first associated, are worthless. Let us test in this way, for instance, the genesis of filial love and gratitude from the child's associations of experienced natural pleasures with the kind mother's person. Those pleasures, when experienced, were personal and selfish! But the very essence of filial love is, to be disinterested. How could the mere circumstance that these pleasures are revived by suggestion in association with the mother's image, work all that mighty change into an affection of the opposite class! Again, how do we get, from such a source, an ethical affection for the mother, including the judgment and sentiment of right, merit, desert, and obligation? Why should these remembered personal pleasures generate a love different from that felt for the kindly cow, which relieved the child's hunger more constantly than the mother's bosom; or for the jolly toy which gave him as many gay moments as the mother's caresses? There are loves, again, which go out towards objects which are sources of our griefs and not our joys: the mother's love for her new-born infant, which, up to that moment when she enshrines it in her heart of hearts, had made its existence as a *fœtus* known to her only in the pains of gestation and the agonies of parturition; the parent's love attaching to a child whose faults and cruelties only pierce the loving heart with sorrows.

It is unnecessary to pursue the parallel process with the supposed generation of sympathy from our own remembered pains and of the other affections. The argument is so similar as not to need repetition.

The other branch of the theory which accounts for appetency as the deliberate self-calculation arguing from pleasures before experienced to the repetition of their means, receives a more easy

and popular answer. How was the soul carried to the appetency of that object the first time it sought it? Not by the experience of the pleasure derived from the object, for there has been no experience as yet, this being the first experiment. Here the theory breaks down hopelessly. Now, when the soul sought the object of its appetency the first time, the impulse to do so could not have been calculated, but it must have been immediate and instinctive. But this first instance of appetency is of the same class of mental affections with all the subsequent instances of the same appetency. In the subsequent ones, then, this immediate and instinctive desire cannot be absent, which was the sole element in the first and most characteristic instance. It is not meant to deny that rational calculation, founding on remembered experiences of advantage, does afterwards mingle with and reinforce instinctive desire; all that is argued is, that it cannot first generate it, any more than a child can procreate its own parent. Let us suppose that a physiologist was asked: What causes the newborn infant to imbibe its natural nourishment? and that he were to reply: "The cause is its experience of the sweetness of the mother's milk." The folly of the answer would be transparent. How did the infant know it was sweet before it had tasted it? By similar reasoning it appears, that, as this infant seeks the mother's breast under the guidance of an original and inborn animal instinct, so all the soul's elemental appetencies are spiritual instincts. This truth reflects new honor upon the wisdom of Him who fashioned human spirits, when we come to perceive the "final causes" of the original feelings. The designs which the Maker pursues in them are so profound that we learn man "is fearfully and wonderfully made," not only as to his anatomy, but as to the frame-work of his feelings.

V. We advance now to the true classification of the elemental feelings. We have already found them fundamentally separated by a dual division into sensibilities and appetencies, the former passive, and produced by an external cause, the latter active and springing from a subjective source. Then, in view of another principle of division, we found them all falling into pairs: sensibilities, pleasurable or painful; and appetencies, either of desire

VOL. XXXV., NO. 3—4.

or aversion; and each pair the expression, not of two, but of one original disposition of soul yielding the contrary feelings in response to opposite objects. Still another basis of a dichotomy was found, by remembering that man is corporeal and spiritual, and has accordingly animal sensibilities and mental. The passive sensations experienced in the animal susceptibility are impressions on the bodily senses; the corresponding appetencies are known by the name "appetites." In popular language, these are usually limited to the appetitive part of thirst, hunger, and the sexual sensibility. But it would be curious and interesting to inquire whether each of the appetencies occasioned by the sensation impressed on the other animal senses is not equally entitled to be called an "appetite." Why may we not say that the peasant whose back itches has an appetite to scratch as properly as we say that when thirsty he has an appetite to drink? When the eye is wearied by confinement in darkness, may we not say that it has an "appetite" for the light? When the musician's ear is wearied by silence, why should we not speak of him as having an "appetite" for harmony? But waiving this question, we only add, that the pleasures and pains of the sensuous æsthetic—we shall meet the mental æsthetic feelings farther on—and the desires and aversions occasioned by them, also belong to this division of feelings.

There remain, then, to discuss the mental feelings of the two classes: the sensibilities and appetencies which inhabit the rational spirit properly, as distinguished from the animal nature, to which the senses contribute nothing except the remoter ministerial service of channels for the cognitions which occasion the spiritual feelings. Let this be more clearly viewed in an instance. The virtuous man is informed of the utterance of a base lie. The feeling which we take into account here is, the ethical loathing he feels for the falsehood. Now, it may be asked, had not this virtuous man employed his acoustic sense, would his mind have known that the foul sin of lying had occurred? No; the bodily acoustic sense has been the channel of the cognition. But the evil quality which occasions his mental abhorrence does not all reside in the *sounds* through which, by the ministry of the ear,



his mind cognised the evil lie. It is not that these sounds were grating or unmelodious, or the words unrhctorical. The vice is in the *thoughts uttered* by the liar; and the moral feeling is spiritual, and not sensuous.

Looking, then, only to the feelings of the mind, and excluding bodily sensations and appetites, we venture to suggest, as an imperfect and tentative arrangement, the following classification. The first column contains the objects, on the presence of which in cognition feeling is conditioned. These objects, as explained, fall into pairs. The second column contains the corresponding sensibilities; and the third the corresponding appetencies, also appearing in pairs of opposites. But each pair of pairs reveals only one subjective disposition or capacity of feeling in the soul. So that the whole variety of feelings is reduced to *nine principles*.

These nine elements of disposition, susceptibility, and conation, of course combine in various ways, producing many forms of complex feeling. Of these a few have been indicated in the table. The moral emotion may combine in many of these, as with instinctive resentment, love, sympathy, and modify the products. So the sensuous affections may combine with others, as love, selfishness, sympathy, and ambition, or avarice, producing the most energetic results, of which some are criminal and some legitimate.

The eight traits of disposition, with their resulting capacities for sensibility and conation, are implanted by our Maker in our souls. The ninth disposition was introduced by the fall. We may safely conclude that, had a given capacity no legitimate and innocent scope for its exercise, a wise and holy God would never have implanted it in the man made in his image. Hence, while the perversions of these feelings, produced by the combination of the ninth, native depravity, are all mischievous and criminal, there must be exercises of the other eight which are lawful. There is a legitimate wonder, curiosity, mirth, admiration, desire of power, delight in a good name. It is possible for a man to "be angry and sin not." There is a desire for one's own welfare, which is not sinful self-love (or the craving for unrighteous advantage and good). There is a generous emulation, which is sympathy with our fellow's manifested energy.

Dual Objects of Feeling	Corresponding Feelings of Passive Sensibility.	Corresponding Feelings of Active Appetency (Desire and Aversion).
1. { Existence and Extinction.	Simple Pleasure of Existence. Contrasted Pain at Extinction. { Sense of the Ludicrous, Sense of Beautiful. Wonder, { Sense of Sublime. Ennui. { Sense of the Dull, Sense of the Trivial, Sense of Ugliness. Instinctive Pleasure of Exertion. Pain of Inaction.	Desire of life. { Motives of all self-protective acts. Aversion to Death. { Curiosity, or Desire to know. Disgust, or Aversion from contemplation of.
2. { The Novel, The Trite.		Desire of Power, or Ambition. Aversion to Restraint. Avarice, or Desire of Wealth, as combined with No. 7. Desire of Reward to the Deserving. Desire of Penalty on Guilty.
3. { Action, and Passivity.	Ethical Approbation. Ethical Reprehension. Remorse. (Rational Sensibilities.) { Sympathy with others' joy, grief, &c. Emulation, being Sympathy with the energy of fellows.	Desire to Help. Desire to Excel. But, perverted by No. 7, Envy, or Desire to prevent others excelling.
4. { Righteousness and Sin.	Pleasure in Praise. Pain in Dispraise. And combined with No. 7, Pride and Humility.	Love of Fame (or, with No. 3, Ambition). Haughtiness and Vanity. Desire of Improvement.
5. Others' Feelings as Witnessed.	Gladness. Sorrow. But combining No. 4, Resentment at Injury.	Desire of our own Well-being. { Erroneously called Fear of Evil. { Self-love. Combining with No. 9, <i>Selfishness</i> , Desire to retaliate, and (combining No. 8, part 2d.) <i>Revenge</i> .
6. { Applause, and Reproach.	{ Love, or Delight in. Hatred of.	Desire to make happy, or Benevolence. Malice, or Desire to cause Suffering.
7. Well-Being, Ill-Being.	{ Innate Depravity.	{ Aversion to Duty (at least some). Preference for Self-will.
8. Our Fellow-Man.		
9. { Moral Obligation, License.		

Let us pause here to remark in this instance upon the important light thrown by a just analysis and classification of the feelings upon their moral quality. The emotion of emulation has been by some moralists applauded, and by others condemned. Some teachers and rulers appeal freely to it as a wholesome *stimulus* to effort. Others deprecate all use of the principle, as depraving to the morals. Now, if we conceive no emulation,

save that which is the outcome of envy, the latter are right. For envy can only be criminal and malignant. It is a mixture of selfishness, pride, and hatred, as quickened by the contemplation of a rival's superiority. The appetency of will which attends it is not the laudable desire to advance one's self, but the mean craving to depress and degrade the rival. The envious man does not wish himself better, but his competitor worse. Were all emulation but a phase of this vile emotion, it must always be wrong. But is there not a totally different phase? Every thoughtful man knows that the great law of sympathy extends to other affections besides sorrow. We sympathise with our fellow's joy, with his hope, with his courage, with his fear, with his resentment, with his mirth, just as we do with his grief. The philosophic meaning of *πάθος* is not sorrow merely, but feeling, all feeling; and *συμπάθεια* is the social infection of the one with all the forms of his neighbor's *παθήματα*. Now, love of action, energy, *is a feeling*, and a legitimate and noble one. Why may not the ingenuous spirit, witnessing the flame of this animating emotion, instinctively sympathise with it, just as he would with his neighbor's sorrow, or terror, or gladness? Doubtless this disinterested sympathy is felt. There is, then, an emulation which is *sympathy with another's energy*. It is from wholly another element of emotion than envy. It is not malignant, but just and generous. It does not crave to drag its honorable competitor down, but rightfully to raise itself up. And thus the Scriptures are justified and reconciled with themselves, which in one place rank "emulation" among the evil fruits of the "flesh;" and in another enjoin us to "provoke one another to good works."

The consistency of the classification proposed above must be left mainly to speak for itself. The reader's own reflections will pursue the hints which it presents him. This article is already approaching the limits of allowable length, and room can be claimed only for two other points.

One of these is the evident prevalence of "final cause" throughout the structure of the emotions. Every one has been fashioned with design. The skill with which they are all fashioned to educe their results bespeaks the Creator's wisdom

and benevolence just as clearly as the structure of the human eye. What was the end designed in imbuing the mind with the sensibility of *wonder* and its corresponding appetency of curiosity? To stimulate man to learn and to make his newly acquired knowledge sweet to him. Why was the law of sympathy established? To provide a spontaneous and ready succor for the distressed; to connect men in social ties, and to enable them to double their joys and divide their sorrows by sharing them. What is the "final cause" of instinctive resentment? To energise the innocent, weak man against aggression, and thus to prevent his giving additional *impetus* to the unjust assailant through timidity and sloth. But we must forbear this attractive line of thought.

Psychologists, in explaining the dispositions and classifying the native feelings of the soul, almost uniformly overlook the one we have placed in the ninth rank, native depravity. But we hold that the same sort of inquiry and reasoning from facts, which leads them to hold that the love of applause is a native trait of man's heart, should cause them to count depravity equally among man's constitutive dispositions. Why this grave and most inconsistent omission? Has the pride of reason blinded them? Kant is the only great writer, not teaching from the theological point of view, who has stated the psychological truth as to this trait, and therein he shows his acuteness and honesty at once. This original depravity he defines as a subjective "propensity" (*propensio*) prompting the soul to adopt something else than duty, as sensual good, selfishness, advantage, for the prevalent rule of voluntary actions. But notwithstanding this deplorable election, these lower motives may prompt the man to many actions formally right, as business honesty, domestic kindness; so that the man's *conduct* may be to a large degree moral. Yet the man himself is fundamentally immoral, radically depraved, because he has deposed from his soul what is entitled to be the supreme rule of all actions, and established the unrighteous rule of self-will, so that every one of his acts is bad in motive, at least by defect. If we ask what subjective cause determines the original propensity to determine the will to this life of disobedience, we raise an

absurd question. For, if an answer could be found, this would only raise a prior question, What determined that antecedent determining cause of propensity? The *regressus* would be endless. We must stop then with the inscrutable but indisputable fact, original evil propensity. It is the end for us of all possible analysis. But to preclude the sinner from the cavil, "Then my propensity, being native, infringes my free agency by a physical necessity; so that I am not responsible for the volitions that result," Kant argues acutely, that this propensity to evil is none the less a function of spontaneity, because it is original. For it is as truly and as freely elected into the soul by its free agency as is any specific act of evil freely willed by the sinner. Is not this propensity to evil as truly, as freely, as thoroughly, *the soul's preference* as any single bad act it ever willed? The propensity reigns in the soul by virtue of a perpetual, *continuing act* of spontaneity, unrelated to time. Each specific sin that soul commits is a similar act of spontaneity, related to some particular point in time. Hence, the soul's determinate preference for sin is both certain and free, and therefore responsible. The evidence by which Kant proves the existence of this original depravity is very plain and short. All men sin, both in the savage and civilised states, and the morals of nations (which have no earthly restrainer over them, and consequently show out man's real *animus*) are simply those of outlaws or demons. International relations are *frequently* those of active robbery and murder, and *all the time* those of expectation and preparation for robbery and murder.

Kant's description of that mixture of good and evil conduct which natural men exhibit, which yet coexists with radical depravity of will, is luminous and correct. We do not say that because the natural man is radically depraved, he is therefore as bad as man can be, or as bad as he may become in future. We do not condemn his social virtues as all hypocrisies. Many affections in this man are still normal and legitimate, and they concur in prompting many actions. His ethical reason in those judgments which recognise the rightness and obligation of God's holy law is not essentially corrupted, and cannot be, except by lunacy.

This sacred judgment of conscience in favor of the right has not wholly lost its force in this man. But he holds God's law persistently dethroned from the place of universal supremacy in his soul, to which it is entitled. When he does the formally right thing, he does not do it supremely to please God. When the law of right comes into clear competition with the law of self-will, the man always gives the preference to his own disobedient will. His conduct may be mixed—some good, some bad—but his soul as a moral monad, incapable of an ethical neutrality, is *decisively against duty*. The man is radically depraved.

In proving psychologically that the disposition to evil is a native spring of feelings and volitions, just as truly as the love of applause, the desire of happiness, or the love of the beautiful, it is not necessary, then, to assert that every natural man desires to break every rule of right. All we have to prove is, that every natural man is fully determined to commit some sins—such as his other propensities do not restrain him from—and to neglect some known duties. When an exact naked issue is made between God's holy will and self-will, the latter has the invariable preference.

Our first evidence is an appeal to consciousness. Let the man who is in the state of nature answer honestly the question, whether it is his *present* preference and (by God's grace) *purpose* to act from this time up to every known obligation, especially those due to God, and to forsake now every known sin, and he must say no. He thinks he admires virtue as a whole and in the future. To some of the particular parts of virtue he has, at this time, an inexorable opposition. Observation shows us that while some men are far less wicked than others, every natural man transgresses in some known things deliberately and repeatedly. The only man of whom the writer ever heard who asserted his entire freedom from the dominion of sin was a Col. Higginson, a Boston Socinian, who, in one of Joseph Cook's "*symposia*," declared that he had never in his life slighted a monition of conscience. But this claim to a perfect natural holiness was rather damaged with all men of common sense, when it became known that in the Confederate war he had raised and commanded a regi-

ment of runaway-negroes to invade his fellow-citizens. Thus he ran greedily into the very wickedness which his political gospel, the Declaration of Independence, had charged against George III. One is not surprised to find in such a boaster just that blindness of heart which would prevent his seeing the cruelty and wickedness of arming against his brethren semi-savages and slaves, whose allegiance to their masters was solemnly guaranteed by the very Constitution under which he pretended to act!

Again, if we trace this absolute aversion to duty back in each man's history, we find its appearance coincident in every child with the earliest development of reason and conscience. When first the child's mind comes to know duty rationally, he knows it but to hate it, at least in some of its forms. All sensible persons who rear children discover that their sin is in part always a development from within, and not a mere habit learned from imitation, or propagated by bad treatment and unwholesome outward influences. So true is this that the average child, left to its own expansion without any moral nurture or restraint, would be so much worse than the average child reared under a faulty and evil discipline, that average men would regard him as a monster. We view the evil of the nature of little children under an illusion. We call them "little innocent babes." Because their bodily and mental powers of executing their impulses are so weak, we think of them as harmless. The animal beauty of their bodies seduces our judgments. But let this picture be considered. Let us take the moral traits of an ordinary infant, his petulance, his unreasoning selfishness, his inordinate self-will, his vengefulness, his complete indifference, whenever any whim of his own is to be gratified, to the convenience or fatigue and distress of his loving mother or nurse, his entire insubordination to all force but corporeal, his bondage to bodily appetite, his uncalculating cruelty. Suppose him, instead of appealing to your pity by his helplessness, embodying precisely these qualities in the frame of a robust adult, we should have a wretch from whom his own mother would flee in terror. Does one say that these dispositions, which would be hateful sins in an adult, are no sins at all in the infant, because he has as yet no intelligence to know they are

wrong? We reply with this question: If this child were left absolutely free from all external restraints, *when his intelligence came to him, would he therefor forsake these dispositions?* Experience tells us he would not. But fortunately for society, while his native evil is at its greatest, his faculties of execution are at their weakest. Thereby Providence subjects him from the outset to an ever-present *apparatus* of restraints and discipline which, by the time his powers of mischief are grown, have curbed his native depravity within bounds tolerable to society.

Now, how can the existence of any native principle of feeling be better proved than by the fact that some degrees of it are found in every man; that it appears from the first in each, and that it develops along with the growth of his faculties? Is there any other or stronger proof by which psychologists show that the æsthetic sensibility, sympathy, resentment, love, are native to man?

One more fact remains: that this aversion to duty and love of sinful self-will operates with determining energy, and against all possible inducements. This dominancy of the feeling exhibits itself especially, in many cases, in resisting and conquering inducements which, rationally, ought to be irresistible. For instance, the love of life is usually supreme. Here is a man who is indulging a sensual sin to the injury and destruction of life itself. He is clearly forewarned; but he does not stop. In another man avarice, in another inordinate ambition, is his dearest permanent appetency. The one has wealth, the other fame and power, within his reach. But each is falling under the power of drunkenness, which is known to be destructive to fortune and to reputation. But this fact does not arrest the course of indulgence; the able, energetic man finally sacrifices his own dearer desire to the low and sensual vice. Or if we take the general view of this matter, it can be made clear to any understanding that, on the whole, a course of temperance, prudence, and virtue will be best for every man's own happiness. In the final outcome any and every sin must subtract from man's highest good. Indeed, this conclusion is the testimony of every man's conscience. Let men be urged, then, to make this true self-interest their uniform guide; to eschew all evil, and perform all duty. In each man the appe-



tency to sin will assert itself still, against the man's own highest interest and most reasonable self-love.

But it is when we observe man's uniform neglect of the duties of godliness this rebellion of sinful self-will becomes most marked. Here the inducements to repentance are literally immense, including all the worth of heaven and dreadfulness of hell. When the problem is urged, "What shall it profit a man to gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" the judgment of every man's understanding is, of course, absolutely clear against the exchange. Or, if the sinner pleads, "I do not *decide* this horrible exchange; I only *postpone* the right decision in favor of God, and my soul, and heaven;" when we show him the unutterable rashness of this delay, and show that he is staking an eternity of blessedness, on a very perilous chance, against a worthless bauble of self-indulgence, his understanding is equally clear against his own proceeding. But none the less does he proceed in the paths of ungodliness.

Now, in mechanics we measure a force by the resistance it uniformly overcomes. And so it is correct to measure the energy of this appetency for transgression by the rational and moral obstacles which it overcomes.

Here, then, is a fundamental dislocation in man's soul. In his appetencies, man's subjective spontaneity finds its expression. They inspire the will; they regulate from within the whole free agency. In them centres man's activity. But on the other hand, conscience claims to be the rightful and rational ruler of mankind. It utters its commands with an intuitive authority; it is as impossible for one to doubt whether conscience, duly enlightened, is *entitled* to be obeyed, as to doubt his own existence or identity. We have, then, this situation in each natural soul: *the supreme faculty of the reason at war with the fundamental appetency of the free agency*. And this fatal collision presents itself on the most important of all the soul's concerns—duty; that on which the soul's destiny consciously turns. There has been, then, a catastrophe in human nature! Just as clearly as "there was war in heaven when Satan and his angels fought with Michael and his angels," there is a strife going on in the firmament of man's

spirit. We see no such dislocation in the natural laws of either man, or animal, or inorganic nature, in any other instance. In man's other faculties there is entire consilience. Perception, memory, suggestion, imagination, reasoning, all work together in substantial harmony. The laws of material nature concur. Or else, if we perceive in sentient beings any disorder similar to the one we have displayed in man's soul, we at once say, "There is disease." Is there not, then, a moral disease infecting the soul? It cannot be disputed.

When and how was this disease contracted? How can it be effectually remedied? To these momentous questions, philosophy has no answer. If we attempt to solve the second by saying, "Self-discipline can and must subdue the propensity to sin," philosophy herself meets us with this fatal difficulty: Whence is the effectual motive to that subjugation of the ungodly self-will to arise, within man himself? The dominant appetency has already pronounced, always pronounces, in favor of self-will and against conscience! Kant has seen, and stated with transparent clearness, this insuperable point. The soul is free agent, wherever it is responsible. True. Its action is self-determined? True. But unless the soul is an anomaly, a monstrosity in nature, an agent acting by no law whatever, it must contain some regulative law of its own determinations. If we violate its freedom by supposing an external objective law, then, at least, we have to suppose a subjective law regulative of its actions. What can that subjective law be but disposition—*habitus*? But as to this issue of an ungodly self-will against duty, we find *there* the regulative, ultimate propension, and *it is fundamentally against this subjugation of self-will*. This decision is native. Now, how can nature reverse nature? How can the first cause reverse its own law of effects? Can the fountain naturally propel its own stream against its own level?

The remedy for this spiritual disease, then, must begin, if it ever begins at all, in a supernatural source. So saith Scripture. John i. 13; iii. 5.

R. L. DABNEY.

## ARTICLE III.

## THE CHURCH ONE, THE WORD ONE, AND THE COVENANT WITH ABRAHAM STANDS.

The Church of God is one. He has never had but one Church on the earth. There is one Head of the Church and the Church is his body. One head with two bodies would be monstrous. There have been three different dispensations—the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian—but only one Church. It did not begin with the Apostles, nor with Abraham, but at the Fall, when Redemption's work commenced, and the gospel was first preached in the promise about the seed of the woman. Many sects, many denominations of professed Christians exist, but in so far as they are true Churches holding the Head, they all constitute but one Church. Paul, writing to the Ephesians, declares in the strongest terms that the Old Testament Church was the same with the Christian, telling these Ephesian converts that so long as they were without Christ they were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. To become a Christian was to enter the commonwealth of Israel. The Jewish Church and the Christian were the same, differing in some minor things, but one in the main. Both had the same Saviour, and were to be saved in the same way. Abel, Enoch, Abraham, David, Isaiah, and all the other saints of God in the two former dispensations, looked forwards by faith to the coming Christ, and we look backwards by the same faith to the Christ that did come. Jesus is the common centre, and his people in every age and country sit round him in concentric circles. In a true and proper sense you can say of them all that they were *Christians* just as much as we are, for equally and alike they all belonged to Jesus, and equally and alike Jesus belonged to all of them.

Let any one read the language of our Lord (Matt. xxi. 33–43) in the parable of the vineyard. That vineyard was his Church and it had been “let out” to the Jewish people, but they did not prove faithful. And what then did the Lord of the vineyard? Destroy his vineyard and make a new one? No; he “miserably

destroyed those wicked men," and "let out his vineyard to other husbandmen." He took it from Jews and intrusted it to Gentiles, but it is the same vineyard still.

Let any one read Rom. xi. 16-24. The Church is there described as an olive tree, of which the natural branches, who were the Jews, were for the most part broken off, and wild olive branches, that is, Gentiles, grafted in, the root and trunk remaining, however, still the same. The Church is one and remains always the same, whether with Jewish or Christian people for its branches. And the Jews shall one day be grafted into their own olive tree again.

There has never been but one Church of God. Beginning in fallen Adam's family with the first promise, it comes down through the first or Patriarchal dispensation to Abraham, in whose family it becomes a more formal organisation, and so it passes on to the time of Moses who led "the Church in the wilderness" to Sinai, where it received "the lively oracles" to conserve them, all through the second or Jewish dispensation, and pass them down to us of the third or Christian dispensation of the one Church of God.

So, too, God's word is one. There are two Testaments, but they make one Bible. It is *the* Bible—that is, *the* Book—because there is none other in the world. This Book stands alone. All that is true, or of any original value, in any other books touching religious truth, comes from this Book. Nature's voice confirms Scripture, but she always equivocates until the Word speaks. And men know nothing of God as they need to know him, without the word. The Book is made up of many parts, some written earlier, some later, some in one language or country, some in another language or country, yet it is one Book. Moses wrote the first five portions some twenty-five hundred years after the Fall. Before his time men possessed no written Scriptures and had to depend on *tradition*, which was, of course, more to be relied on in those days because of the much longer lives of men. After so long a time God saw fit, for the better preservation and propagation of his truth, to have it committed to

writing. After the five books of Moses came the Historical books and the Psalms and the Prophets and the Evangelists and the Epistles, but the whole make but one Book or Bible. It is all the one Word of God, having one author, the Holy Ghost, though he used different men as amanuenses, and having one theme, the Lord Jesus, who appears on every page and in every line of it all. Accordingly our Catechism holds it forth as the only and the sufficient rule of our faith and of our practice.

Thus we read in Acts vii. 38, that Moses "when he was with the Church in the wilderness" "received there the lively oracles" to give them unto us. In Rom. iii. 1, Paul says that to the Jews were committed the "oracles of God." Also, that "all the Scripture (meaning the Old Testament) is given by inspiration of God." Speaking of the prophecies of the Old Testament, Peter tells us that "holy men of old spake as moved by the Holy Ghost." Our Lord Jesus commands us to "search the (Old Testament) Scriptures." On the way to Emmaus, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, "he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." The apostles continually reasoned "out of the Scriptures" of the Old Testament. They constantly appealed to them thus: "What saith the Scripture?"

The Christian Church cannot afford to have the Old Testament made, to any degree, or in any sense, obsolete. It cannot endure the dismemberment of having the Church of Abraham, of David, and of the Prophets, unchurched. This we suppose to be a tendency of opinion amongst some of our Baptist brethren. They seem to incline to the idea that there was no church on earth before Christ came, or at least to deny that the Jewish Church, or that of the Patriarchs, if worthy to be called by that name at all, was the same with the Christian Church. Indeed, they could not well identify the Jewish with the Christian Church, because they do not acknowledge the visible Church at all. "The Seven Congregations or Churches of Christ in London," in their "Confession of Faith" in 1646, published to relieve themselves of certain aspersions, do say that Christ has a kingdom on earth, which is his Church, "which Church is a company of visible

saints, and to this Church he hath made his promises." But in 1689 the "ministers and messengers of upwards of one hundred baptized congregations in England and Wales (denying Arminianism)," in putting forth their confession of faith are still more in the negative, and only say concerning the visible Church, that "all persons throughout the world professing the faith of the gospel . . . are, and may be called, visible saints, and of such ought all particular congregations to be constituted." And they speak thus "of a gospel Church: We believe that a visible Church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers," etc. These quotations are made from Professor Sewall S. Cutting's *Historical Vindications*, published in Boston in 1859. But Dr. Wayland, speaking of "an established confession," says, "With us it is impossible. We believe in the fullest sense in the independence of every individual church of Christ. We hold that each several church is a Christian society, on which is conferred by Christ the entire power of self-government. No church has any power over any other church. No minister has any authority in any church, except that which has called him to be its pastor. Every church, therefore, when it expresses its own belief, expresses the belief of no other than its own members."<sup>1</sup>

It appears to Presbyterians a very dreadful thing that the Church of Christ on the earth should not only be divided into separate denominations, but actually cut up thus into little separate joints or fragments, each dissociated from its fellows. But our brethren of the Baptist and other Independent persuasions allow a just and proper reaction from the monstrous headship of the Pope, and from that external unity of the Church, to carry them to this opposite extreme. And so it appears to Presbyterians that it would be a very dreadful thing to cut off more than one-half the Bible at a single blow, nor any less dreadful to cut off and cast out the whole Church of God upon the earth for all the first four thousand years of its inspired history. Our Baptist brethren will not accept any argument for the church membership of infants drawn from Old Testament principles and

---

<sup>1</sup> Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist churches, by Francis Wayland, New York, 1857, pp. 13, 14.

practices. We are ready to give what they have a right to demand—a “Thus saith the Lord”—for our doctrine and doing, but they insist that no such divine prescription shall be drawn from the Old Testament. This appears to Presbyterians the same as to say that the Old Testament is not Scripture—is no part of the word of God. The eminent and excellent Dr. Wayland (whom we remember with especial love and gratitude, mixed with the profoundest reverence, as for a time our faithful, as well as able, college professor, and our affectionate and helpful spiritual guide in critical days of our youth) says in his work previously named (Chapter XVI. p. 85): “The fundamental principle on which our difference from other evangelical denominations depends is this: We profess to take for our guide, in all matters of religious belief and practice, the *New Testament*, the *whole* New Testament, and *nothing but* the New Testament. [Italics Dr. W's.] Whatever we find there we esteem binding upon the conscience. What is not there commanded is not binding.” This is certainly very strong language. When made the subject of unfavorable comments as a denial of the divine inspiration of the Old Testament, Dr. Wayland said he did not think himself called to make any reply to such an imputation, that all he had “intended was to exclude the authority of tradition and of all uninspired men.” His language then was surely too strong and his assertion too wide. But he proceeds to acknowledge that he holds “the New Testament to be the standard by which the precepts and teachings of the former revelation are to be judged, and that thus it is our only *rule* of faith and practice.” He adds that “its relation to the Old Testament is that of the meridian sun to the preceding twilight.”

It is now submitted that this is quite different from the language of Chillingworth so generally adopted by all outside of the Roman Catholic Church: “The Bible, the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants.” It is submitted that there is a grave disparagement of the word of God in comparing any part of it to dim “twilight.” Further, where will this respected author find a “Thus saith the Lord,” for putting up the New Testament as “a standard by which the precepts and teachings of the former reve-

VOL. XXXV., NO. 3—5.

lation are to be judged" by men? We are taught that the Old is all *fulfilled* in the New Testament, and this language is proper to be used, but it seems rather irreverent to call any portion of that which holy men of God spake and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, a "former revelation," whose teachings men may set aside. Dr. W. says (p. 133): "By this word we are to decide upon the obligatoriness of every part of the older revelation." It is submitted that this expression is open to serious objections. Surely if the New Testament is a judge of the Old, the Old is equally a judge of the New. Had the New in any respect contradicted the Old, the Church could never have received it, but contrariwise it confirmed every moral precept of the Hebrew Scriptures, and fulfilled perfectly and completely all their ceremonial portions. Both Testaments are parts of the one rule of faith and practice. It will not do to set aside the law written by inspired prophets as requiring another standard to judge it, and that according to *our* "deciding." Inspired David said truly of the Old Testament: "The law of the Lord is perfect." Inspiration must not override and trample down inspiration. Apostle must not, will not, does not, contradict prophet. We dare not say that the New Testament is our only rule, lest we provoke Him who also gave us the Old as a perfect standard, but reverently do we bow to every part of the one word of God.

The Christian Church, let it be now repeated, cannot get along without that portion of the word of God which the Old Testament contains. With reverence let it be spoken, "*the New Testament, the whole New Testament, and nothing but the New Testament*" would not be, if separated from the Old, a perfect and sufficient rule of faith and practice. There certainly are some things binding upon the conscience now which we do not find set down clearly in the New Testament. Where, for example, is there any law of incest in the New Testament? If the eighteenth Chapter of Leviticus is not given us for the regulation of our marriage relations, what law has the Christian Church on the subject, and what right would it have to discipline a member who should be guilty of incest in its most shocking forms? If we discard the Old Testament as not part of our rule



of faith, where can we find any full statement of the moral law? Where do we get the doctrine of the Creation, of the First Covenant, of the Temptation, of the Fall, of the original interposition for our salvation? Where and when was uttered the first gospel? Where originates the idea of atoning blood and propitiatory sacrifice and the prophetical, priestly, and kingly offices of Christ? How could we get on without the argument for the truth of Christianity from the fulfilled prophecies, especially those relating to our Saviour? In fact, how could we go about to prove the New Testament to be God's word at all, if we should reject all argumentation and proof from the Old Testament Scriptures? How could we dispense with that most rich, most precious, most complete repository of every experience of believers which is to be found in the Psalms?

There is a third statement now to be made which cannot be contradicted. It is that in the Patriarchal dispensation of the Church, God entered into a solemn covenant with Abraham, and that in the Jewish dispensation, he also made a covenant with his people Israel when he took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt. This second covenant introduced the ceremonial law which, in the third or Gospel dispensation, was all of it fulfilled in the person of our Lord, and therefore was abolished and made to pass away. But the covenant God had made with Abraham, as it antedated the Mosaic economy, so it also survived it. That covenant still stands, for God said it was to be an everlasting covenant. And Paul tells the Galatians that Moses' ceremonial law, which was 430 years after the Abrahamic covenant, when itself abolished, did not and could not carry that covenant with it. The covenant with Abraham, he tells us, stood by itself for 430 years, and had no sort of dependence upon the Mosaic ritual. Paul also tells the Galatians that if they were Christians, then were they Abraham's seed and heirs with Abraham of the promise which God made to him and to his seed after him. Here, then, is a "Thus saith the Lord"—a clear and positive warrant, and *that from the New Testament*, to satisfy us that the covenant with Abraham is still standing, and all Christians heirs of all its privileges and all its promises.

It is very far from being true, as our Baptist brethren suppose, that this everlasting covenant of God with Abraham was a mere political charter, conferring citizenship in the Jewish state. Paul declares that "circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith." Could any covenant be a mere political or temporal covenant which has a seal to it like that—a seal of the righteousness of faith? A seal of the righteousness of faith must be a seal that is an assurance or certificate of all the promises and privileges of the covenant of grace. What did God promise to Abraham when he made the covenant with him? "I will be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee." Is there any better, can there be any higher or more spiritual promise? If God is God to us, what more do we want? If God is God to our children, what more can we desire for them? Such was God's part in the covenant with Abraham. What was Abraham's part? "Walk before me (said the Lord) and be thou perfect." What more in the way of duty could have been laid on Abraham? Every kind of service was included in that stipulation. What higher or more spiritual life for him than to "walk before God and be perfect"?

From the time of the covenant with Abraham the Church of God was shut up in the one family of Abraham. Previously it had been composed of individuals from many families and of divers nations. Henceforth the rest of mankind are given up of God, but Abraham's family is walled around and made to constitute the visible Church of God upon the earth. Abraham becomes the father of all believers, and he is the father of all believers now, and will be to the end, for it is written, "If ye be Christians, then are ye Abraham's seed." Henceforth the idea of individual union to the Church is modified by that of family union to the Church—"the promise is unto you and your children." Baptism, like circumcision, involves and implies the training of the children of the Church. "Walk before me and be thou perfect," was spoken to the father of the faithful, and is spoken to every believing father, to be repeated by him to his children as soon as they can understand the precept. God's words are to each son of believing Abraham, "I will be a God

to thee and to thy seed after thee." Thy seed, thy children, are heirs according to the promise. The true unit in the Church of God, ever since the days of Abraham, is not the individual person, but the family. It is families that make up the visible Church on earth—professors of Christianity and their children. Household baptism is Christian baptism in its most impressive and completest form when parents bring their children to be acknowledged by the Church as hers and her Lord's. So far as recorded, the apostles never baptized the head of a family without admitting his household to the ordinance. For there are named in the New Testament just eight particular individuals who received baptism, viz.: the eunuch, Saul, Simon Magus, Gaius, Crispus, Cornelius, Lydia, and the Philippian jailer. These are all. Now the eunuch and Saul certainly had no families, and there is no evidence that Simon Magus or Gaius had. Of the remaining four it is expressly said the households of three, namely, of Lydia, of the jailer, and of Crispus, were baptized, and it seems to be implied in the record that the household of Cornelius also was baptized. To these four we must add that of Stephanas, which is expressly recorded. Here, then, are the records of nine personal baptisms—in four of the cases there were no children to be baptized, but of the other five, who were heads of families, the record is that their households were baptized.

Now, the "strength of the argument (viz., that as households ordinarily include children, we have no right to exclude them from the general statement) lies not in any one case, but in the repeated mention of whole houses as baptized." "Who can believe that not one infant was found in all these families, or that Jews accustomed to the circumcision and Gentiles accustomed to the lustration of infants, should not have also brought them to baptism?" What, will they have us believe that the apostles gathered into the Church only old bachelors and childless householders? Look at the case again: five families out of the nine cases of personal baptism which are recorded in Scripture, or rather, five out of seven, for surely Saul and the eunuch should not be counted, whatever we are to think about Simon and Gaius—five cases of personal baptisms that are recorded where it was possible

that there might have been some children, and not another case recorded, and yet we are required to believe that there was no little child in all these five households!

But the most important feature of the whole subject is not connected with the question whether there were children in those families or what their ages may have been, but rather the fact of these whole households being baptized. This involves the conception of a *Christian family*. Family religion is often referred to by the apostle—"the household of Chloe, the household of Stephanas, the church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, the household of Aristobulus, the household of Narcissus"—these are familiar expressions in the mouth of Paul. Family religion, the right training of the children of the Church, the bringing of them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, why, that is one main hope we have of success in the holy war, as it is one main object of the setting up by the Lord of a Church that was to be perpetuated through successive generations.

Now, under the Abrahamic covenant the infant of eight days must by divine command have applied to his person the seal then used, which was circumcision. The duty imposed was twofold: *first*, the child was to be devoted by the parents and acknowledged by the Church; *secondly*, the seal of the covenant was to be imposed on the person of the infant. Of course, the babe was no believer, and understood not what was done to it. Yet God, who was then, as he is now, a Spirit and to be worshipped always in spirit and in truth, and who gave to Abraham a spiritual covenant, with a high and holy promise and a high and holy obligation imposed, this glorious God and Redeemer required this service at the hands of his people. But, of course, circumcision could not be for the sake of circumcision, but for something higher than itself, of which it was the seal or token, namely, for the *covenant*, of the stipulations of which it is the witness and the assurance. There is an essential and there is an accidental part. The essential part stands, and will stand to the end. The accidental, the symbolic, part is changed. The duty and privilege of consecration and acknowledgment stands—the sign and seal is altered, and baptism comes in the room of

circumcision. The old seal is substituted by a new and milder one suited to the character of the new dispensation. The bloody knife gives place to water, but the meaning is the same; corruption was formerly *cut off*, now it is *washed away*. The same truth is signified; the same promise and the same vow remains for the parties, viz., God and the believer; the same covenant stands, and it has the same subjects, viz., believers and their little children.

There then is where we stand—on a “Thus saith the Lord” never abrogated by him, and which no man and no Church has any right to abrogate. It was the express ordinance of the Almighty that the children of believers have the seal of the everlasting covenant with the Father of all believers applied to them, because they, too, are God’s, just as their parents are, and they, too, have an interest in his promise as truly as their parents. We no more dare to take away from than to add to his word. And therefore reverently, humbly, trustfully, thankfully we baptize them into the Adorable Name.

Let us refer briefly to our Saviour’s manner of dealing with little children. Fond mothers, no doubt aspiring for the honor of his touching them, possibly going higher still and wishing to secure just what they got—the Saviour’s blessing on their little unconscious babes—bring them to Jesus. The disciples rebuke them. Jesus, who said to Peter, referring to little children, “Feed my lambs,” is much displeased with them and says, “Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.” It is for such as they. It is theirs. Now, he meant either that his kingdom on earth, that is, his Church, is for such and that they belong to it and it to them; or else he meant that his kingdom in the heavens is theirs, which would make it plain that to them also belongs a membership in his earthly kingdom. It matters little which meaning we fix on—both necessarily come together. But what does he to the little ones? He takes them up in his arms, gives them imposition of hands (that very sacred and significant rite of the ancient Church which we still venerate and practise), and then

blesses them with audible voice! What more than all this is ever done in baptizing? And what minister or Church shall dare to say that infants may not have baptism with water in the Adorable Name applied to their persons, since the blessed Master himself with his own hands did all this to the infants of Perea?

Let us refer to another significant passage of Scripture. In 1 Cor., chap. vii., Paul counsels believing husbands or wives not to forsake their heathen partners if these are willing to continue the connexion. The Christian wife might gain her husband; the Christian husband might gain his wife for the Lord and the Church. And he tells such persons, for their comfort, that their own faith, as it were, sanctifies their unbelieving partners, and that the children of parents thus divided as to religious belief and profession, are not unclean, but *holy*. Now, what else can he mean but that the children of such a believing father or of such a believing mother, notwithstanding that the other parent rejects Christ, are still *holy* as belonging to him, and may be rightly dedicated to him in baptism? These were children of Christians, not Jews, and what Paul refers to as the means of their dedication and acknowledgment as Christ's was not the old seal, of course, but the new seal—not the Circumcision but Baptism.

Let it never be said that Infant Baptism is a relic of Popery. If it were a Romish invention, we might well expect to find it nowhere amongst those early Christian bodies which left the communion of Rome. On the contrary, we find it everywhere, amongst them all, and amongst all the modern Churches also, one single body of Christians alone excepted. The Greek Church, which always resisted Rome, nevertheless baptizes infants. The Armenian Church early separated itself, and they practise infant baptism. So do the Nestorian Christians in Persia, and so do the Christians of St. Thomas, who are named in Church history as early as the middle of the fourth century, and so do the Christians of Abyssinia. Then there are the Waldenses, a very ancient Christian people, whose history can be traced up almost to the apostolic times—they baptize infants.

And let it be observed that Church history gives us no account

of any sect or body of professing Christians that ever did object to infant baptism until we come all the way down to the Petrobrusians, an obscure and small sect, in the twelfth century. Think of it: there is no Church objecting to infant baptism for nearly 1,200 years after Christ. And our Baptist brethren, whom we love and honor for their many and great Christian excellences of character, but from whom we have to differ as to both the mode and subjects of baptism, were never known as a separated and distinct body until before or about the middle of the seventeenth century. The peculiar views which separate them, not only from us, but from the whole Christian world everywhere, are, comparatively speaking, *novelties*. They are not the ideas of the apostles nor of the early believers; and inasmuch as these brethren belong to one of the youngest Christian bodies, we may say without offence, we trust, that it does look somewhat presumptuous for it not only to unchurch and to refuse communion with all other denominations of the people of the Lord Jesus, but also to claim a monopoly of all true learning and sound Christian knowledge and faith.

If we go back to within three hundred years of the apostles, we find that no Christian society had then certainly been heard of that refused baptism to infants. Pelagius arose and preached that infants are born free from moral defilement. Augustine pressed the heretic with this question: Why are infants baptized if they have no sin? Pelagius knew not how to meet the inquiry. Then one charged his doctrine with this necessary inference that it must needs lead to the denial of infant baptism. And Pelagius, who was a good man and a learned scholar, though unsound in the faith, resented this charge as a slander, and declared indeed that he "had never heard of any, even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants." Augustine also declared that he had never heard of any such erroneous doctrine. And so we can trace the matter up through Origen and Tertullian and Irenæus and Justin Martyr to within fifty or one hundred years of the apostles' day, and can discover evidence that all these men and their contemporaries believed the institution to have come down from those who brought in the Christian dis-

pensation. And well they might believe so. For had the apostles been Baptists, they would surely have embraced the opportunity afforded them to declare plainly that children, hitherto acknowledged members of the Church, were now to be excluded from it. That was the time for such a doctrine to have been set forth, and not the middle of the seventeenth century. Had the apostles preached as our Baptist brethren do on this subject, we should have found the abolishment of the Abrahamic covenant declared somewhere in the New Testament, and Justin Martyr and Irenæus, and other early Christian writers, and all those who followed, must have known that little children were no longer to be received into the Church. But instead of this, what we hear from Paul is that Christians are all Abraham's children, and heirs of the promise made to him and to his seed to all generations; and what we hear from Peter is that "the promise is unto us and to our children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." JNO. B. ADGER.



## ARTICLE IV.

## A WORD FOR THE CLASSICS.

The extent to which a discussion may be protracted should always be commensurate with the importance of the subject discussed, and with the danger that would arise from a wrong decision. When education is the topic of debate, then it surely is not necessary to offer an apology for consuming time in endeavoring to discover the best method of obtaining the best results. Some of the highest interests of mankind are involved in this discussion, and the debate has waxed so hot and loud that the whole intellectual world is aroused, and the trustees of some of our most conservative Colleges have already been frightened by the boisterous clamor into changing the *curricula* of the institutions under their charge. By far the most mooted question in this discussion is, whether the Ancient Classics should be allowed to retain their present position in our system of education; or whether they should be removed and a substitute provided. On the one side are arrayed all those who love and value the rich legacy of the ages; on the other is a mixed multitude under a few renowned and valiant leaders. The views of the latter class have recently been presented in a very pleasing, and at the same time a very able, manner by a writer in this REVIEW; and as his article embodies most, if not all, of the seemingly valid objections to the study of the classics, we will confine ourselves to an analysis of his argument, testing his premises and looking well to his conclusions.

In the first place he assumes in the title of his article, "The Supremacy of the Ancient Classics," that the classics occupy an exalted position; that they are more highly esteemed than other branches of study; that Latin and Greek, like sceptred monarchs, look down from a lofty throne upon the Modern Languages, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics; which are all clamoring for an equal share of power. But strange to say, he does not tell us in what this "supremacy" consists; he does not even attempt to do so, except to *state* that the larger part of the college course

is devoted to the study of Latin and Greek, and this part of his discussion we will notice in its proper place.

Now this "supremacy," if possessed at all, must be bestowed by public opinion, or by the requirements of the Colleges, for these alone regulate courses of study. But public opinion does not grant this place of preëminence to the classics, nor is it given by the college course; for in all our Colleges there are courses leading up to academic degrees, which do not require Latin and Greek at all. The author admits this himself in so many words, when he says: "One may find in our institutions of learning a course of study lying almost exclusively out of the line of our standard that will furnish him all the mental culture and mental store that are necessary to give him passport into educated circles." *Ipsa judice*, it is not needful that a man should be thoroughly versed in classic lore in order to be reckoned among scholars; for the world generally is more ready to grant homage to the astronomer, who, sweeping the starry vault of heaven with his magic glass and peering into the dim vistas of space, can tell of suns and planetary systems more numerous than the sands that are upon the sea-shore, than to render honor to the pale, quiet student of ancient languages, who has spent his life in communing with the spirits of the past.

Let us not be deceived by the fair proposition of the opposers of the classics. "We do not desire," say they, "to abolish the classics, but to dethrone them and to place them on an equality with other studies." This proposition sounds plausible. It seems but right that justice should be meted out to all alike, and that the sciences, for instance, being, as it is contended, of equal importance with the classics, should be so recognised in our system of education. But this plea for justice loses its force when we remember that other courses are already on an equal footing with the classics, and that objectors are clamoring for that which they already possess. We see, then, that those who enter this plea are not really urging the claims of a weak, but worthy, plaintiff, but are aiming a deadly blow at the classics; for should any radical changes be made in our courses of study, in a few years Latin and Greek would be buried in oblivion, practically as dead as the tongues that spoke them.

Now, are the classics entitled to the position which they now hold? We answer, Yes; and will proceed to assign a few reasons for thus replying in the affirmative.

As to the purposes which education is designed to serve, all are so well agreed that it is almost unnecessary to state them here. We will do so, however, even at the risk of seeming needlessly tedious. Burke has presented the matter clearly when he says: "The elevation of the mind is the principal object of all our studies, and what does not in some measure effect this we must consider useless." Another great object of the college course should be to fit the student as much as possible for the duties of active life. And just here it may not be amiss to observe that the average graduate has really very little knowledge of any subject; he stands on the lowest round of the ladder, and his course has been chiefly valuable in so far as it has given him strength to ascend, and has fitted him to perform his duties in the world, that "stage where every man must play a part."

We agree with our author *in toto* when he says that the time for preparation is short, and the subjects which might justly claim our attention are countless. The only question is as to what studies are most worthy of attention. *He* alleges that the classics are made too prominent; *we* allege that they have nothing more than is their due. His first great objection is, that too much time is devoted to them by the average student; and in urging this objection he makes such astounding statements that but for the high source from which they come, it would not be necessary to consider them. The objection is summed up in this sentence: "We are to take into account that they (the classics) domineer over their colleagues to such an extent that it is perhaps under the truth to say that three-fourths of college life is absorbed by them." If this were the case, all would be forced to admit that some change is demanded. This would be a "supremacy" with a vengeance. Can this be true? Look at the catalogues of our first-class Colleges. They do not seem to indicate such a state of things. But we are told that we must be careful not to be guided by catalogues. Apply to the student, then. Walk into that chamber where the midnight lamp is

burning, shedding its beams out into the black night: ask the student what so long prevents him from retiring to rest; inquire what it is that causes the nervous twitching of the mouth and the restless rolling of the eye. He would not tell you that he was trying to express purpose in Latin, or that he was searching his lexicon in vain to find the end of some thread which would enable him to extricate himself from the mazy labyrinths of Ciceronian logic. Nor yet would his difficulty be to appreciate the point of some home-thrust of Horace. "Oh, no," he would say, "Latin and Greek do not give me half the trouble nor consume half the time that my other studies do. My trouble just now is to see into this example under Sturm's Theorem, and to understand this expansion of Maclaurin." Or else he might cry out in disgust, "What good will all this logic and mental philosophy do me? What difference does it make to me whether I ever find out what is the distinction between an intuition and a concept? What do I care for Aristotle's *dictum de omni et nullo*, of which so much is made here?" Or perhaps he would mourn over the hours spent in endeavoring to fathom the chemist's meaning, when he talks of "Atomicity" and the Atomic Theory. Then, too, he might complain of the difficulties which beset him when he is required to compute an eclipse, or to prove, by a dextrous manipulation of his knowledge of conic sections, the great Laws of Kepler.

But let us appeal to a few examples, and use a little of the inexorable logic of *fact*. In all our Colleges the Freshman and Sophomore years are devoted to Latin, Greek, Mathematics, and English. At the lowest possible estimate, the latter two must absorb half the time, so that in these years the classics divide time fairly with their colleagues. When it comes to the Junior and Senior years, new studies must be undertaken and the old ones partially discarded. The number of recitations in Mathematics and English is usually not lessened; consequently the classics must be thrown aside, consuming less than one-fourth of the student's time. Four years are required for the average student to take his Master's degree at the University of Virginia, and he generally finishes up Latin and Greek in one year.

This shows that the time devoted to the classics in this great representative institution amounts to about one-fourth of the whole course.

Our author has drawn a very fanciful, but well executed, picture, showing the manner in which he *supposes* the student acquires his knowledge of the other branches to which he may be obliged to direct his attention; but while we may admire the master-strokes, all can see at a glance that the picture is not true to life; that it is both overdrawn and too highly colored. We will give a rude outline: "A glance at Natural Philosophy before breakfast." If the student depends on this "glance," Optics, Acoustics, Momentum, Hydraulics, etc., are all meaningless terms to him except in so far as he can interpret them by the aid of his classical knowledge. "Moral Science between breakfast and chapel." Indeed! "Physiology between the student's room and the class-room." Why does our author not mention Mathematics and say that the knowledge of it is intuitive? "Stolen peeps into Mental Philosophy, while other members of the class are reciting." Surely to conceive such a design the author must have sorely taxed his creative imagination. No student ever passed through College with such application as this, for the above mentioned topics are not so plain and easy that he who runs may read and understand. It is not claimed, indeed, by the author that the student understands; but surely he does not mean to imply that so little is required for graduation, that such an amount of knowledge as could be obtained in the manner described would prove sufficient to entitle the student to a diploma. It must be admitted, then, from college catalogues, from the testimony of the student, from actual experience, and from the nature of the case, that the ancient classics absorb scarcely one-fourth of the boy's time, instead of the three-fourths so confidently claimed. Surely no one can object to this; no one can think this too much to be devoted to studies so beautiful in themselves, so well calculated to ennoble and elevate, and so instructive as teaching us to know the great men of the past who, though dead, still speak to us in their works, inspiring reverence in us as we regard the products of their mighty intellects, and

causing hallowed memories to cluster around the broken colonnades of fallen Athens and the scattered ruins of the "city of seven hills."

Our author's first objection evidently fails, as he has not established the very necessary premise, that the classics occupy too much of the student's time. Let us now test his second canon of criticism, and see how it bears on the subject under discussion. This canon, as stated by himself, is this: "*Ceteris paribus* that department of knowledge is to be preferred which yields the most pleasure." We will exclaim with Gratiano, "We thank thee, Shylock, for teaching us that word." The pleasure produced is usually in direct proportion to the good derived; but we must be cautious in using this test, for, wrongly applied, it will lead us into error. *Quot homines tot mentes*, is an adage trite, but on that account none the less true. The difference in the minds of men is just as marked as the difference in their bodies. The cause of this difference is twofold. It is due, first, to a natural diversity in the minds, the *habitus* of one being different from and often directly opposite to that of another; secondly, to a difference in the early training. In the first case our author's canon should have its full force. When it is apparent that a mind is especially adapted to a particular branch of study, that it is fashioned in a mould that eminently fits it for a certain department of knowledge, then this branch of study, this department of knowledge, will give most pleasure, and should, of course, engross the attention. The natural bent of the inclinations should not be changed, for in that case useful material would be wasted, nay, actually rendered worse than useless, as is the case when the attempt is made to change the course of a mighty river which for ages has been flowing on, bearing peace and prosperity upon its swelling bosom; its waters are poured—a roaring, devastating flood—upon the smiling valleys and rolling lowlands, changing them into worthless bogs, whose stagnant pools exhale a pestilential breath. Men of such a cast of mind are usually very successful, but they are nothing more than specialists, men of a single idea, who, if transferred to any other field of knowledge, would be as helpless as the untutored peasant. Such minds are

few in number, and it is well for the world that they are; for society would be in a sad condition if it were composed of men of whom a dozen would be required to make up the stature of intellectual manhood.

While we freely admit, then, that there are some minds to which special courses of study present peculiar attractions, we claim that the majority of minds, though possessing a diversity of gifts, are so similarly constituted that the same course of training is, in the main, required for their development; and we further claim that they will find equal pleasure in all the factors which make up this course of training. There are only two disturbing causes which can bring about a different result. The first is this: owing to early training, one power of the mind may have outstripped the others and been made more powerful by constant exercise. The second, in a measure growing out of the first, is, that it is a law of our nature to take most pleasure in the study in which we feel ourselves most proficient. Considering the last of these first, we may be justified in asserting that the classics give to the ordinary student at least as much pleasure as any other course gives; for the pupil usually finds himself making better progress in his classical studies than in the others, and feeling this, he looks upon them with a kind of affection, as very pleasant helps in time of collegiate trouble. The reason for this progress is not, as our author supposes, because so much time is devoted to Latin and Greek, but because the rules and words are constantly recurring and kept fresh before the mind, so that it is possible to make advances in these studies even without having mastered every little detail; whereas in mathematics, for instance, every principle must be thoroughly digested, every fortress and stronghold must be taken and garrisoned, or the student will soon become enveloped in darkness, in which forward strides are impossible.

Now, as to the first mentioned disturbing cause. On account of early associations, the mind may have become accustomed to acting in those directions which would prevent it from deriving pleasure from classical study. Should such study on that account be neglected? We answer, No. This lack of pleasure is

VOL. XXXV., NO. 3—6.

a sure evidence that the distasteful study calls into action faculties which have been comparatively unused, and are consequently in a weak or slumbering condition. We claim that they should be aroused to action; for the object of collegiate study is to awaken and bring into exercise all the powers of the mind, and to develop them side by side, to stimulate those hitherto dormant and to repress in a measure those unduly matured. He who has his faculties most evenly balanced, each growing naturally and none overshadowing the others, he it is who has most nearly approached the ideal of a perfect man; and in so far as this beautiful symmetry is not produced, precisely to that extent has education failed. Do not banish the classics, then, because a few students do not take pleasure in them; for the prosecution of these studies may be of great service to those few, and if not, the majority, at least, will always find unfailing pleasure in the magnificent literature of Greece and of Rome. This must be true from the nature of the case; for who would not prefer to peruse the splendid epics of Homer, or to laugh with the genial Horace, than to pore over the *Principia* of Newton, or to follow out the labored proof of the Theorem of Lagrange, vainly endeavoring to find out the meaning of the first, second, and third differential? Will it not give us more pleasure to follow Herodotus, him "who has written something better than the best history," through the misty gloom of the remote past, enchanted by the child-like simplicity of his style, and almost holding our breath till he reaches the end of some interesting anecdote, than to commit to memory the history, preparations, and properties of chlorine, the modifications of sulphur, the graphic formula of potassic aluminic sulphate, and a host of other things no more interesting but no less important to him who aspires to the understanding of the first principles of chemical science? And surely it is not more agreeable to engage our attention with "profound metaphysical disquisitions of philosophical principles," or to puzzle our heads over the old fallacy of the "tortoise and the hare," than it is to enjoy those most pleasing of all pleasures, the pleasures which the imagination bestows, which we must feel when the chords of our inmost souls vibrate back a response to the notes struck



by that bard of Mantua "whose spirit still in the world endures and shall endure—long lasting as the world."

Having now endeavored to show that, *ceteris paribus*, the classics do not consume too much time, and that they afford as much pleasure as other studies, we must inquire what mental discipline and useful knowledge is gained by classical study? for after all, if the student has not received a *quid pro quo*, his time has been misspent and his labor has been wasted. It is objected by our author that "the faculty chiefly called into exercise is memory; and its work is purely mechanical," that "there is no room for the exercise of the reasoning faculty and the imagination in the study of the dead languages." If this is true, we are forced to give up the case. If it be true that no place is found for the exercise of any faculty save the circumstantial memory which would enable us to keep at our tongue's end the Latin accusatives in *im*, then the work of disinterring the dry bones of Latin and of Greek should at once be discontinued, and we would say of them, "*requiescant in pace*;" for, while such a memory is very useful, we cannot afford to devote time to studies which develop a small part of a single power. Those who raise such objections and make such statements, though they do *claim* that they are not hostile to the classics, are really, as we have said before, deadly enemies, and were it not that the splendid literature of Greece and Rome stands invulnerable, clad in the plated armor of its own excellence and merit, it would long ago have fallen a victim to such insidious attacks. Our author, following Macaulay and other objectors, feels that the burden of proof rests upon him, and has accordingly endeavored to make out his case. He reasons thus (we quote his words): "The great business is to store the mind with a vocabulary of words and a lot of rules." "Nothing is more arbitrary than the structure of language, and hence there is little scope for the exercise of the reasoning powers and the acquisition of new ideas is too tedious to afford pleasure." Assume these premises, and the conclusion must follow. But whence are obtained these remarkable premises? Surely they have been assumed without proof. And yet they must be proved, for no defender of the classics will admit

that the great business is to *cram* rules and words; indeed he would lift up his voice in pious indignation and his hands in holy horror to hear such a work pronounced his highest aim. "The structure of language arbitrary!" What philologist admits that of any language, save, possibly, of the English? We cannot allow such reasoning to pass unchallenged; these foundation statements must be proved, *not assumed*, to be true. Not contenting ourselves with the simple statement, we will now try to prove that many powers are called into exercise, nay, into vigorous exercise, gaining strength in so far as used, growing more useful, and becoming more capable of still greater development.

The faculties of the mind by which we become conversant with outside objects are, speaking generally, the perceptive, the representative, and the reasoning faculties. These, though developed side by side, do not reach maturity at the same time. Sense perception is first used and first matured, next memory and imagination, and last of all the reason. Now it is claimed—and we hope we may be pardoned for repeating this objection so often, for its mere statement is its best refutation—that only one sort of memory is educated by classical study; and that in such study the improvement of the other great powers is overlooked and disregarded. In considering the representative faculty, as our author has been so liberal as to grant that the "mechanical memory" is much used, we will be saved the trouble of proving that proposition. But why is the advantage derived limited to the memory of facts? Surely recollection (as distinguished from memory), the memory of relations, is also cultivated, and the imagination can find no more spacious field for its exercise than among the extant remains of departed greatness. Especially is this true of the creative imagination; for in this faculty the Greeks were far our superiors. Novel ideas were what they sought, and their writings are studded with wild creations of the fancy. In Greek and Latin poetry there is material enough to occupy the most active imagination. What more could be desired in this respect than is furnished by the superb similes and metaphors of Homer? The aspiration of the soul after beauty is gratified, and as we read his portrayal of nature in every phase,

his bursts of pathos, or his graphic descriptions, all couched in rhythm of mellifluous flow and wonderful adaptation, we feel ourselves elevated and are glad to ascribe to him the honor of being the author of the greatest epic in any language. But it may be objected that while this is sometimes the result of classical study, it is the exception, and not the rule; that, while great and varied good does accrue, it is only an occasional occurrence. Very well. The objection, if admitted, implies that the classics have a tendency to produce the good result, and if they possess this tendency in as great a degree as other studies, and if they present as wide a field for the exercise of imagination and the philosophical memory as their colleagues in a college course, should we stop studying them because in every case the full advantage is not reaped? From the nature of the case we think we are justified in claiming that these faculties are cultivated in this line of study as much as in any other, and that if the imagination is not cultivated amid such rich gems of genius as are the works of Homer, nor yet amid the wild rantings of Æschylus and the majestic beat of Virgil's hexameter, it will never be cultivated at all.

Next, as to the reasoning faculty. Whatever the products may be, the processes are analysis and synthesis, breaking apart and putting together. Both of these are used in every Latin or Greek sentence with regard to three things: first, the words considered separately; second, the words as combined into the sentence; and, third, as to the meaning of the whole connected passage. With regard to each word the student must, if the word is not a familiar one, read over the meanings given in his lexicon, and taking each meaning separately, by a course of reasoning, he determines what meaning best suits his purpose, and chooses that as the proper reading. Does he not discriminate and exclude? And in the processes of discrimination and exclusion is not the reasoning faculty active? Again, if he decides to use not the primary but some derived signification of the word, he must see why and how this secondary meaning springs out of or is developed from the primary; and in determining the *why's* and *how's* the reason must come into play. If he works out this problem himself, so much the better; but if he does not,

and his lexicon is a good one, the successive steps are marked out for him, and it is required of him to use his understanding in order to grasp the work of others and to follow up and test their reasoning. But, furthermore, if the word is a compound, the student may at first try to commit it to memory as a whole, but he soon finds it easier to reason out the meaning of the compound from the meanings of the components, by weighing their mutual influence on each other. Examples of this might be multiplied, but as we presume the point is sufficiently clear, we will not adduce them.

With regard to words, considered as parts of sentences, very much the same process must be used. The words are mutually interdependent, and in determining the nature of this interdependence, it will not do to say that all that is needed is to have the head packed full of etymological and syntactical rules, for it is often hard, even with a knowledge of the grammar involved, to decide upon the proper rendering, as is proved by the diversity of opinion respecting many passages. And, of course, the student must be able to clear up the difficulty for himself, or to weigh the arguments of others so as to come to a satisfactory conclusion; and as he often cannot know what others have said about the matter, he is forced to hew out his own track. This requires original thinking of the highest order. But even after the student has mastered the separate words and thoroughly understands the relation of each to every other in the sentence, his task is not finished. He must discover what is the bearing of this particular sentence on the general train of thought, how it is connected with what goes before and what follows after. Here he must be ready to examine the general and the particular, as he must keep before his mind the general scope, and must look to the minute things, such as connectives and the like, which are all-important in determining the sense to be conveyed. Is it true, then, that "it is a very feeble intellect that cannot perform the logical process of putting the sentence into such shape as to extract its meaning"? But we hear an objector cry out: "True; this, all this, should be done; but the average student leaves undone those things which he ought to do." This may be true, but

we do not claim that these processes of reasoning are always used as much as would be best for the advancement of the student and for the growth of his mind. But we do claim that they enter very largely into classical study. In proof of this it is only necessary to hear a group of students reading over their Latin and Greek. We constantly hear such queries as these: "What is the sense in that?" "What does that sentence mean?" "What is its connexion with what has gone before?" and seldom will they proceed with the translation until one or other of them has offered an explanation which seems satisfactory to all. Every teacher also can testify that his pupils reason, and reason clearly too, over their lessons in ancient languages. However young they may be, the teacher finds them anxious to keep up the connexion, to follow the train of thought. He sometimes finds them not willing to take the rules of the grammar "on faith," but they desire to know *why dignus* takes the ablative case or *ut* final the subjunctive mood.

Again, the careful student will develop his power of observation, inasmuch as he must come to the study of the language ignorant and prepared to be instructed, and as he goes along he must make his own grammar by carefully observing the facts of the language, noting the points in which it resembles his own, or in which it differs from his mother tongue. He studies the book of language as the scientist studies the book of nature. He sees in one place, to use an illustration, that purpose in Latin is *not* expressed by the infinitive, but by some other term; and after his attention has been directed to this point several times, he generalises, and reasoning from particulars to generals by unerring methods of inductive logic, he arrives at the conclusion that "purpose cannot, in Latin prose, be expressed by the infinitive." Or else, he may first learn the facts from his grammar and by processes of deduction apply his general rules to particular instances. All this involves a use and a consequent cultivation of the observing faculty, to cognise the particular cases; and of the reason, to note resemblances and to spy out differences. Thus it is evident that the imagination and reason are brought into exercise. The imagination is furnished with material unlimited as it

is varied, and from it springs much pleasure and consequent interest. The reason finds ample room for its exercise both in the thought of the original, and in the language by which that thought is conveyed.

While it may be true that a man's capacity to learn the ancient languages should not be the criterion of his mental ability, yet it is certain that the men who have attained eminence in the field of classical study have always possessed well cultivated minds, brightly polished in all parts; and as more men have become eminent in this field than in any other, we must conclude that the good result springs from the efficiency of the means employed. As a means for expanding the mind, then, the ancient languages are preëminent.

Does any practical good accrue, further than the strengthening of natural powers? Before discussing this question, we will repeat what has already been insisted upon, that a college graduate at best is by no means a walking encyclopædia of universal knowledge; that his researches in any direction have been neither far-reaching nor comprehensive. Leave out the Latin and Greek, and what would be the result? The field of research would be much narrowed, and the knowledge acquired in the remaining courses would not be correspondingly increased. But suppose it were. The student would, perhaps, know a little more chemistry, a little more natural philosophy, a few more facts in history, and a little more of English literature. Would this addition to his store compensate for the loss he has sustained in not studying the languages of by-gone ages? We think not. This addition would be spread over a large surface, and, to make the best of it, would be very small. His extra supply of chemistry would not be sufficient to enable him to rank among chemists. His additional charge of natural philosophy would not render him competent to unlock Nature's vast treasure house and to lay bare the treasures therein concealed. No; to attain proficiency in these branches a life-time of careful labor and constant devotion is required, and even then the most celebrated feels that the half has not been revealed to him. With the ancient languages this is not the case; for a man may lead an active, stirring life, and

yet draw deep draughts of pleasure from the living fountains of Latin and Greek literature. Examples abound, but a notable instance is Mr. Gladstone; who, with the weight of the mightiest kingdom of the globe on his shoulders, yet ranks with the best as a classical scholar. It thus appears that if the student were freed from this great classical bugbear, he would be, as far as his actual knowledge is concerned, no better fitted for the duties of life, would be without the mental training to be derived from the study of the classics, would not possess the knowledge obtainable from them, and would be for ever cut off from this knowledge and from the outcoming pleasure. Our college graduates know little, they know probably more Latin and Greek than anything else; but away with the notion that if Latin and Greek could be taken out of the course the colleges would turn out full-fledged scientists, astronomers, and English scholars, all in one! This result is not now obtained, it is true; but the classics must not be required to bear the blame; it should be laid to the charge of the finiteness of the human mind.

But let us return to our question: Is any good to be obtained from a classical education, and, if so, what is the value of the acquisition? All admit that the possible value is great, and that the actual value is measured by the degree of excellence attained. Now, this rule must hold good for all studies. But the proficiency is generally greater in Latin and Greek than in the other courses. Then the good accruing must be greater.

The saying is familiar, that "the proper study of mankind is man." Whatever interpretation may be imposed upon this adage, it may be fairly supposed to mean that humanity in the aggregate is the most suitable object of human contemplation; not only the most improving and interesting, though this is manifestly true, but also the most practical and productive of everyday good. The men of to-day may be studied as we go in and out among them; the book is open, and he who chooses may read therein. The men of the past are gone; the places that knew them once know them no more; they sleep with their fathers, and the only means we have of knowing them is to study their works which have been handed down to us through the ages,

monuments more lasting than marble slab or shaft of granite. The men by the future, who can know? Life is like a huge kaleidoscope, and in it the forces and actors will constantly assume new and fantastic positions. And yet history repeats itself, and as was said by the matchless orator of the Revolution, "There is no way of interpreting the future but by the past." Let us, then, resurrect the departed great, that even though clad in the cerements of the tomb, they may act as expounders of what has gone before, and as, in a measure, foretellers of what is to come. We will gain much if we can only understand the language of their message, and in the mere study of this language much good may be obtained. In considering these points we can but reproduce what has been often said already, and we will attempt to do so briefly, a lengthy discussion being unnecessary after all that has been said by Matthew Arnold, Prof. Gildersleeve, and a host of other valiant champions of the classics, who have not entered the lists, as some have said, because they were "contending for their altars and their firesides," but because they recognise how important the dead languages are as a means of mental training. We should give them our attention, as we are sure they know whereof they speak, and furnish living examples of the beneficial results of classical study. The study of Latin and Greek is useful, as it is the study of language as language, a study which leads to a fuller understanding and a clearer knowledge of our own. Language is necessary to clear thinking, and its object is to convey thought clearly, concisely, and forcibly. While it is true, as Burke has said, that a clear thought is synonymous with a little thought, it is none the less true that without clear expression the thought will not be clear. It must be so. We think in words; and if we have not words to convey to ourselves our exact meaning, the thought will grow more and more obscure, and the obscurity will increase when we attempt to crystallise the thought into expression, and to make it visible to others. Linguistic study, then, is eminently important and useful in itself. From what source can a knowledge of language be obtained so well as from the great head-springs of classic literature? Where will we find better models of terseness than in the writ-



ings of Tacitus; where more close and pungent reasoning than in the great work of Thucydides? Do we look for thought decked with all the embellishments of the rhetorician? We can find it nowhere more beautifully expressed than in the magnificently rounded periods of Cicero.

How do the ancient languages help us in mastering our own, and how are they superior to the modern languages in this respect? It is claimed by many that the best way to learn English is to study English. But every one must admit that students manifest more interest in everything else than they do in the study of their mother tongue; and that the knowledge derived from English grammars amounts to almost nothing. The causes for this may be many. It may be due to the fact that the average pupil comes to the study of English with the idea that he can speak and write the language as correctly as his teacher, and confident that as far as practical good is concerned, the text book will be to him of but little service; or else the reason may be that English, as has been asserted, and in a good measure proved by Richard Grant White, is, in reality, a "grammarless tongue," of which a knowledge cannot be gained by studying the rules of etymology and syntax. However this may be, it is certain that if English is to be mastered at all, the study must be pursued in a different manner. Only two courses lie open to the student. The one is to apply himself to the languages from which the English has sprung, thus laying a broad foundation on which to build; the other is to confine himself to the English literature of to-day. We claim that the first course is preferable, first, as it produces better mental training, and, secondly, as it gives a more thorough knowledge of the English. The training is better because we get the benefit of comparative grammar, the value of which study, as a means of intellectual culture, can hardly be overestimated, though it is by no means the chief and only good to be derived. In Latin and Greek we study both words and ideas; in reading English our minds are occupied with the thought to the exclusion of the words, except in that species of composition in which we are carried away by the show of rhetoric, and being engrossed with the vehicle, entirely overlook the thing conveyed.

At any rate, we rarely find a polished English scholar, skilled in the use of words, who has become so simply from a study of the literature of the language as it now stands. The Professors of English in our Colleges see this and tell us we must go back to the mother and grandmother of English, and must study the Anglo-Saxon and the Gothic. But why stop there? When we wish to trace the genealogy of a man, we do not stop when we have found out who his grandmother was, and who was his mother. Is the language of the English people to have so short a pedigree? Are we only to trouble ourselves to see that it is legitimately descended from mother Anglo-Saxon? No. English is a language of motley composition, and is a branch deriving much of its sap from the gnarled roots and twisted trunk of the ancient classics. We suppose it is not exaggerating the truth to say that nearly half the words of our language are derived from these ancient tongues. Surely, then, the reason for studying them is just as urgent as that for studying the immediate progenitors, and the reason is enhanced when we remember how far superior the literature of the former is to that of the latter.

The question is asked, "Why should we not study the modern rather than the ancient languages?" In view of what has been said, this question may be answered in a few words. The ancient languages are the head-springs of English; the modern are parallel streams flowing partly from the same fountain; from which we do not and cannot learn so much of our own language as we can by going at once at the common source.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not, of course, wish to undervalue the importance of English studies. They should enter largely into our courses of study. But what we do assert is, that the good derived from classical study and from the reading which an ordinary man does any way, is greater than the advantage of what is known as a liberal English education. But not only is the student's theoretical knowledge of the English increased, but his practical proficiency, as has been already stated, is also much augmented. This will not be the case if he is allowed to translate into "slovenly English," as our author takes for granted is the method usually adopted. He seems to think

that every student is like the Irish boy who, in reading Virgil's account of Æneas's hunt in the fourth book of *Æneid*, translated the line, "At puer Ascanius mediis in vallibus acri gaudet equo," etc., "But the boy Ascanius on a bitter horse," etc. Such translations would, of course, be of but small value; but if the teacher is careful to make the student choose his words and render the passage so as to bring out the ideas in smooth and easy English, every lesson will be a sort of composition exercise of a kind especially adapted to the wants of a boy. The ideas are ready-made for him, and it is his duty to search them out and to couch them, after having determined the precise meaning of the various Latin or Greek words, in expressions calculated to convey the exact sense in pleasing English. If this is done, the mental growth is rapid, and the English speedily mastered.

But again. We learn the habits and modes of living and thinking of great nations. We can trace the gropings of the mind after truth, and the gradual development intellectually, politically, socially. We can see why governments arose, and can discover the reasons for their decline and fall. It is interesting to see how near the truth the ancients sometimes came on questions of religion—so near and yet so far. Infidelity boasts that by force of unaided reason it has found a sufficient explanation for the existence of a universe in a system of evolution, and it points to this as the highest achievement of the human mind, and as a proof of the intellectual superiority of the nineteenth century. But away back in the misty past we find the evolutionists Anaximander, Anaximenes, and Heraclitus putting forward the same impious doctrines as the evolutionists of to-day, and we also see these doctrines supplanted by the theory of Anaxagoras, which was that Supreme Intelligence had imparted form and order to the chaos of nature. We do not feel that these men of whom we read are far removed from us in space and time, but we feel that we know them, that they are real personages who lived and spoke and acted. We think of these ancient worthies with a feeling that is akin to affection; there is a remembrance of the dead to which we turn even from the charms of the living. They have made an impression deep and lasting; they have said much that

modern thought has appropriated to itself; to them we owe what we know of the past. Let honor be rendered to whom honor is due, and let us continue to learn of the mighty men of by-gone days, "whose distant footsteps echo down the corridors of time."

We have now endeavored to show that the time spent in the study of the classics is not so long, and that the pleasure derived is not so small, as to justify the claim that these studies should be made to take a subordinate place. Not thinking the concessions of the opposite side liberal enough, we have claimed more, and have seen that the various powers of the mind *are* developed to a great extent. We now turn upon the objectors with the question, "What will you give us in return if you take from us the ancient languages?" We have never heard any substitute definitely proposed, but what this substitute shall be must be determined by the other side. We have now a course of study which answers the purpose of education very well, and we will not give it up without knowing what is to take its place. Are the Natural Sciences to be substituted? To become proficient in these one must make them the study of his life, and the graduate would know but little more of them if the classics were dropped from college catalogues. Then it will not do to substitute these. But English Literature may be triumphantly brought forward as an aspiring candidate for the distinction of supplanting the ancient tongues. Would we really in that way learn more of our own language? No. The anatomist must not only study the living • body in all its freshness and beauty and strength; he must also study the dead subject, the bony skeleton. So the student of English must look to the Latin and the Greek, upon which the living language depends for whatever of symmetry it may possess. As well try to persuade us that we can obtain a complete knowledge of a spacious portico by studying the architrave, the frieze, and the cornice, without observing the Doric or Corinthian columns by which these are supported, as to try to make us believe that we can know English thoroughly without studying Latin and Greek, the two pillars which, like the pillars of Dagon's temple, uphold the whole superstructure.

Latin and Greek, then, deserve the position which they now

occupy by virtue of the pleasure which they bestow, the mental training which they give, the knowledge of English which is gained from them, and the acquaintance with the ancients which from this source alone can be acquired.

We are not prepared to assail our author's position on the subject of ministerial qualifications. His argument is able, as indeed is the whole article. He arrives at his conclusion by a separate line of argument, not depending for its validity upon the conclusion of the preceding portion of his reasoning; he nowhere states that any course will give a man *better* preparation for the ministry than a classical course; but only contends that the standard should be changed to suit the changed system of education. We feel ourselves, therefore, inclined to endorse his statements in the main, and certainly will not place ourselves in a position of opposition. But before such a momentous issue is decided, before such decisive action is taken, the matter should receive very careful consideration. The proposed change may be necessary, but it should be cautiously made.

WM. H. WHITING, JR.

## ARTICLE V.

## "EVOLUTIONARY ETHICS AND CHRISTIANITY."

The article with the above title, in the *Contemporary Review*, from the pen of Professor Goldwin Smith, cannot fail to strike every thoughtful reader as one of the many indications that the theory of Evolution is loosening its grasp on the minds of students of physical science. Professor Smith evidently feels that any theory with so broad a sweep as that of Evolution, touching as it does the whole sphere of man's knowledge and relations, cannot, if true, be repugnant to any part of his nature. If it be true, it must not only fit all the facts of his physical nature, and of the world of matter around him; but, also, must not fail to harmonise with all the facts of his moral and religious nature. Those who hold the theory of Evolution feel this. Evidences of this are seen in the great efforts which have been put forth to construct a system of ethics founded on the principles of this theory, and the somewhat ridiculous performances in the line of public religious services. It is an effort of the former sort that has called forth Professor Smith's article—that article being a review of Mr. Leslie Stephen's "Science of Ethics." About two years ago Professor Smith published a very able article in the *Contemporary Review* on the question, Has Evolution yet found a new "Basis of Morality"? His very decided opinion was that it had not done so up to that time, and his late article shows that he thinks no nearer approach has been made to success by later efforts. After noticing some admissions which Mr. Stephen made in his treatise, he says, "The inference which I (though not Mr. Stephen) should draw from these frank avowals is, that it is impossible to construct a rule of individual conduct, or for the direction of life, by mere inspection of the phenomena of Evolution, without some conception of the estate and destiny of man. In what hands are we—in those of a Father, in those of a power indifferent to the welfare of humanity, or in those of a blind Fate? is a question which, let the devotees of physical science, in the intoxicating rush of physical discovery, say or imagine what they

will, must surely have the most abiding as well as the highest interest for man. The ship of life is not, nor is it likely ever to be, made so comfortable that the passengers will be content to float along in it without asking for what port they are bound." Again, he asks, "Can the question of our destiny be prevented from forcing itself upon our minds? If it cannot, is it possible, without a satisfactory solution of that question, to attain the happiness to which it must be the aim of any science or system concerned with human action to light mankind? . . . Can a man when he buries his wife or child shut out of his mind the idea of death? Even the enjoyments in which the thought of annihilation is to be drowned, the more intellectual they become, bring, mingled with their sweetness, more of the bitterness which springs from a sense of perishableness and imperfection, so that the advance of civilisation is likely itself to defeat the counsels of the philosophy which bids us fix our minds on life and not on death. The highest of our joys is affection; and the more intense affection becomes, the more bitter will be the reflection that if this world is all, love must die."

Some of the "frank avowals" of Mr. Stephen's book are the following: "There is no absolute coincidence between virtue and happiness. I cannot prove that it is always prudent to act rightly, or that it is always happiest to be virtuous." "The virtuous men may be the very salt of the earth, and yet the discharge of a function socially necessary may involve their own misery."

"Now if, according to Evolution, man has no God, and no future existence, what is there to enable him to be virtuous in those cases where it brings him only suffering and danger?" "We may doubt," says Professor Smith, "in his opinion, whether it answers to be a moral hero." The endeavor to supply, by the theory of altruism, the "Basis of Morality" here found lacking, is next examined. He likewise weighs this in the balances, and finds it wanting. "But is it possible to believe in the existence of pure altruism, that sort of altruism which alone can render martyrdom reasonable, as Mr. Stephen affirms it to be? Can my pleasure ever be really your pleasure, or my pain your pain? Is not this as impossible as that my thoughts or emotions should be yours? Social

VOL. XXXV., NO. 3—7.

pleasure, of course, we can understand; a Christmas dinner-party is a familiar instance of it; but while all the members of the company contribute to the sum of the enjoyment, and the cheerfulness is reciprocal, the pleasure of each member is as much his own, and not that of any other member, as is the pleasure of an Alexander Selkirk eating his solitary meal on the desert island."

Those who adopt the altruistic theory must be hard pressed indeed. It bears its absurdity on its face, for the very moment it becomes possible, virtue is *ipso facto* rendered impossible. To be operative as a motive, it must be perfect. But when it becomes perfect, individuality has been merged in the "social tissue," and lost. As every virtuous act is the act of an individual, dependent for its moral coloring on his relationships, it will be readily seen, that when the thorough altruist has (according to this impossible theory) lost his individuality, his act is no longer that of a person, but the performance of a painful function by a cell of the "tissue" of humanity. *Sic itur ad absurdum.*

Let Evolution produce at least a few missionaries and martyrs before it begins to boast of its disinterestedness and self-sacrifice, while scornfully branding Christianity a selfish system.

Some few evolutionists have endeavored to supply a motive power for virtue and self-sacrifice by dreaming of a "Social Utopia" in the future through the working of Evolution. Of this Prof. Smith remarks: "If the coming of the Utopia could be certainly predicted, this would still be cold comfort to the shades of the myriads who had lived and died, and are now living and dying, in a state very far from Utopian." But Mr. Stephen gives this up. "Speculations," he says, "about the future of society, are rash." "We cannot tell that progress will be indefinite; it seems rather that science points to a time at which all life on the planet will become extinct, and the social organism may, according to the familiar analogy, have its natural old age and death."

Thus it would seem that Evolution furnishes no "Basis of Morality."

In considering the theory of such evolutionists as Spencer, Clifford, and Stephen himself—that Evolution after attaining



"the highest arc of the curve," must begin to make its descent— Prof. Smith concludes, "In the down-hill stage of Evolution, that action will be best which most conduces to the dissolution of society. From this conclusion I see no escape; and when we add to it the doctrine of necessity under the new name of determinism, the principle of morality will surely become difficult of expression to ordinary minds." That evolution is non-moral, some of its bold German hierophants at all events do, to use Bacon's quaint phrase, "ingeniously, and without fig-leaves confess." But Evolution is, in the contemplation of agnostic science, the supreme power of the universe, or at least the sole manifestation of that power. What footing, then, at bottom, has morality? May it not be destined to disappear before the advancing light of science like animism and other superstitions? May not those prove to be right who, with Dr. Van Buren Denslow, say that the commandment against stealing or lying is the law of the "top dog," and nothing more? When the belief that Evolution is all, and that Evolution brings forth but to destroy in the end, has thoroughly penetrated the human mind, will not the result be a moral chaos? We are still living in the twilight of religion, and the grim features of Evolution are not yet distinctly seen.

But it is time for us to turn from this futile search in a very barren field to one where we may hope for a reward of our labors. Christianity has been the object of much scorn of late years among those who have held the theory of Evolution. As a result, many of our popular writers, following the lead of scientific men, seem to have taken pains, on whatever subject they may have been engaged, to let it be known that *they* were not believers in Christianity. Orthodoxy has seemed to them more horrible than any "Gorgons or chimeras dire" that ever devastated the earth. Especially has this tone been observed in the utterances of what may be called the small fry, who in shoals follow a few scientific great whales who set the fashion to "swagger and bully." It would seem that to many of these the charge of being orthodox Christians would be more terrible than an imputation on their honesty, if we are to judge from the care they

take to let us know that they are nothing of the kind. It has been a sad thing of late years for any one who loves Christ to read some of our most popular magazines, and see how Christianity is either utterly ignored or made the subject of sneers.

Prof. Smith evidently has not entirely escaped this infection. He is likewise careful to inform us that he is not an orthodox Christian. In reply to a criticism of his article on "The Basis of Morality," by Herbert Spencer, he says: "If Mr. Spencer fancies that I am one of his orthodox persecutors, supposing such enemies of truth and beneficence to exist, he was never more mistaken in his life. I am no more orthodox than he is, though I should think it scarcely worthy of philosophy to court sympathy by ostentation of the heterodoxy which happens to be just now in vogue."

This utterance may have proceeded from a nervous dread of being regarded as a "Philistine" by his brother scientists; but, whatever its motive, it is certainly plain enough to assure us that he is not an interested witness, with all his prejudices in favor of Christianity. Let us see what he thinks of it as compared with Evolution. Of course his point of view is the same as that from which he examined Evolution—its fitness to meet the wants of man as a moral being.

The prime necessity in any system intended to elevate mankind morally is a moral ideal. This ideal may be only described or presented in the system through the rules for conduct which it lays down, or it may be practically set forth in the person and character of an individual who exemplifies its principles in his life. As mankind are naturally imitative, and generally prefer the concrete to the abstract, it will be readily seen that the system which presents such an exemplar, especially if it also furnishes directions for following the example set, and the hope that each individual will be enabled to attain the goal placed before him, has a great advantage.

How does Christianity, according to Prof. Smith, meet this demand? "To realise, by effort, a moral ideal embodied in the character of Christ has been, since his coming, the avowed object, and in no small degree the real endeavor, of the whole progressive portion

of humanity. The established belief has been that the ideal was perfect; that in proportion as it was realised, human nature, individually and collectively, would be raised and made like the Author of our being; that the world would thus become the kingdom of God; and that the spiritual society so formed would survive the physical catastrophe of the planet. This belief, so far as it extended and was operative, has hitherto been the practical basis of Christian ethics, and, whether true or false, has furnished a definite rule and aim, personal and social, of those who held it."

Thus he shows that Christianity does most fully meet this requirement.

Again, no system of religion or morals can exercise a good and lasting influence if it has in it those qualities which oppose human progress. Hope is the mainspring of human energy, and any system which ignores it must become impotent. This is true of most, if not all, heathen religions. Their Golden Age is in the past; their faces are turned backward, not forward. Christianity, while indeed placing her feet on the foundation of covenants and promises made in the past, lifts her head in joyous hope, her features radiant with the glory of a future such as "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard"—such even as "hath not entered into the heart of man."

Each individual Christian, looking to this future, can say: "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is."

What effect has Christianity had on human progress? Hear Prof. Smith on this point:

"Progress, as was said before, is conterminous with Christendom. Outside the pale of Christendom all is stationary. There have been notable outbursts of material wealth and splendor, transient flashes even of intellectual brilliancy, as in the Caliphates and the Mogul Empire, though the light in these cases was mainly borrowed; real and sustained progress there has been none. Japan, to whatever she may be destined to come, has kindled her new civilisation with a coal taken from the Christian hearth."

After referring to the progress of Greece and Rome, which the event has shown was transitory, and, as he says, "carried in it from the first its own moral death warrant," Prof. Smith concludes this part of his subject with the following profound observation: "What makes the fact more notable is, that Christ appeared, not in the line of such material, intellectual, or political progress as there was, but out of that line, in a province of the Roman Empire which was materially poor, as the gospel narrative shows us, intellectually backward, and as a dependency devoid of political life."

A moral system, to be practically effective, must of course aim at universality, and must, in its principles and institutions, be suited not to one tribe or nation only, but to all mankind everywhere and at all times. It must be, in the true sense, catholic. How does Christianity fulfil this requirement?

Says he: "Philosophers speak of four universal religions—Christianity, Judaism, Mahometanism, and Buddhism. There is only one. No religion but Christianity has attempted to preach its gospel to the world. Mahometan or Buddhist missionaries at London or New York! Mahometanism and Buddhism are more than tribal, perhaps, but they are far less than universal. Mahometanism is military, as its Koran most plainly avows; in conquest it lives; with conquest it decays; it also practically belongs to the despotic, polygamic, slave-holding East; it has never been the religion of a Western race, or of a free and industrial community; by arms it has been propagated, and by local influence and contagion, not by missions. Buddhism, if it is really a religion, and not merely a quietist philosophy, engendered of languor and helpless suffering, is the religion of a climate and a race; its boasted myriads are inclosed within a ring-fence, and it may have a prospect of becoming universal when an Englishman becomes a Hindoo; while in its heart Hindoos are becoming Christians."

"Wonderful treasures of spiritual lore were supposed to be hidden in the sacred books of the East. Thanks to the University of Oxford and Professor Max Müller, they have now been opened, and after a perusal of the long series, I confess my profane reflec-

tion was that there had been no such literary revelation since Monkbarns constrained Hector McIntyre, with much hesitancy, to give him a specimen of an Ossianic lay."

"Social and legal antiquities of the highest interest doubtless there are in these books; much, too, of the poetry of primitive nature worship; but of anything spiritual, universal, moral, hardly a trace." "Sinful men are, he who sleeps at sunrise or at sunset, he who has deformed nails or black teeth, he whose younger brother was married first, he who married before his elder brother, the husband of a younger sister married before the elder, the husband of an elder sister whose younger sister was married first, he who extinguishes the sacred fires, and he who forgets the Veda through neglect of the daily recitation." "This is about the religious level; much grosser specimens might be cited; and the consecration of caste is the perpetuation of iniquity. There is but one universal religion. There is but one religion of which Renan could say, as he says in his passage on the words of Christ at the well, that if there were religion in another planet, it could be none other than this."

The changes which Christianity wrought, which have been both means for attaining its success, and, indeed, parts of that success, are next briefly mentioned; among these are:

1. The abolition of tribalism, and the proclamation of the brotherhood of men without distinction of race, "the transition being marked by the substitution of baptism for the tribal mark of circumcision."

2. The proclamation of "hope for the future of humanity."

3. The division of the "things of Cæsar from the things of God."

4. The proclamation of the "spiritual equality of all men and of the two sexes," the consequence of the latter being "the institution, in place of the marital despotism which prevailed in early, or concubinage which prevailed in later, Rome, of that real union, which without subverting the headship indispensable to the unity of the family, blends two lives into one higher than either, and has been the mainstay of private virtue and of moral civilisation from that hour to this."

5. "The enunciation of the principle that morality is internal, that the true law is not *Do this*, but *Be this*, that the commandment ought to be directed not against killing, but against hatred, not against adultery, but against lust."•

6. The establishment of liberty of opinion. Of this he says, among other things, "It was the principle of the early Christians, nor did it cease to be so, I apprehend, for half a century after the union of the Church with the Empire."

After adverting to the objection drawn from persecutions of Romanism, he says, "There can be no doubt that, after the recovery of the gospel at the Reformation, intolerance gradually departed and tolerance returned, though nothing comes with a bound."

His conclusion from these facts is: "A scientific hypothesis is verified by comparison with facts. A moral ideal is verified by practical experience, individual and social. Each inquirer must judge for himself whether the characters and lives of the best Christians, those who have most distinctly formed themselves on the gospel model; the state of the communities in which the ethical mode of the gospel has most prevailed; and the general advance of society under the influence of Christianity, have not been such as to render it credible that the Christian ideal is the true ideal, that it fits the facts and meets the requirements of man's estate; that the attempt to realise it is the right line of progress for us individually and for mankind at large. This is the main question, the question by the answer to which it is to be determined whether we shall adhere to Christianity or look for some other guide of our moral life."

Space and time will not allow us to follow Professor Smith in his discussion of the objections which evolutionists have brought against Christianity as a moral system. We can do little more than mention them. The first charge is that it is *anti-scientific*. His reply to this is that "In Monotheism there can be nothing at variance with the conception or the study of general law;" that miracle, "instead of denying, assumes the general law, and Newton was a firm believer in miracle;" and that "prayer for spiritual help, however irrational it may be deemed, cannot possibly interfere with physical investigation."

He next takes up the charge of *asceticism*, and after refuting it, presents the evolutionary theory of virtue—that it consists in the highest physical development and enjoyment—in the following terms: "‘Nature,’ says Mr. Stephen, ‘wants big, strong, hearty, eupeptic, shrewd, sensible human beings, and would be grossly inconsistent if she bestowed her highest rewards of happiness upon a bilious, scrofulous, knock-kneed saint, merely because he had a strong objection to adultery, drunkenness, murder, and robbery, or an utter absence of malice or even highly cultivated sympathies.’ There is no reason why a saint should be scrofulous or knock-kneed; bilious, if his diet is spare, he is pretty sure not to be; and we know that he may be long-lived and intellectually prolific. But if what nature wanted was the set of qualities here enumerated, why did she not rest content when she had got it? In the Museum at Oxford are some of the bones of a Saurian which must have been so large as utterly to dwarf any creature now on earth. Here were bigness, strength, heartiness, eupepsia in perfection; here, too, were practical shrewdness and sense enough to make the best of physical existence; nay, the monster may be said to have reached the height of positive philosophy, for he was a real Agnostic, which hardly any human being is, and had never lapsed into Theism. Nature can hardly have attached paramount importance to the human form, so long as the essential qualities were produced. Why, I ask again, did she not rest content? Why did she retrograde to a weaker type, to say nothing of invalids such as Alfred, Pascal, and William the Third?"

He next easily disposes of the charges that Christianity is anti-economical, and that it is opposed to political progress and to art.

It will be seen that we have done little more, thus far, than to set before the reader the main points of Prof. Smith's article, our chief object being to give some readers who have not had access to the article the opportunity of seeing this portraiture of Christianity from a purely scientific point of view by one who utterly disclaims the imputation of being an orthodox Christian. We have aimed at little more than to set the picture in a frame and

place it in a light where more eyes could see it, and see it more clearly than they could have done in its original place.

At the same time it will occur to the reader that while this likeness of Christianity is in many points true and very beautiful, in others it is defective. Every true Christian who does deeds of pure self-sacrifice knows that his highest motive in doing them has not been mentioned. The Christian acts under a very high and pure motive indeed when he looks at the ideal and presses toward the goal, which is not only perfect blessedness, but likeness to Him who is his ideal. "He that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure." But there is another motive, if possible, higher, purer, and certainly more unselfish than this hope of personal perfection and glory. "The love of Christ constraineth us," is Paul's explanation of that self-sacrifice and earnestness which, in the eyes of many who beheld them, seemed madness. The love of Christ, pure, unselfish, and infinite to us, his enemies, displayed in coming to die for us, is that which awakens the noblest energies and unseals the fountains of the purest feelings in the Christian breast. No full portraiture of Christianity can be drawn without this feature—this charm of a Saviour's dying love which has led missionaries to bid farewell to home and loved ones, and robbed the stake and the gibbet of their terrors for the martyr.

The love of the brethren, that beautiful virtue seen in the keeping of the "new commandment," not only evoked the admiration of the old heathen lookers-on, as they observed the treatment which the early Christians received from and bestowed upon one another; but from it have, in large measure, sprung the hospitals and asylums, as well as the large proportion of the institutions of learning, which adorn and bless every land where Christianity prevails, while its perfect realisation in a glorious future forms no small element of the Christian's hope.

These motives are not only felt and acted on by Christians, but are clearly presented in the Scriptures, and hence should not have been omitted in any portraiture of Christianity as a moral system.

The humblest Christian knows, again, that however perfect the



rules or the ideal of the Christian system, and however powerful the motives presented for the observance of the one and the attainment of the other, all would be in vain if one other characteristic of Christianity were lacking. Both the Scriptures and experience teach the Christian that it is "by the grace of God" that he is what he is. Were it not for the regeneration of the Holy Ghost and his constantly sanctifying agency, the ideal might indeed have been presented, but it would have been to blinded eyes; the rules of holy living might have been written on the sacred page, but they would never have been written in the heart.

This is all plainly announced in the Scriptures, which present Christianity to the world, and without this it would not only have failed to do what it has done, but would not have accomplished the moulding of a single character into the likeness of him who is the ideal of the Christian. But for this, Prof. Smith would never have had the opportunity to pen the following eloquent words with which he pays a parting tribute to the system he has been examining:

"Since its appearance, the ideal has passed under many successive clouds of human opinion, from which there was no supernatural intervention to save it. It has passed under the cloud of legend, which among a primitive people in an uncritical age was sure to gather round the character of a great Teacher; of Alexandrian theosophy; of ecclesiasticism, and of sacerdotalism begotten of Pagan contagion; of Popery; of Monasticism; of Scholasticism; of Protestant sectarianism and the dogmatism which was left in existence, and perhaps in some respects intensified, by an imperfect Reformation. It has passed under clouds of political influence, such as Byzantine imperialism, feudalism, Spanish and Bourbon despotism, and has been obscured and distorted in transit. Yet it has always emerged again, and even, in passing, has filled the cloud with light."

Had we a friend who held the views which Professor Smith has expressed, we could not refrain from saying to him, "'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.' Why not enter?" We can hardly conceive how one can go as far as he has gone and

not go farther. How can Christianity be what he describes it as being, and have done what he shows that it has done, without being what it claims to be, the divinely ordained religion for man? If it be divine, it must be true, and also truthful in its assertions. It asserts that its Author performed miracles, which none but the finger of God could do, as evidences and seals of his Messiahship. Is it inconceivable, or strange even, that, if God gave a divine religion, it should be attested in this manner? Are the miracles of Christ and his apostles unsuitable to and in character foreign to the Christian system? Are they not, on the other hand, illustrative of its great truths, and part and parcel of the religion itself? Are they not attested by the depositions of eye-witnesses whose characters are so glassed in what they write that we cannot doubt their veracity? Were not the alleged miracles of such a character, and performed under such circumstances, that no intelligent eye-witness could possibly be deceived as to their reality? What possible reason, then, can there be for denying that they were done? Can one believe that Christianity has bestowed on the human race the greatest benefits it has ever received through the instrumentality of falsehood? As must be acknowledged by all, the great instrument by which she has wrought her beneficent work for the human race is the Bible. It is by the exposition and application of the truths of the Scriptures in Christian lands that the influence which lifts them so far above heathen countries is exercised and maintained. The Bible is the weapon of the missionary when he goes to meet the hosts of error and ignorance on pagan soil. This is attested by the fact that the Bible, in whole or in part, has been translated into nearly two hundred and fifty languages and dialects by those who are engaged in spreading the light of Christianity. The Bible is the lamp to the feet and the light to the path of every subject of the saving power of Christianity. Can these Scriptures, then, be false? False they must be, if not God-given and if not attested by miracles. And if this claim be false, the falsehood is more awfully iniquitous than any lie that human ear has ever heard or human lips ever uttered. Christianity has gone forth in our world, as has been acknowledged, the most salutary, beneficent, ennobling

power it has ever seen and felt. She has been the purifier, the guide, the almoner of the nations. Light has shone round her footsteps when she has gone into the deepest darkness. Health and healing have attended her touch whenever she has approached those most hopelessly affected with moral disease. She has stooped to man in the lowest degradation to which he has ever sunk, and raised him to the noblest height to which he has ever attained. In doing all this, was she false? Was her means of accomplishing it a lie? Who that reasons, who that believes in the distinction between virtue and vice, can believe this?

P. P. FLOURNOY.



#### ARTICLE V.

### THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR, ONE OF CHRIST'S ASCENSION GIFTS.

BY THE LATE REV. DR. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE.

When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.—*Ephesians iv.* 8.

I. "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men." Such are the exalted strains of the Psalmist (Ps. lxxviii. 17, 18), predicting the triumphant ascent of Messiah into heaven. The Apostle, in our text, quotes and applies to Christ so much as asserts the fact of his ascent to glory; and the consequent distribution to men of his ascension gifts. Though in our English translation of that Psalm the rendering is, "thou hast *received* gifts for men," the words of Paul, he "*gave* gifts to men," are fully as just a translation of the Hebrew, and agree precisely with the Chaldee, the Syriac, and the Arabic. Our translators seem to have been misguided by the LXX.; and the example is a striking proof how little dependence is to be

placed on the assertion, so often hazarded, that the quotations in the New Testament are chiefly drawn from the Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures.

In this ascent of the Lord Jesus, he led captivity captive; for he had before this blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross (Col. ii. 14). And now, "having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it" (*Idem*, 15). Through death he had destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil (Heb. ii. 14); and now, the captives being delivered (*Idem*, 15), he openly triumphs over him who had triumphed over all, and leads him captive who before led men captive at his will. The utter and final ruin of Satan's kingdom and dominion by means of the cross of Christ is openly and triumphantly demonstrated by the resurrection and ascension of him who liveth, and was dead, and is alive for ever more, who hath the keys of hell and of death (Rev. i. 18).

And well do they say—both Psalmist and Apostle—that he ascended *up on high*. Before the world was, he was in glory with the Father (John xvii. 5, and i. 1–14); for the joy set before him, as the author and the finisher of his people's faith, he endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God (Heb. xii. 2); thus suffering all things and entering upon a new inheritance of glory (Luke xxiv. 26, and 1 Pet. i. 11), God hath made him both Lord and Christ (Acts ii. 36), and invested him with all power in heaven and in earth (Matt. xxviii. 18).

This exalted Saviour, whom God hath raised from the dead and set at his own right hand, far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and constituted him the head over all things; this Saviour hath the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, given to the Church to be its head—even to the Church which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all (Eph. i. 17–23)—that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he

might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth (Eph. i. 10). Being God, he hath purchased with his own blood that portion of his glorious heritage which shall be constituted out of the spirits of just men made perfect—and which in the large sense he calls his Church—even the Church of the first born (Acts xx. 28; Heb. xii. 23; Col. i. 18). That he might sanctify and cleanse this Church, and present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish, Christ gave himself for it (Eph. v. 25–27). All the members of this mystical body of Christ, at any time upon this earth, are distinguished by this, that they love God, that they are called according to his purpose, and that all things work together for their good (Rom. viii. 28); for they are, every one, foreknown of God, predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, and are all called, justified, and glorified in him (*Idem*, 29–31). God's own Son, having been delivered up for them all, everything else is freely given to them of God; and the obedience, death, resurrection, ascension, glorification, and intercession of Christ are grounds of an assurance immovable and immortal, that nothing shall ever be able to separate them from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord (*Idem*, 34–39).

Although the work of redemption was not actually wrought out by Christ till after his incarnation, yet the benefits thereof were communicated to the elect in all ages of the world (Gen. iii. 15; Gal. iv. 4, 5). And although the covenant of grace, whereby life and salvation are offered to sinners by Jesus Christ, has been very differently administered, under the various dispensations from Adam to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses, from Moses to Christ, and from the glorification of Christ to the present time, it is nevertheless one and the same covenant throughout (Gal. i. 14; Rom. iii. 21–31; Heb. xiii. 8). That dispensation of the covenant of grace, which the apostles of the Lord Jesus, by his express command, have established upon earth, is by far the most glorious of all that have yet been made manifest, and is the last exhibition of mercy to sinners (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Heb. xii. 18–28; Acts iii. 21). By it salvation is freely proclaimed to the

whole family of man, and whosoever will believe in the Lord Jesus shall not perish, but shall have life eternal (Eph. ii. *passim*).

It is, emphatically, a dispensation under the power of the Holy Ghost, that blessed Comforter which the Saviour promised his apostles to pray the Father to give unto them—and which should abide with us for ever (John xiv. 16, 17)—that divine and eternal Spirit whose advent was the great promise of the Father, the crowning proof of the glorification of the Lord Jesus and of the eternal Sonship of the Word which was made flesh, the consummate unction of the Apostles themselves (Acts i. 8; ii. 4, 33; iii. 13). He is the Spirit of all truth, all life, all holiness. He it is that spiritually and savingly enlightens the minds of the heirs of salvation, and enables them to understand the things of God (Acts xxvi. 18; Eph. i. 17–19). He it is that takes away their hearts of stone and gives them hearts of flesh (Ezek. xxxvi. 26; Eph. i. 18–20). He it is that renews their wills, and by his almighty power determines them to that which is good (Eph. i. 19; Phil. ii. 13). He it is by whose effectual working in us the life of the second Adam, who is a quickening Spirit, supplants in us the life of the first Adam, who was a living soul (1 Cor. xv. 45; Rom. viii. 2). He it is without whose enlightening, quickening, sanctifying power, we can neither enter into the kingdom of God, nor find access either to the Father or the Son (John iii. 5; vi. 44; xiv. 6). He it is, blessed be God, whom our dear Master has declared our heavenly Father will give to them that ask him, with a readiness as much exceeding the joy with which we give an egg and not a scorpion, a fish and not a serpent, bread and not a stone, to our son that asketh, as the beneficence of his infinite and perfect nature transcends the best emotions of those whose best estate is only evil (Luke xi. 6–13).

That all the heirs of eternal life, as they pass in successive generations through this vale of tears, may be effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified; that they may be enabled to believe, repent, obey the gospel, persevere in the Christian life, be built up in the comfort and assurance of grace and salvation; in short, that the saints may be gathered and perfected in this life to the end of the world, it has pleased God to bestow upon his Church

his divine oracles, the sweet and powerful ordinances of his house, and a living and perpetual ministry composed of several classes of office bearers in his kingdom; and these oracles, ordinances, and office bearers he doth, by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make effectual thereunto. In immediate connexion with our text, and by way of exposition of its sense, Paul tells us that the gifts which the ascending and triumphing Saviour bestowed on men, and to which he has, in this passage, especial reference, were apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers; and he adds that they were bestowed "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ" (verses 11, 12); unto every one, as he had before said, "grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ" (verse 7). For the whole body which is to be edified is one, and the Spirit which bestows every grace and every gift is one, and the hope of our calling is one—one Lord, one faith, one baptism, all one, and one God and Father above all, through all, in all (verses 4-6). It is therefore clear that amongst the ascension gifts of Christ to his Church, some of the chief were office bearers, and one class of these here expressly enumerated is pastors.

As it is my present design to speak particularly of the pastor's office, it is scarcely proper to bestow our labor in establishing the distinction received by nearly all Protestants, and expressly asserted in our ecclesiastical standards, between the extraordinary and the ordinary offices constituted by Christ in his Church; or in showing precisely which are permanent and which are not; or in pointing out the precise nature and boundaries of such as are perpetual—all three, it must be conceded, points of great importance, and in regard to which it is very evident the Christian world in our day has but vague and shallow notions. It is worth while, however, to observe that the word here rendered *ministry* is not only used throughout the New Testament in reference to every kind of office bearer mentioned in it, but is applied to many sorts of functions, in the way of service, which even private persons can perform. In this place it is undoubtedly employed to signify all the offices which Christ has appointed in his Church; and the sense conveyed is, that they are all ordained, not in a

way of honor, but for arduous labor; that the work required is in the proper sense a service of the Church, not a dominion over it; that the great object of it is to perfect the saints and to edify the body of Christ; and that they were all amongst his ascension gifts. And it is not only incredible but absurd to suppose that our Church should first define that a ministry is divinely appointed, and then define that it consists ordinarily and permanently of pastors, elders, and deacons; and yet that it should mean that the word *ministry* can signify nothing but preachers of the gospel.

II. It is a very obvious truth that all office bearers, and especially all such as are ordinary and perpetual, are given by Christ to the Church, and that the Church is not, in any conceivable sense, given to them. And yet the neglect of this truth has been one great reason why such confused opinions have prevailed on the whole subject under consideration. The personal ministry of Christ was surely not utterly barren. He had disciples before he had apostles; he had many, perhaps multitudes of followers before the descent of the Holy Ghost had fully anointed the apostles for their office and work; and we are told that after his resurrection and before his ascent to heaven "he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once" (1 Cor. xv. 6). And of the vast crowds that followed him, and heard gladly him who spake as never man spake, who shall presume to say that multitudes did not believe upon him? To those already united with him by faith, and to his elect throughout the earth and throughout all generations, he gave, after he had singly triumphed over death and hell, the inestimable gift of a living and permanent ministry. But he had a Church in the world before there was either apostle, or prophet, or evangelist, or pastor, or teacher; and he will have his Church around him throughout eternal ages, after all his saints are gathered and perfected, and when oracles, ordinances, and ministry, shall all have fulfilled their work. His bride was equally his undefiled, his only one, before any ordinance was established, or any oracle given, or any ministry constituted, as she is now that we enjoy all these proofs of his care and love; and if there had never been an office bearer of the race of Adam given as a servant to minister unto her, if angels had



been her only ministers for ever, or the Divine Spirit had disdained all secondary agencies, or were now to reject the whole body of sinful men who are nothing but as he enables them, still that spotless bride would be the Lamb's wife, by a covenant reaching from the depths of eternity, steadfast as the oath of God can make it, and sacred by the blood of Jesus with which it is sealed. No, no; there is no lordship, no headship in Christ's Church, but that of Christ himself; there are but servants in the Church for Christ's sake; and their Master's rule is this, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; he that is greatest among you, shall be your servant" (Matt. xx. 27, xxiii. 11). And if we will but keep steadily before our minds this solitary truth—that Christ's people, his Church, are before, above, independent of all office bearers ever given to them, far moreso than any commonwealth is distinct from and superior to the authorities which may at any time exist in it, or the form of administration which may at any period prevail in it—it will bear us clearly and firmly onward through all the snares which ignorance, superstition, fanaticism, the lust of power and the pride of caste, have set to entrap God's people into abominable will-worship, or hateful, though perverse men choose to call it "voluntary humility."

Seeing then that amongst the ascension gifts herein expressly named is a ministry, such as I have indicated; and that of that ministry, also expressly named, are pastors; while Christ has a Church on earth we may confidently expect to find faithful pastors in it, whom he will raise up, qualify, and send forth, as ordinary perpetual officers therein (1 Peter v. 2-4). The chief functions of their office, as summarily established out of the Scriptures, and held by the purest Reformed Churches, are, 1. To pray for and with their flocks as the mouth of the people unto God; 2. To read the Scriptures publicly; 3. To preach the word, thereby teaching, convincing, reproving, exhorting, comforting, and nourishing their flocks; 4. To administer the sacraments; 5. To bless the people from God; 6. To take care of the poor; 7. To bear rule with other elders amongst their flocks, and in the Church at large. These functions all pre-suppose a

gathered Church, and are directed to the perfecting of its members; or have direct reference to the work of gathering into the fold those who still wander without God. They are all based upon an authority which is merely ministerial and declarative. They all involve a simple and arduous service or ministration, as distinguished from an inherent, much less an independent subsistence. They all have a direct relation to Christ on the one hand, and to Christ's people on the other. They are all of such a nature as to require peculiar qualifications as well as special authority for their performance; and yet they are at the same time of such a character that no performance of any of them is possible, except in relation to such as voluntarily allow of them, and no benefit can be predicated of the performance of any of them, as resulting necessarily out of their own inherent force and operation. It is an exalted stewardship, but it is no more. If it carries a blessing with it, it is because God superadds that blessing. It is laden with privileges and with mercies for a world in ruins; but to make any of these available, men must receive willingly those treasures, which even after they are poured into their bosoms, multitudes are ready to reject, to defile, to trample under their feet.

It is manifest that unless men were directed, individually, by a divine infallibility, we cannot trust to their individual decisions that they are divinely called to such an office as this; nor is it less clear that nothing less than miraculous powers on their part, or a divine illumination on ours, is sufficient to enable us to decide individually, with infallible certainty, on the value of such pretensions. And yet it is of supreme importance, that both they who minister and they who are ministered unto, should not err in such a case. Nor need they, if they will deal humbly, faithfully, and honestly, with God, with their own souls, and with each other.

Does any man assert that he is an apostle, a successor of the apostles, a minister of Jesus Christ, invested with the functions of the apostolic office? Then his calling is immediately from God, he is divinely inspired, and the proofs of his apostleship are simple, precise, and clearly laid down in God's word. Was he

an eye witness of any portion of Christ's personal ministry? Has he had personal, divine, and super-human proof of the resurrection, ascension, and glorification of Christ? Can he prove these two points by raising the dead? If he can, the question is settled; if he cannot, it is also settled.

Does any man assert that he holds the apostolic, the pastoral, or any other office, in the Church of Christ, by reason of a perpetual succession which has brought down the office power from the Saviour to him, through an unbroken succession of office bearers like himself, and that it is upon the authority of this investiture that he challenges the reverence of the followers of Jesus? This places the claim wholly on questions of fact; and if the claim is well founded, it can, of course, be clearly and easily made out. Let it be shown that according to the Scriptures this is the way in which the office is, by divine appointment, to be transmitted; that when thus transmitted, the spiritual investiture is complete, independently of the spiritual character of him upon whom the succession terminates, and that of those through whom it has descended; that such a succession has been preserved in the Church throughout all generations, without taint or interruption, man after man, in a right line from Jesus; that the present claimant is one of those upon whom this unbroken succession has fallen; and that the office he claims is a perpetual office in Christ's Church. In such a case it is altogether ridiculous to attempt to establish by *arguments* any one of the facts necessary to complete the chain of proof; seeing that the whole question is one of fact, and in its own nature to be established only by proof. It is, moreover, little less than impious to tell us that any portion of this chain of title, which from its nature can rest only on facts, must be received as matter of faith, even though it cannot be proved to be true; that is, that we must believe, as matter of faith, that a succession exists, though as matter of fact it cannot be proved, because, as they say, though God promised that the fact should exist, he failed to furnish the evidence that it does exist, or even allowed the evidence to be apparently conclusive that it does not exist; which, though in a Protestant mouth, is precisely the Popish argument

for transubstantiation, the real presence, and the mass. I say nothing in the way of positive objection to this form of the claim to office in the Church, though it can be clearly shown that every assertion upon which it rests is false; but what I say is this, let him who makes the claim give over idle attempts to establish by argument that which rests nakedly in proof, let him omit his Popish appeals to our faith and address himself to the evidence, and then, if he can prove his claim, it is good; and if he cannot prove it, it is an offence to God that he should make it, or that we should allow it.

Does any man assert that, although such extraordinary offices as were connected with a divine inspiration and the power of miracles ceased when those gifts ceased, and although there remain permanent offices, and amongst these the pastor's office, yet as God has promised to raise up these pastors, every one is the sole judge in his own case, and necessarily must be; and that all other evidence, but the convictions of his own mind, is inconclusive and needless? If nothing else could be objected to pretensions of this sort, it is sufficiently evident that the principle on which they proceed defeats themselves. For every child of God is as really called to be a follower of Jesus as any office bearer can be to discharge any function for the edification of God's people; and therefore every particular disciple is as much a judge whether the office bearer is divinely sent to him as the office bearer is whether he is divinely sent at all; and so the government of the Church of Christ, which is admitted in admitting the permanence of offices in it, is subverted in the pretension that the officer is the sole judge of his own call. I confess I do not see how the result would be varied if this pretension were allowed to office bearers jointly, instead of severally; a form in which it is by no means uncommon to urge it by such as assert that church courts are properly composed only of ministers of the word, and that these courts, independently of anything else than their own judgment, and without any call from any particular flock, may regularly and commonly ordain men *sine titulo*.

Absurd as are the pretensions of an extraordinary vocation, in the absence of every vestige of extraordinary evidence; absurd as

are the pretensions founded on a perpetual succession, where no such succession was ever promised or did ever exist; neither are more absurd than the pretension which in its very nature denies the necessity of any proof at all. And yet upon one or the other of these three grounds—obscured somewhat, it may be, to conceal its nakedness—you shall hear continually the most confident assertions that the under shepherds in Christ's flock hold their office power in it.

The true grounds upon which the vocation of a Christian pastor rests, are in their own nature extremely clear, and are plainly stated in the word of God. They have relation, 1. To God himself; 2. To the man's own conscience; 3. To the Christian people; and 4. To those who bear office in the Church. Let us briefly examine the subject in each of these aspects.

1. At every period and under every dispensation, God has been pleased to reserve to himself a great and a direct agency in designating those who should minister to his people in holy things. When the Lord passed through Egypt and smote their first-born both of man and of beast, he saw the blood of the passover on the lintel and on the side posts of the dwellings of his people, and he suffered not the destroyer to come nigh unto Israel. (Exod. xii. 23–30.) As a memorial of a deliverance so striking and so marvellous, God set apart to himself, by a formal statute, the first-born of man and of beast in Israel, as sanctified unto himself. (Exod. xiii. 1–16.) These first-born amongst the sons of God's people, thus hallowed unto him, he exchanged, by a divine ordinance, for the tribe of Levi (Num. iii. 12, 13); and these Levites were publicly and solemnly consecrated and offered up, for the service of the Lord, by Aaron and his sons, with the hands of all Israel laid upon them. (Num. viii. 5–19.) For the priest's office, God selected from amongst the Levites Aaron and his sons (Exod. xxviii. 1), and established in that family an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations (Exod. xi. 15); and, by his command, Moses his servant took Aaron and his sons, and anointed them, and consecrated them to God, in the presence of the whole congregation of Israel convened before the tabernacle and shouting for joy as they beheld the manifest and mira-

culous proof that God was in their midst. (Lev. viii. *passim*, and ix. 23, 24.) As if to render still more signal the proof of the immediate agency of God in all these transactions, he ordained that every stranger, not a Levite, who presumed to intrude into the Levite's office, and every stranger, not of the house of Aaron, who presumed to meddle with the priest's office, should be put to death. (Num. i. 51 and iii. 11.)

The grand truth of the divine interposition in the selection of the ministers of religion, is set in the clearest light by this great example. Nor is it less clearly exhibited in the New Testament than in the Old. The priesthood of the Jewish dispensation was a ministry for sacrifice; and by means thereof believers had access to God, and obtained through that law of sacrifices a legal righteousness. But the Lord Jesus has set aside that mode of the believer's access to God for justifying righteousness, seeing that he is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth (Rom. x. 4); and thenceforward the righteousness appointed for justification is no longer that which is legal, but that which is divine and which is bestowed on us by God, through faith in Christ. (Phil. iii. 9.) For he being a priest for ever, none can succeed to him; and having an unchanging priesthood, no priesthood can follow; and having offered himself a sacrifice, no sacrifice of less worth can any more be accepted; and having by that one sacrifice of himself perfected for ever those that are sanctified, all other sacrifice is wholly superfluous; and having entered into heaven itself there to present his sacrifice and offer his intercession, all sacrifice here below would be at once absurd and impious. There is therefore no priesthood at all any more, but the eternal priesthood of the Lord Jesus Christ, nor any sacrifice at all any more, besides the one perfect, infinite sacrifice which he made of himself. Instead of the priesthood instituted before his incarnation to exhibit in types and shadows his coming and his work, he ascending up on high has instituted a ministry, as I have before proved, which in the use of the oracles he has given and the ordinances he has established, is designed for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, in a threefold permanent work of preaching, governing, and distribution, which he has committed to a three-

fold perpetual ministry of pastors, elders, and deacons. No human being has any more right to intrude into either of these offices without a divine call, than there existed to intrude into the office of a priest or a Levite under the Mosaic dispensation. For it is plainly said that even Jesus Christ himself was "called of God an High Priest after the order of Melchisedec," and constituted one by him who said, "Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." And therefore, much more is it true that "no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." (Heb. v. 4-10.) So that the call of Aaron was not more really divine than that of every office bearer—and of course every pastor—in the Christian Church should be. And with this agree the words of John the Baptist, "A man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven." (John iii. 27.) And to the same purport is the whole argument of Paul, by which he establishes, out of the Jewish Scriptures, the call of the Gentiles into the Church of Christ, proving that as God had promised to save them if they would call upon his name, and this was impossible unless the truth were preached to them by men sent of God; therefore and because of the express promise to send such unto them, God had thus fulfilled his gracious purposes in divinely raising up a ministry for them. (Rom. x. 12-15.) And in like manner, we are given to understand that those who are not sent of God, nor commanded by him, nor taught of him, may be expected to prophesy only lies in his dreadful name, and that all their labor will be a "thing of naught and the deceit of their heart." (Jer. xiv. 14.)

There is a very close analogy between the methods by which persons were admitted into the visible Church, and called of God to the exercise of religious functions, as compared with each other, under the Old Testament dispensation, and the methods adopted for the same ends, compared with each other, under the New Testament dispensation. Under the former all was by natural generation; under the latter all is by spiritual generation. So that if the ordination of God whereby the natural seed of Abraham constituted his visible Church could with any justice be

called an election, and his superintending providence could with any propriety be said to be the cause of the continuance of that Church in a way of natural generation; how much more now, when by his divine and special grace all the disciples of the Lord Jesus are supernaturally brought to a saving knowledge of him, in their effectual calling, may it be said that every believer becomes a member of the body of Christ by a special divine interposition! And if the call of the Levites and their seed in the place of the first-born, and the call of Aaron and his descendants, was in that sense divine, that every Levite and every priest in all their generations was truly under a peculiar divine designation, each to his own work about the sanctuary; how much more now, when the work is altogether spiritual, when God has expressly reserved to himself the power to call and qualify and send forth the workmen, and has graciously promised to do it, must it appear evident that this calling, and fitness, and mission from God, is itself divine and spiritual! And it may be as confidently asserted that every converted man is no more called to be an office bearer in the Christian Church than every man in Israel was called to be a Levite; and that it is as indispensable for him who would be a pastor to have a divine call and fitness over and above that which entitles him to mere membership in the Church, and yet like it, spiritual and special, as it was for an Israelite who would minister in the priest's office to have a call and fitness over and above that which made him an Israelite, though like it dependent on natural generation, to wit, that he was a descendant of Aaron. There might be some difficulty in making out the case that a man was a Levite or that he was of the seed of Aaron; there might be doubts even in his own mind as to either fact; and there might be incidental points difficult of determination; and there must necessarily be some outward method to settle all these questions to the satisfaction of other persons. Still, the ultimate question is, is he a Levite? is he of the seed of Aaron? and so, has he the divine call to this office? In the same manner there may be serious and painful doubts in a man's own mind, whether he is a child of God, whether he is called to be a pastor; there may be great difficulties in settling these questions, to his own



satisfaction and to that of others; and there must be some adequate way in which the people of God may arrive at a satisfactory conclusion on the point. But nevertheless, there must be a divine fitness which precedes worthy membership, a divine call which precedes an authorised entrance upon the pastor's office. And this divine call is, for its substance, a spiritual fitness imparted by the Holy Ghost, for the performance of the great work, the various parts of which I have already pointed out, which is divinely committed to the pastor's hands; and for its manifestation, the settled conviction, in the light of God's word, God's providence, and God's inward work, upon the man himself, upon Christ's people, and upon those who bear rule amongst them, that indeed God has raised up the man to do the work. This great distinction ought never to be lost sight of. It is God alone who can call or qualify a pastor; every trial and inquiry is merely to ascertain whether or not, in the particular case, God has done it, and to add all outward means of usefulness and every seal of lawful authority to him thus chosen from on high, and whom the Church elects and ordains because she believes God has called him.

I see no alternative between holding fast to these truths, and subverting the whole doctrine of God's word as to the divine vocation of all the office bearers in his Church from the beginning. But if we really embrace them, there are many consequences which flow from them which it will be hard to reconcile with many prevailing and some almost unquestioned principles and practices. I have heard it uttered in many quarters, and from the midst of nearly every denomination, that in a day like this, when the demand for ministers of the word is so urgent, it may be considered the duty of every pious young man, of fair talents and sound health, to devote himself to that calling, and that the burden of showing he ought not to do so rests upon him. This is even more absurd than it would be to say every man ought to profess to be a Christian, and the burden of proving he is not fit to do so rests on him; for, in one sense, every man is under the highest obligations to repent and believe the gospel; but there is no sense whatever in which any man has any right, much less is under any obligation, to be an office bearer in Christ's Church,

unless he be specially called of God thereto; and then it is his duty to make out the evidence of that call.

It is a kindred error to this, to set on foot plans and doctrines whose radical notion seems to be that in some such way God's action in raising up and sending forth preachers may be stimulated or its frequency increased. Such schemes, to say the very least, seem not so much directed to inquiries for such as God has called, as to experiments which may ascertain if he has not called a multitude besides. And it surely increases the danger greatly, that youths in the first stages of religious experience, of tender years, of circumstances in which a gratuitous education is itself very often a powerful temptation and the station of a minister of the gospel a seduction nearly irresistible, are, to a great extent, the objects of these experiments. Suppose them to succeed perfectly, and the result is, almost inevitably, a class ministry; and what is worse still, an eleemosynary class ministry.

I readily concede that it is not only a clear duty, but a high privilege, to aid such as need it, of those whom God calls to be pastors to his people; and that there is every way a great reward in so doing. But I greatly doubt if it is the best way to accomplish this important end, either to throw the door wide open, and invite all to enter, that those we need may come in with them, or to cultivate the idea, as is constantly done, that God calls a very great majority of his ministers from this class, and to talk as if he called few or none from any other; or to proceed as if it were not an immense evil for men to find entrance, who are not called of God; or as if it were not a fearful calamity to weaken, in such poor youths as are called of him, the spirit which leads them to struggle for self-support; or to set aside, virtually, the tribunals of God's house, in any part of the work of training and settling ministers of the word; or to train them, because they are of this class, in any respect differently from other candidates. It is easy for us to multiply ministers of the gospel, but it is impossible for us to multiply such as are called of God. This is the great truth which men are ready to neglect, to deride. And the results of every attempt which we can make, in disregard of it, must always be disastrous. We may supplant a ministry called of God from

all classes by a ministry raised up by ourselves from a single class; but have we thereby added anything but a principle of disorder, an element of disease?

If it were only that what we did amiss in training and ordaining our preachers was superfluous, the evil might be endured in silence. But if there is the remotest danger that our Church may gradually recede from its ancient position, as its ministry is gradually transmuted in all its relations to society; if there is any reason to fear that men called of God are liable to be set aside from their true stations by men patronised by influences stronger than the church courts; if there is any, much more if there is a steady and evident, increase of idle, unprofitable, self-seeking ministers, who, by prevailing interpretations, exercise all the powers of pastors called of God, without performing a solitary function of the pastoral office; if men exclusively engaged in secular employments, yea, even ordained to them under pretence of being evangelists, openly usurp the powers of diocesan rebuke, and are countenanced in their flagitious breach, both of covenant and of decency, by the highest institutions and tribunals of the Church; it is indeed evident that something is sadly wrong, and it is high time that some voice of warning should be lifted up, even at the risk of that concerted outcry with which, from the days of the silversmiths of Ephesus, all those who find their craft in danger, are ever ready to overwhelm every mover of reform.

If our candidates who are gathered into our seminaries could be there subjected to a system of training which would correct the evils of the system by which many of them were brought there, and reveal distinctly that which man had done and that which God wrought, there would be much less reason for apprehension. A very general impression prevails that this is the case; and while it follows, nearly as a matter of course, that any young man who enters one of these seminaries may complete the ordinary course and period of study, it is still more generally a matter of course that he who has done so is licensed by his Presbytery. Thus, in the case of our beneficiaries, the ultimate decision which puts them into the ministry may virtually be considered, in many cases, the vote of Presbytery, or the recommendation of a com-

mittee, that they ought to be aided, and that perhaps when they began their course at grammar school; and in the case of those, not beneficiaries, who go to the seminaries, it may in many instances be considered the act which took them under the care of Presbytery. What I mean to assert is, that our present system, so far as the seminaries enter into it, provides no sort of adequate barrier by which the inevitable mistakes of the beneficiary system, and the loose mode of proceeding which that system has tended to introduce in regard to other candidates, may be corrected in a subsequent stage of training. This vice is inherent in the system upon which the seminaries are projected; even if the mode of instruction there, the men who give that instruction, and the course of study adopted, were all such as to reduce that evil to its minimum. That these are all in fact worthy of this commendation, he would be a bold man that would undertake to assert. I will venture, with deference, to say that I have a strong impression that so far as secluded, cloistered residence at these seminaries is a part of ministerial training, it is unfriendly to health, to propriety of manners, and to growth in grace; that, moreover, the whole plan of training in them is defective in its professional and moral aspects, especially in the latter; that the course of instruction in them has no sufficient relevancy to the actual duties to be afterwards performed, and especially not to the immediate controversies, movement, and aspects of the age; and that, on the whole, they cannot be relied on, either as a means of keeping improper persons out of the gospel ministry, or as sufficiently establishing the fact that persons really intended by God for religious teachers are therefore fit for their work, because they have been trained in them.

There is another and most serious aspect of the subject, which deserves to be placed by itself. There may be great errors of principle and of action, which yet being honestly directed to the end avowed, and that being the important one of training a ministry of the word, for the actual service of God, we must respect the intentions, even while we feel obliged to dissent from the soundness of the opinions and the wisdom of the means in question. But it is too manifest that the office of a gospel minister is, in our

day, as in all others, and as in all other Churches, perhaps in ours sometimes, sought by persons who habitually make it a means to other ends; who take it up as a living, or who resort to it as a respectable profession without any purpose to devote themselves to its duties. Men, some of whom seem to have no more settled idea that there is a special call of God indispensable before one becomes a public teacher of religion than that such a call should precede the public teaching of any art or science; others of whom seem to have no more difficulty in taking up or laying down the fearful responsibilities of the pastoral office than in changing their garments, no more trouble in evading the obligations of their ordination vows than if those vows had been taken in jest; while others still appear to have no more sense of fidelity to any particular denomination than if all the differences between the Churches were riddles contrived to amuse children. And yet every one of these persons, so far as our Church is afflicted with them—if, indeed, any such still linger amongst us—may presume to sit in judgment upon the momentous question whether or not God has called every candidate that may have the misfortune to be brought before him, and may take upon himself to settle, so far as his voice and influence go, the most difficult and important matters that belong to the doctrine, the government, and the discipline of that Church whose confidence he has abused, into whose ministry he has intruded, and whose entire spiritual power his example is calculated to subvert. Calvin has observed concerning Paul, that when he wishes to prove his apostleship he almost always alleges his call, together with his fidelity in the execution of his office; and then he adds these memorable words, "If so eminent a minister of Christ dare not arrogate to himself an authority to require his being heard in the Church, but in consequence of his appointment to it by a divine commission, and his faithful discharge of the duty assigned him, what extreme impudence must it be if any man, destitute of both these characters, should claim such an honor for himself!" (*Inst.*, Book IV., Ch. 3, Sec. 10.)

Having thus spoken, I ought to add, that while I solemnly believe that the methods now in use touching beneficiary education

for the gospel ministry are not without great danger, and that the general system of ministerial education is both defective and hazardous ; and while I dare not say that by these and other means persons who ought never to have turned their attention to the office of public teachers of religion, may not have been introduced into it, and that some who may have been truly called of God are not tolerated in systematic covenant breaking for which they ought to be subjected to discipline ; and while there appears to me to be a state of opinion upon the whole subject of a call of God to the pastor's office, and the proper modes of ascertaining this and training the person for the work to which he is called, by no means satisfactory ; still, it is also my deep and joyful conviction that through the rich grace of Christ the great body of our ministers are men evidently called of God, and that they would have been a rich blessing to any age of the Christian Church. I pray God, and I thus labor, that it may never be otherwise ; and I beseech my brethren to bear with a plainness of speech whose only object is the common good.

2. It has been already stated that the grand and ultimate fact is, the call of God ; and that everything else should be directed merely to the satisfactory ascertainment of this fact, to the best preparation of the person for the work, and to his official investiture, upon scriptural grounds. I take the first and an indispensable proof of this call of God to be the inward testimony of the man's own conscience.

I cannot conceive that an upright man, who was prevailingly convinced that he was not of the seed of Aaron, could have allowed himself to exercise the priest's office, even though all Israel supposed him to be lawfully entitled to it ; much less can I believe that a truly religious man could do such audacious perfidy with the doom of death recorded against him by the Ruler of the Universe. So if we believe, as I think I have proved out of the Scriptures, that God as really calls his pastors now as he did his priests before ; we are as plainly bound as any ever were, to know that this vocation has fallen upon us. But as the dispensation of the grace of God through Jesus Christ is, to us, one altogether spiritual, as our entrance into his Church is itself upon spiritual

grounds and unto spiritual ends, so God's call to us is a spiritual call, and it must therefore needs be by a spiritual work, not only real, but, which is the immediate point, convincing also.

In every act we can perform on earth we are entitled to expect before we can be required to perform it, and we are bound to have before we venture to perform it, the testimony of a good conscience; and the clearness and force of our conscientious convictions should be analogous to the magnitude, the perplexity, the difficulty, of the contemplated duty. For a man then to presume to be an ambassador for Almighty God, and that touching questions no less awful than the glory of his throne, and the endless states of his rebellious subjects, without a settled conviction in his own soul that this fearful trust is laid on him by the King Eternal, is insane audacity. I say not, he must be convinced he ought to be sent—Moses plead hard against his mission; the conviction must be that he is sent. I say not, he must judge that he is fit to be sent, for no man is fit. I say not that this or the other motive, as many will assert, or any motive at all, beside the simple one of obedience to the voice of the heavenly monitor, should mingle with the inward fixed conviction; nor that this proof or the other proof, as many will contend, or any proof at all, beside the testimony of consciousness itself, should beget within us this strong assurance that it is God's Spirit which has wrought us for this self-same thing. I say not, there may not be doubts and perplexities, trials very sore, and temptations of the adversary, fightings without and fears within, and troubles on every side; for if these things be not, it is either that grace is overwhelmingly abundant, or that Satan judges us to be workmen that he need not fear. Nor do I deny, that like as the kingdom of heaven itself is but as a grain of mustard planted in the broken heart, which must be watered by many a tear, and watched amid long and anxious vigils, as its roots strike down and its branches spread strongly and widely abroad; so this inward testimony of a divine vocation may be a whisper to the soul, almost inaudible in the profoundest stillness of the spirit of man, lost, restored again, strengthened, repeated struggling amidst the passions that toss us to and fro, and fighting against the sins

that would quench it, following us, if need be, as God followed Jonah, till out of the belly of hell the right of the Almighty Disposer is confessed. Paul, "trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Upon Paul, blind and helpless, waiting for the promised manifestation, God's disciple laid his hands, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." Immediately, when it pleased God to reveal his Son in Paul that he might preach him among the heathen, he conferred not with flesh and blood, but preached Jesus and the resurrection. And yet three years after this most distinct and divine appointment to the Gentiles, Paul, in a vision of Jesus Christ, even earnestly set forth his peculiar fitness to proclaim the riches of grace amongst the Jews, and it required a second explicit declaration from the glorified Saviour that his mission was not to the Jews but to the Gentiles. And thenceforth how abounding are the evidences scattered over his life and crowded into his writings, that with an immovable conviction he rested in his call to preach Jesus, and to preach him amongst the Gentiles; and how sublime is the testimony he has left us that this inward assurance is from God, that it is sufficient to bear us up amid every danger brought upon us by the vocation it attests, to make every sacrifice that vocation requires a light thing compared with the obligation to be faithful in our calling, and to crown, by the grace of God, our career with triumph, and with the foretaste of that glory which is to be revealed in those who make full proof of their ministry, with their eyes and their hearts set on the appearing of the Lord (2 Tim. iv. 5-8).

It cannot be denied that we are liable to be deceived in this matter, as well as in that of our personal interest in Christ, and indeed in every other which concerns our inward state and exercises; and that we are so, is precisely one chief reason why the testimony of our conscience cannot be sufficient evidence to others, and why it needs to be enforced even to ourselves by other and concurring proofs. The human heart is not only desperately wicked, but is deceitful above all things, and the most difficult



part of knowledge is to know ourselves ; and sin itself is not only infinitely deceitful, but is also most deceivable, and therefore to the extent that it reigns in us it subjects us to the risk of being deceived and of deceiving ourselves. What I have before said plainly shows that the danger of being deceived by others into a conviction that we ought to preach the gospel, is by no means imaginary ; and all who have endeavored to fathom the wiles of Satan, and who have wrestled earnestly with the plague of their own hearts, well know that the danger of self-delusion is real and constant. It is for this reason, amongst others, that kindness to those who are seeking the pastoral office, as well as fidelity to the Church of Christ, demands a degree of faithfulness on the part of teachers and church courts far beyond what is commonly exercised ; it is upon this ground, in part, that ordinations *sine titulo* which have been such a curse to our Church, are always so dangerous, seeing they proceed in the absence of one of the main evidences of any call at all to the work, namely, the testimony of God's people.<sup>1</sup> It is from a deep conviction of this

---

<sup>1</sup> There is very great difficulty in proving that any *ordinary* office bearer in the Church of Christ can be lawfully or even validly ordained at all, without he is ordained to a determinate office ; and the only ground upon which the ordination of evangelists can be justified, is that their office is an *extraordinary* one. But it is clear that the getting of this office as *extraordinary*, and then using it not at all, but in place of it using the *ordinary* office of a minister of the word, is either a piece of rash and inconsiderate ignorance, or else is mere fraud and covenant breaking, and so is both void in law, and punishable besides as an immorality. As to the validity of ordination to the ordinary office of bishop, pastor, or minister of the word, without designation to any particular church, consider (1) That the thing is utterly unwarranted by precept or example in the word of God, and is contrary to the constant practice of the apostles (Acts xiv. 23, xx. 28 ; Tit. i. 5 ; Rev. ii. 3). (2) It was absolutely forbidden in the ancient Church ; the Council of Chalcedon pronounced all such ordinations invalid, and the Council of Ephesus even decreed that a real bishop could be considered entitled to the name, title, and honor of one only by courtesy, but not at all to any office power, except as he stood related to some particular charge. (3) The election of the people is an absolute and indispensable element of collation to office power, and therefore without this an ordination to such power is strictly invalid. (4) Every term, bishop, pastor, elder, by which the ordained person is desig-

truth that I have earnestly, but without success, labored to have some provision made in our discipline, whereby persons who have been unfortunately deceived in this matter, and of whom it has been discovered, by themselves or by others, after they were ordained, that they never were called of God, might be relieved from the dreadful temptation to continual hypocrisy, and from the degrading sentence of deposition for what was perhaps as much their misfortune as their sin, and in which, whether one or the other, the Church herself was an accessory before the fact.

Still, however, this is no sort of reason why those who have no belief that God has called them should venture unbidden to meddle with holy things; but is only a reason why those who believe they are called of God should more carefully examine themselves and the grounds on which they rest. It will generally be found, in practice, that a mistake on this point is very apt to involve a previous mistake as to our interest in Christ at all; and while cases are extremely common in which men who have proved that they were not Christians at all, have deceived themselves into the belief that they were divinely called to be ministers of Christ, it is very seldom that a sincerely pious and faithful child of God is allowed to deceive himself upon that point. And the reason is obvious: for if there was no testimony besides, the Spirit of God is a faithful witness to all who will listen to the still small voice in which he communes with the soul; and the testimony of

---

nated, is a relative term, and therefore to use them of one who has no church, people, or flock, implies, as John Owen well notes, as real a contradiction and impossibility, as to make him a father who has no child, or him a husband who has no wife. (5) It is wholly inconsistent with the whole office, duty, and work of the ordinary ministry of the word, every part of which, and especially the whole power of rule, supposes a state of case the opposite of that supposed when a man is ordained *sine titulo*, and at large, without any to rule over or amongst, or to care for, feed, and edify; especially is the thing absurd and unscriptural of such as are thus ordained in the immediate view and intention of secular offices and employments, agencies, professorships, etc., which one could perform as well without as with ordination, and which he cannot perform and at the same time discharge his proper work, to any particular flock. The whole thing is manifestly repugnant to the fundamental principles of Presbyterian Church Order, and is in a high degree dangerous to the Church.

that Spirit with ours that we are God's children is hardly more plainly promised than the convincing power of the same divine Comforter that we are chosen to bear office in his Church.

3. I come next to speak of the part which the Christian people have to perform immediately in the vocation of ministers of the word, considered with special reference to the effect which their determination ought to have upon the question whether or not God has called such or such a person to that ministry. The Apostle Peter says of those who believe, and to whom Christ is precious, that they are living stones out of which a spiritual house is built; and he calls them not only a chosen generation, a holy nation, a peculiar, or rather indeed a purchased people, but also a holy and even a royal priesthood. (1 Peter ii. 5, 7, 9.) That is a wondrous commonwealth, in which every individual member is not only a king, but a priest! And yet it is more wondrous still that all these royal priests, being once bond slaves of Satan and citizens of his kingdom of darkness, were redeemed by the precious blood of the only begotten Son of God, translated into the kingdom of light, and made joint-heirs with Christ Jesus! Over this kingdom, nation, people, there is no head nor king, save only the Lord Jesus Christ. He calls them unitedly his body, his Church, his bride; he permits no authority to be exercised amongst them but his own; whatever exercise of his power amongst them he prescribes to be exerted by any secondary means whatever, is only in a way purely ministerial and declarative; and this sort of power is primarily and fundamentally committed by him to the Church itself, and its exercise to such as are lawfully called thereto; and all officers who claim to exercise any portion of this power and authority primarily invested in the Church, to whom all office bearers are given, must either exhibit the miraculous proofs of an extraordinary vocation, or they must receive their investiture from the Church in the way of the divinely appointed exercise by her, of her own functions; and the sole end of the exercise of all power and rule in the Church is the edification of itself. (Rom. xv. 1-3; 2 Cor. x. 8, xiii. 10, iv. 5; Eph. iv. 14, 16.)<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The 9th chapter of the II. Book of George Gillespie's *Aaron's Rod*

The unity of the Church of Christ is one of the plainest doctrines concerning it which is taught in the Scriptures; and its division into sects and parties is one of the greatest evils which has ever been allowed to overtake it on account of its sins. Though the visible Church universal is thus unhappily rent, yet each particular portion or denomination of it is still able to appropriate to itself in some degree those great principles and reasonings which rightly apply to the whole, if all were united in one general fold. Thus we by no means assert of our branch of the Lord's purchased people—what is boastfully and foolishly asserted of themselves by some others—that we constitute *the Church of Christ* on earth. But our received faith is, that into how many parts soever our Church may be divided for convenience sake, or from necessity, either as congregations or as larger portions, still, the whole of these parts constitute but one Church. It follows that all the office bearers who may be more particularly attached to any one portion of this Church are in the same sense

---

*Blossoming* contains an argument, which I judge to be unanswerable, upon the proposition: *That there is an Ecclesiastical Government in the hands of church officers.* If this proposition be made out—and it seems impossible to deny it—many very grave consequences flow from it: and amongst them the fundamental ones, that it is a kind of treason against God for any man, or any association of men, to usurp the functions of this divinely instituted government; and that it is a sort of treachery to Christ on the part of this government to divest itself of any part of its authority, or commit to others even co-ordinately with itself, the duties which God has devolved on it. There is a very rare Scotch tract entitled "*A Treatise of Ruling Elders and Deacons*"—concerning which the tradition is that it was written by Alexander Henderson. The only copy of it I have ever seen has the imprint of 1652. It contains seven short chapters about ruling elders, and five shorter still about deacons; the whole, including a Preface and an Address to the Christian Reader, occupying 84 pages 32mo. The scriptural institution and the indispensable necessity of the ruling elders in the constitution of church courts, are very clearly made out and strongly insisted on. I would have had this tract reprinted, but that four pages are lost, in the copy at my disposal, at the end, chapter vi. I will give a few short extracts: "The I. is of those who either out of ignorance or disdain do call them *lay elders*, as if they were a part of the people only, and not to be reckoned amongst officers of the Lord's house," &c. (Ch. i.) "Every elder in the Lord's house is a

office bearers of the whole body, as the particular part is one portion of the whole; and, therefore, the action of any particular portion, as a single congregation, in virtue of which any particular office bearer is set apart, is necessarily taken as decisive of the entire question concerning his vocation as completely as if the whole body had acted upon every case, which is physically impossible. And this is the more evident when it is considered that in the nature of the case the same principle is applied to every conceivable state of the Church, however small it may be, or however great; for each particular congregation is supposed to have everything which the whole Church has: the same officers, the same ordinances, the same kind of powers, derived from the same divine source; every one in all respects like all the rest, and like the whole united into one; so that if it was possible for the whole Church to be met in one place on one occasion, there would be absolutely nothing, except a vast increase of what every single congregation should possess. Thus contemplated, we see, not only the evil, but the folly and uselessness of divisions

---

ruling elder, because the power and exercise of rule and government belongs to every elder," &c. (*Idem.*) "It is true that by the sloth, or rather by the pride of teachers, whilst they alone would seem to be somewhat, and by the policy of Satan and inadvertence of the Church, these officers were for many ages together out of use in the Christian Church. But certain it is, that both the Jewish Synagogue, and, after, the Christian Church had *seniors*, or elders, *without whose counsel nothing was done in the Church.*" (Ch. ii.) "Whilst we speak of elders, of which the Assemblies of the Church are made up, we mean all sorts of elders: ministers, doctors, and ruling elders." (Ch. vi.) "In all Assemblies of the Church, ruling elders being thereto rightly called have power to sit, write, debate, vote, and conclude in all matters that are handled therein." (*Idem.*) "The things which be handled in the Assemblies of the Church be either matters of faith, matters of order, matters of discipline, or that which concerneth the sending of Church officers," &c. (*Idem.*) It is immediately following this quotation, after seven lines, that the four pages were missing when I got hold of the tract. My own impression is exceedingly strong that in the Presbyterian Church in this country the church courts omit a very large part of their duties, and that ruling elders, as divinely instituted members of all those courts, are neither personally nor officially in the position which they ought to occupy.

amongst Christians; since the Lord Jesus has erected his Church upon such a model as to provide perfectly for its indefinite extension and at the same time to secure its perfect unity. And when it is considered that the seal which each particular congregation gives by its call to the vocation of any office bearer in the Church bears with it the highest and the most impressive evidence which can be given of human sincerity, in this, that they take the person to be their teacher, or ruler, or distributor, that they commit their own highest interests into his hands, it is plain that no greater security is possible.

That pastors should be intruded on Christian congregations, whether by church courts, by prelates, by patrons, or by the civil power, without the consent of the congregations themselves, is so monstrous an absurdity, and so utterly without a shadow of support from the word of God, that it is truly wonderful such assumptions should ever have been put forward, or tolerated; much less that they should still continue to disgrace and corrupt so large a portion of the nominal Church. In our own principles, and to a great degree in our practice, nothing of this kind is allowed; and therefore I need say little in regard to a usurpation which, wherever it exists, necessarily sets aside and makes nugatory one of the principal evidences of the divine mission of the pastor, by silencing the voice of the Christian people. It is to be greatly lamented, however, that practices not only exist, but are extending in our Church, which in their principles differ but little from the worst forms of patronage; such as the usurpation of the election of pastor, in many of our largest congregations, by the pew owners and occupiers, without regard to the Christian character of the voters, and to the exclusion of all beside themselves; and the exclusion, in other cases, of all Christians who are not heads of families; and in others still of all but males. Nor can it be denied that a system of patronage of another sort has been rapidly extending in our Church, by means of which ministers are constantly settled in congregations under the influence, direct or indirect, of the Professors in our Theological Seminaries, and the action of our Board of Missions; which, in its legitimate sphere, it is not perhaps possible, nor even desirable,

to discountenance entirely; but which requires an unusual share of wisdom in its exercise, and is therefore correspondingly liable not only to mistakes but to abuse. That our Theological Professors should, any of them, be safe depositories of an influence of this kind, when they are themselves, to a great extent, amongst the fiercest partisans in the present controversies in the Church, will scarcely be asserted by any but those who approve not only of all their opinions, but also of all their methods of propagating them.

I take it that if the testimony we are in search of is of any value, it is an unbiassed testimony to be rendered in God's fear, by Christian people, gathered in Christ's name, and having a title to his promise to be in their midst; and it is this which both by precept and example we are taught in the Divine Oracles to require. When Peter desired that some witness of the life, doctrine, and resurrection of Jesus should be ordained in the place of Judas, he stood up in the midst of the hundred and twenty disciples convened in Jerusalem, and proposed it to them in a body; and as such they chose two from amongst themselves, and then by an extraordinary appeal to God designated which of these should be numbered with the eleven. (Acts i. 15, 23.) When the first deacons were elected, it was the whole multitude of the disciples who chose them, and this by the direction of all the apostles. (Acts vi. 1-6.) And when Paul and Barnabas ordained presbyters—doubtless both pastors and ruling elders “in every church”—the words used by the inspired penman “distinctly mark,” as Calvin well notes, “the manner in which this was done, namely, by the suffrages or votes of the people.” (Acts xiv. 23; *Inst. Book IV.*, Ch. 3, Sec. 15.)

In our ecclesiastical standards, no provision existed for more than a century and a quarter after the first planting of our Church in America for the ordination of any office bearer in the Church, except upon his election by a particular church; and in this they agreed with the great body of Presbyterian Churches the world over. As their provisions stand at present, they contemplate no removal of a minister of the gospel from one Presbytery to another, except in immediate connexion with his installation as pas-

tor of some congregation; and in the only contingency in which they allow the ordination of licentiates at all, without a call from some church, they require them to be ordained as *evangelists*—a class of officers confessedly extraordinary, and expressly declared to be for laboring “in frontier or destitute settlements;” and exact of them a vow that they will undertake this work and discharge its duties. (*Form of Government, Ch. XV., Sec. 15.*) How this provision, first introduced formally into our system in 1821, has worked, and what are likely to be its effects, both in depriving the congregations of permanent pastors, and in crowding our church courts with nominal evangelists, may be inferred from the fact, that considerably less than one-half of all our ministers of the word, are reported in 1844 as sustaining the pastoral relation; in other words, that more than half of them are in a position never contemplated by the great and general provisions of our Church Constitution, and utterly inconsistent with their exercise of any power of rule, under any system pretending to be representative or free. And so long as even a few Presbyteries conveniently situated to the Theological Seminaries may choose to receive under their care candidates from all quarters of the Church, and may see fit to ordain their numerous licentiates *sine titulo*, and send them over the Church as missionaries, as professors, as agents, as teachers, or in search of settlements; it is easy to see that this *ministerium vagum*, which is abhorrent to the whole spirit of Presbyterianism, can be repressed only by an energetic and general resistance. I do not doubt that many of our seven or eight hundred ministers of the word who are not pastors, are laboring painfully in the work of evangelists; nor that many are virtually, though not formally, pastors; nor that many others are trying to do good in various ways; nor that a goodly number are disabled by age and infirmities; but still, after all possible allowance is made, the number is large for whom little excuse can be made; and as regarding nearly the whole mass, the truth still remains, that having never been called to the work of the ministry by any body of Christian people, or having laid aside the pastoral office, however worthy they may be, they are destitute of any scriptural or presbyterial ground upon which to rest



any claim to the exercise of a large part of the functions of a pastor, and more especially those functions which belong to him as a ruler in the house of God.

The plan which has been adopted by our own and some other Presbyterian Churches, of licensing "probationers for the holy ministry," has for one of its avowed objects this, "that the churches may have an opportunity to form a better judgment respecting the talents of those by whom they are to be instructed and governed;" (*Form of Govt.*, Ch. XIV., Sec. 1) and it is "when any probationer shall have preached so much to the satisfaction of any congregation, as that the people appear prepared to elect a pastor," that the necessary steps for his ordination are to be taken. (*Idem*, Ch. XV.) All the principles and arrangements connected with this peculiarity of the Presbyterian system, are based on the admission that this testimony of the Christian people is an exceedingly important element in ascertaining the fact of every man's call of God, and altogether indispensable in determining his right to be an ordinary instructor or governor, not only of any church in particular, but of all the churches in general. So that the habit of ordaining men without any such evidence, is not only a snare to their consciences, and a grievous departure from the scriptural model, but it is the foundation of a double injury to the Church, in giving to it ministers who have not been able to produce the complete proof of a call of God, and in placing over it instructors and governors who were never chosen by it, and this in total disregard of its own covenanted bond of church union. Nor is it the least remarkable effect of such proceedings, that by this creation of a class of rulers who are invested with power over all the churches, without having a particle of authority in any particular church, a kind of prelatical dominion is established in the bosom of Presbytery, more obscure in the principles on which it rests, and more absurd in the pretensions to which it gives birth, than a moderate Prelacy itself would be, if engrafted upon our system. For it is more rational, and more obvious, that one pastor might be chosen to a permanent presidency over the rest, and then be invested with certain limited and defined, though they were exclusive powers; than that multitudes who are not

pastors at all, should be invested co-ordinately with all the powers of pastors, and rule over congregations to which they bear no definable relations.<sup>1</sup>

The grand object of "the work of the ministry," divinely announced in the very context before us, is "the perfecting of the

<sup>1</sup> I presume it will hardly be questioned that it has always been the common doctrine of all foreign Presbyterian Churches that ministers of the word, when they are ordained, ought to be assigned to some particular ecclesiastical charge; nor that it is the received theory of church order amongst them generally, that the moment such a minister is without an ecclesiastical charge, he is without the least right or power to sit in any church court, or exercise any rule in the Church as a minister of the word. A recent and memorable instance illustrates this in the Church of Scotland. The Rev. Dr. Welsh, who was Moderator of the Scottish Assembly of 1843, and a member of the Free Assembly of 1844, and constituted that body as its presiding officer at its first meeting, sat in both those Assemblies as a ruling elder, by delegation as such; and this notwithstanding he was one of the Theological Professors in the University of Edinburgh. It is well known that the original Secession under *Ebenezer Erskine*, and the subsequent one under *Thomas Gillespie*, in Scotland, had both, but especially the latter, direct relation to the question of ordaining and inducting pastors without a real call. *Witherspoon*, throughout his *Characteristics* and the *Apology* for that work, everywhere holds this proceeding as monstrous in itself, and one cause of the corruption of the Church of Scotland; and this same *Witherspoon* was, more than any other man, the author of our Church Constitution, under which his name is used to justify what he not only abhorred, but had like to have been deposed for ridiculing and denouncing. In the year 1768 the *Secession Church* of Scotland decided this question point blank, that *McAra*, minister at Burntshield, having demitted his charge, and having no charge of any congregation, ought not to sit and judge in any ecclesiastical judicatory, and that his name should be dropped. And in 1773 this decision, upon full consideration, was affirmed upon general grounds as unquestionable Presbyterian doctrine. (See *McKerrow's History of the Secession Church*, pp. 546-51, Glasgow, 1841.) The conclusions and grounds of the Synod are given at large by *McKerrow*; and I must say that it affords a singular gratification to me, to find every general principle therein settled precisely in accordance with all I have contended for in this country in regard to the nature of scriptural Presbyterian order, and the offices of ruling elder and minister of the word; although I did not know of the existence of *McKerrow's* book, nor of this important decision of this question; until after my opinions had been several years published.

saints," "the edifying of the body of Christ" (verse 12). He who cannot in his ministry "build up the saints," cannot have from God any part of "the work of the ministry," least of all that part to which the preaching of the gospel appertains. But, beyond all controversy, the saints are the best of all judges whether the ministrations on which they wait fructify them or not. Their call and their rejection are therefore alike decisive, so far as the case depends on their testimony. Again, he who cannot, in the work of the ministry, edify the body of Christ, cannot be called of God to that ministry. But, surely, the church must decide for itself whether or not it is edified by the ministrations offered to it. Its decision, therefore, is conclusive, so far as the case depends on its call. It is impossible to escape from this direct testimony of the word of life. It does not follow that every man who could edify the church and build up the saints, is therefore called of God to some public ministry; for to labor after both these precious objects, is in some form or other the duty of every member of the household of faith. The *positive* testimony of the Christian people is not therefore conclusive, as I have before shown that two previous testimonies are indispensable. But it is otherwise of its *negative* testimony. Many may have neglected through ignorance to seek this trial of their call, who might have obtained its testimony; and it is doubtless this conviction which justifies us in acting as if their call of God could not be questioned. Many may have obtained it after their ordination; a course dangerous and irregular, but not therefore fatal. But he who cannot obtain it, seems to me to be shut out of the ministry by the direct prescriptions of the word of God. Nor am I able to conceive it possible that any character or amount of proof can sufficiently attest the divine call of any human being to be a Christian pastor, if he is unable to obtain this attestation of the Christian people. For how is it possible for us to believe that he has been appointed of God expressly to perform a particular work, for which nothing but divine grace can fit him, of whom it is made certain that God has not given him the grace needful to the accomplishment of the work?

4. The point which remains to be considered is the relation

which the question of any man's call to the pastoral office bears to those who already hold office, of whatever kind, in the Church of Christ. This is a point so long and so ardently debated in the Christian world, that whoever undertakes to decide upon it rashly must be very presumptuous or very ignorant. Unhappily, there are important differences of opinion in regard to some aspects of it in our own Church, and much excitement and contention have latterly been provoked in its consideration. The principles which I have long adopted and constantly avowed, have not found favor with the party now predominant in the Church; and I have not escaped the common fate of all who ever contended for God's truth against prevailing error and defection. Indeed, I had no right to expect anything else. For men who were almost silent and wholly inactive during the long years that Pelagianism was eating out the vitals of religion in our Church, until others had nearly won the victory; and who stood by in blind or carnal indifference, while Popery was spreading like a flood through the land, until others had roused the public mind to the impending danger, might reasonably be expected to resist the spirit of reform when it touched them with a fury corresponding with their indifference towards errors, which, as they only endangered the Church of God, but did not affect their position, had no terrors for them. This zeal for what is wrong has no more deceived me than their former indifference to what is right; nor does it any more affect my conduct. I confess, with sorrow, that many good men who had a right to speak with plainness and authority, have felt it to be their duty to act towards me and towards this controversy in a manner which has given me great pain. Of these, I will say with David, that their smiting and their reproof "shall be an excellent oil which shall not break my head;" and while my reverence for their persons will not allow me to resent their harshness, my allegiance to our common Master forbids me to turn back from the work he has set before me; since even the burden of their reproaches is as nothing compared with his frown. They are right when they say that I have no title to lead in this or any other matter, that I have no peculiar claims either on the indulgence or affection of the Presbyterian Church, and that she has

more than rewarded me for all I ever did or could do for her. But I think they are wrong—and that the time will come when they will own it—in calling in question my fidelity to that Church, my soundness in her faith, my sincere desire for her purity and success; and especially wrong in traducing me, as if I was not honest in my convictions, and fair and open in all my modes of promoting what I judge to be right. For anything more, it is my part to state the grounds of my opinions, and leave it for the people of God to decide concerning them. Touching this present point, I will proceed to do it, simply and briefly.

As it regards all church power, it cannot be too often repeated that there is none lodged in any human hands otherwise than simply as a trust committed to them by the Lord Jesus. The whole extent of this trust is, that they declare, obey, administer, and enforce in his visible Church, morally and spiritually, the revelation which he has made in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; and the grand rule of all possible official acts is the edification of the body of Christ, the perfecting of his saints. This power is subject to a threefold division, namely, of doctrine, of discipline, of distribution, the administration of the sacraments being in one respect a symbolical teaching, and of course annexed to doctrine;<sup>1</sup> and its exercise is committed to a threefold ministry

---

<sup>1</sup>“Unto the *pastors only* appertains the administration of the sacraments, in like manner as the administration of the word; for both are appointed by God a means to teach us, the one by the ear and the other by the eyes and other senses, that by both knowledge may be transmitted to the mind” (*Second Book of Discipline*, Ch. IV.). I cite this to show two facts: (1) The *ground* upon which the administration of the sacraments belongs to doctrine and not to government; and (2) To show that *pastors only* amongst ordinary officers have this right strictly speaking; and this is still more distinctly asserted in the same venerable formulary (Ch. V.), in which *doctors or teachers*, as such, are declared to be incapable either of statedly preaching the word or administering the sacraments, or celebrating marriage, even though they are confessed to be ordinary, perpetual, and teaching officers on the one hand, and by order, elders on the other. But they are not *pastors*; therefore the Scottish Church excludes them from everything into which our ministers *sine titulo* (which is our nearest approach to that class of officers) not only intrude, but are scandalised at the idea of any one questioning the propriety of their doing so.

of preachers, governors, and distributors, commonly called ministers, elders, and deacons. The whole power ecclesiastical granted by God the Father through the Mediator, Jesus Christ, is granted unto his gathered Church, not to be exercised by it directly, which is neither scriptural nor possible, but by such as have lawfully committed to them the spiritual government of the Church. The order of the Church, that is, its actual government, both in its model and in its action, flows from this power; and the power itself is subject to a twofold use or exercise, or if the expression is preferred, there are two kinds of power which have one and the same authority, ground, and final cause. These two kinds of power are, 1st. That which must be exercised personally and individually by one single officer; and 2dly. That which must be exercised jointly by several officers, constituted into a court of the Church. These two powers are called in ecclesiastical writers and standards the power of *order* and the power of *jurisdiction*. These distinctions and definitions are so simple that it seems impossible to err concerning the matter that may be actually in dispute, how much soever men may differ as to where the truth lies. I assert that the Church has no power except as a trust. If any man disputes this, or the consequences that flow from it, that is well; but let him either admit or deny the fundamental proposition. I assert again that every power of *jurisdiction* is a *joint power*, and that not one of them is capable of exercise by any single person; nor by all persons unitedly, except they are gathered into a court of Christ. Whosoever will, let him dispute this great truth and all its consequences; but let him deal honestly with God and man, and either admit or deny the proposition itself.

Now, since it has pleased God to commit to the deacons no functions but such as may be performed severally by each one of them, he has not constituted any court of his Church out of them; or, in other words, as they have no authority to perform any act

---

So far was the Scottish Church of old from tolerating anything of this sort, that *Baillie* tells us (Vol. I., page 169, *Letters*), in a detailed account of the famous Scottish Assembly of 1638, that "a man who found not a present place, behooved to be deposed, for we would hear of no minister without a place."

of power whose exercise is necessarily joint, they cannot constitute a court in the scriptural sense of one, nor properly sit as members of any court constituted by other office bearers. There is no other reason beside this adequate to explain why deacons may not constitute a court; and when the light of this peculiar feature of the order of God's house, as illustrated in their case, is thrown upon the powers and duties of other office bearers, it reveals with singular clearness the nature and extent of their powers, and the character of the distinction to which they are subject as joint and several powers, or powers of order and powers of rule.

Every minister of the word has the power to preach the gospel and to administer the sacraments by himself, and as a power of order, which cannot, indeed, in its nature and by its terms be exercised jointly, that is, by a court. It is true the extraordinary conduct of many preachers, in dividing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as it were, into three or four separate parts—one person distributing the bread, another the cup, and another perhaps making the prayer, all at the same table—might lead to the belief that this sacrament could be jointly administered, and, therefore, that it did not belong to the power of order, and therefore my distinction and definition are false. The only answer I have to make is, that the practice, however venerable and respectable it may be, can no more be defended than a similar practice could be if applied to the sacrament of baptism, and three or four men were to administer the same baptism. And if it were possible to prove the contrary, the only effect of the proof would be that the sacrament of the Supper could never be administered except by a church court, since every joint power is a power of jurisdiction; whereas it is perfectly clear from God's word that all the courts of the Church put together have no power to perform this particular function, or any other one appertaining to the ministers of the word distributively in their separate right. If it were true, therefore, as appears to be the doctrine of the Seminary at Princeton, that "Presbyterial ordination is ordination by a presbyter or presbyters," it would not only follow, as they immediately assert, that it is not "by a Presbytery in our technical sense of the term;" and also, as they say in the same passage, that any one minister

VOL. XXXV., NO. 3—10.

has a full right to ordain; but it would also follow that no church court, nor any other authority except an individual presbyter, would have any more right to ordain than to preach the gospel or to administer a sacrament, and thus prelatical ordination would be proved by our own teachers of theology to be the only scriptural, valid, or even possible ordination. To adduce as a conclusive reason in support of the exposition which arrives at such a result as this—the argument that as ministers of the word only have authority to preach the gospel, they only can confer that authority—is a very singular instance of mysticism. For, in the first place, such an argument could prove nothing as to the point now in my mind, to wit, the question between ordination by a single person and by a church court; and at the most could only prove that the court must be composed entirely of preachers, and not at all that each of them could separately ordain; which is a doctrine perfectly novel in our Church, denied in our standards, and precisely the opposite of that stated in the Scriptures (1 Tim. iv. 17). And, in the second place, the argument, according to the common testimony of the human race, in all the affairs of life, is, as a general proposition, wholly unfounded; and in spiritual matters it has just the same sense to say a man can ordain another because he is ordained himself, as to say a man can baptize another because he is baptized himself; or to say the formal reason why a man may dispense the Lord's Supper is that it was dispensed to him; as to say the formal reason why he can ordain a minister is that a minister ordained him. And as the question relates to the evidence which is to be furnished, or the authority which is to be conferred upon one seeking to arrive at the conclusion of the matter in regard to his own call to the ministry, it would be altogether preposterous to say that the crowning evidence of a call from God, as contemplated by the Scriptures, though now somewhat varied by prudential human arrangements, is the judgment and the act of any one of the tens of thousands of ordained ministers that the candidate for ordination could get to set him apart to his work. Such doctrines are not in the Bible, nor, God be thanked, *as yet* in our standards.

The final testimony, therefore, which we want, to the fact that



we have been divinely called to preach the everlasting gospel, is that of a divinely constituted spiritual court, met in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and acting by his authority. That such courts are established by God in his word (1 Tim. iv. 14; Acts xv. 2, 4, 6), that ordination, or the solemn setting apart of men to public church offices is a permanent institution (Acts vi. 3, 5, 6; Tit. i. 5; 2 Tim. v. 21, 22), that presbyters are the persons who must compose the courts which ordain (1 Tim. iii. 22; Acts iv. 23, and xiii. 3), that such as are to be ordained must be lawfully called (Rom. xii. 14, 15; Heb. v. 4; John iii. 27), that they must be duly qualified, both as to life and abilities (2 Tim. iii. 2-6; Tit. i. 5-9), that they must be tried and approved by those who ordain them (1 Tim. iii. 7-10; 2 Tim. v. 22), that the ordination is by fasting and prayer with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery (Acts xiii. 2, 3; 1 Tim. iv. 14), these are all matters which are either expressly commanded by God, or are drawn by plain and necessary consequence from what is revealed by him for our guidance in relation to the solemn subject before us. It is thus that the pastors of God's people are to be set apart to his service, and consecrated to him by a high and irrevocable act of official authority, ascertaining and sealing the fact of their divine vocation. I do not presume to say that if this act be unauthorised, that is, if God never called the man whom the court ordains, it has any validity at all in his holy eyes; but outwardly and formally the act, when lawfully performed, is, as it regards all outward relations of the subject, final and conclusive; so much so that the Church may not question the lawful acts of him who is ordained, nor the court repudiate him except by a formal deposition from his office, nor he desert his vocation except under the pressure of irresistible necessity. He is given away to God, to be used in the work of the ministry, for the perfecting of the saints and the edifying of the body of Christ; and this is his grand, perpetual business upon the earth. He is an ambassador for God, called by him, and commissioned in his adorable name. These are awful things. Let no man venture lightly on them. Let no man withdraw himself lightly from them.

Many who have found it easier and more suitable to them to

create prejudices against me than to answer my arguments or to allow me to answer theirs, have taken a good deal of trouble to spread the idea that my principles on the subject of ruling elders tended to subvert entirely the office of minister of the word; that indeed the ordination I contended for was, at last, a lay ordination, and that my whole scheme of church order was a kind of Brownism run mad; while at the same time, and indeed from the same quarters, and in the same publications, opposite prejudices have been appealed to, and my principles denounced as the most stringent form of the highest *jure divino* Presbyterianism. I regret to observe in various publications on the dominant side of this whole controversy, a line of argument which I am not able to reconcile with the belief, in an enlightened mind, of the divine institution of a permanent ministry of any kind. While I utterly reject all such loose and unscriptural opinions, my judgment is that the charge of favoring a lay ordination lies most heavily and justly upon those who, while they persist in calling ruling elders *lay-men*, and in arguing as if they were lay-men, yet concede to them the right to unite in ordering the whole work of ordination, of partaking in every substantial part of that work along with ministers of the gospel, and in short of doing everything except merely imposing hands. Indeed, I do not see how, except upon the principles I have stated, presbyterial ordination, which is, as I believe, past controversy, the ordination of the Scriptures, can be clothed either with a divine, or even with an ecclesiastical authority. If the power exercised in conferring it be held in trust from and for the Lord Jesus, then it is obvious enough that the man is ordained by and upon the authority of Christ; but if it is held or exercised in any other way, then, whatever else is done, it is manifest that the man is not ordained by or upon the authority of Christ; and as Christ's is the only authority which can reach the conscience or the soul, it is further manifest that whatever else the man may get by such an ordination, he cannot get any power to bind any man's conscience or to perform with authority any spiritual act. But if this power be thus held in trust, then all the fine theories about like begetting like, and those only being able to confer rights, who may

exercise the same, and ministers only being able to make ministers, fall into one common mass of learned trash, one vast *caput mortuum* of theological trifling; for, potentially, it is Christ himself who, by the intervention of the stewards of his mysteries, ordains all the office bearers of his Church. And again, if those who exercise in Christ's name this power of ordination, do it as the governing authority in the Church, and because they are invested with the power of rule therein; then it is quite clear that by ordination they may confer rights and powers ecclesiastical, and may bestow upon him who is ordained whatever station or authority is lawful in the Church; but if they ordain as individual persons, or as teachers merely, or in any way except as a church court composed of church rulers, then it is equally clear that, whatever else they may do, they cannot by ordination confer on any one either a *status* in the Church or any right or power ecclesiastical, any more than they could confer them by publicly reading the Scriptures to the man, by preaching to him, or by administering the sacrament of the supper to him. But if this be so, then it is unquestionable that ordination is an official act of high ecclesiastical power, appertaining exclusively to the rulers of the Church, belonging to them as rulers, and therefore to every ruler, and therefore to ruling elders; but capable of being exercised only when and as they are convened in the name and by the authority of Christ as a church court, and when thus performed carrying with it all the ecclesiastical consequences contemplated in the act itself, and furnishing in addition a presumption of the divine vocation of him who is ordained, which must be always great, and which would amount as nearly to conclusive proof as any presumption can, if the commands of Christ were strictly obeyed in the composition and proceedings of these church courts, and if the persons who constitute them were truly what they profess to be.

It is almost superfluous to say that no power or value is attached to the forms or ceremonies of the ordination, except so far as they conduce to decency and order, being thereto appointed of God. The distinction is so obvious between divine and ecclesiastical effects which may or may not concur, that, to Presbyterians,

nothing more is necessary than the simple observation that, although ecclesiastical acts have, when they are lawfully performed, complete ecclesiastical consequences, yet nothing less than the divine power can give to them any spiritual efficiency. Baptism with water unites us to the visible Church; but without the cleansing work of God's Spirit besides, we may be as far as ever from the invisible and spiritual Church. So ecclesiastical ordination makes us pastors of the visible Church, but unless God has called us and sent us, we are but intruders after all.

Nor is it necessary to do more than remark, that the whole of the present chain of reasoning has reference to the ordinary and permanent state of the Church, and to its ordinary and perpetual officers; for extraordinary officers are always raised up in an extraordinary manner, and extraordinary conditions of the Church allow of many things to be done in an extraordinary way, as the Westminster Assembly has defined and proved out of the Scriptures. The blessed Reformation of the sixteenth century may be taken as a very signal example to illustrate that aspect of the subject; and it is well known that the whole body of the Reformers justified all their proceedings in setting up new ecclesiastical organisations upon the ground of their own extraordinary vocation of God to do that very thing. For the form of the argument as between them and Rome constantly was this: "You are not true office bearers, and therefore cannot have a true Church." "We are a true Church, and therefore have true office bearers." And the whole controversy was essentially in the two statements. It is from the Reformed Churches of that glorious era, and from the extraordinary vocation of the men then raised up by God, that we derive outwardly and ecclesiastically our present organisation; and to attempt to trace it back from them through Rome is to deny their fundamental principles, and to build on facts that are palpably false and doctrines that are utterly unscriptural. And it may not be amiss to add that the divine institution of the office of evangelist, as one extraordinary and special, puts it constantly in the power of the Church to spread itself into every part of the earth and into every condition of society where the gospel is not known; as it is the very essence of

that office to be clothed with powers to gather, to erect, and to organise churches, by virtue of an express and extraordinary investiture from the Church itself. This shows very plainly how absurd it is to suppose that men are commonly at liberty to make, or even imagine, extraordinary contingencies, and then assume extraordinary powers; and it also proves the fallacy of the common argument against allowing ruling elders to unite in the ordination of pastors, because, as they say, the less cannot confer power on the greater. And yet pastors, who are but ordinary officers, never imagine that this sophism has allusion to them when they are engaged in ordaining evangelists and clothing them with the whole powers of the Presbytery itself. It is not possible to deny, however, that in many respects the permanent and settled order of the Church is treated as if it were only provisional or accidental; and in none more than in the calling, the settlement, and the translation of pastors. Nothing is more obviously proper, and nothing is more plainly settled in our ecclesiastical standards, than that the calling, settlement, and translation of pastors shall be as really under the care and supervision of the church courts as their ordination; and the clearest provisions for all these are made in detail, so as to prevent any single important step from being taken, except with the knowledge and the consent of Presbytery. But according to the ordinary *practice*—that sacred and venerable substitute for thought, for reason, and for knowledge—the chief action of the Presbytery ordinarily is to register the facts and ordain or instal the preacher; and often the first knowledge it possesses is, that the whole matter has been arranged between one of its congregations and a minister of some other Presbytery, without the consent of either court. One cause of this habitual disregard of the power and authority of the courts is to be found in the very common and dangerous substitution of the relation of *stated supply* for that of pastor; which is itself a result of ordinations *sine titulo*, and of the too common substitution of the office of evangelist for that of minister of the word. But whatever may be the cause of the evil, or whatever its extent, all such irregularities are not only in themselves extremely improper, and in their tendencies fruitful of

mischievous, but they admit of no defence, except one which impeaches the binding obligation of the settled order of the Church, or one which justifies a departure from that order, on the plea that the Church is not in fact in a settled state. There are few, probably, who would openly assume either of these grounds; and the great prevalence of conduct which implies one or other of them is perhaps only another proof of lamentable indifference and inattention to the whole subject.

Much might be said, if it were strictly in place here, upon the great duty incumbent on the church courts to provide in the best manner possible for the training of those who appear to be called to bear office in the Church, and especially those who expect to preach the word, which is the most important duty of all; for in this manner, and by means of the repeated examinations upon which the Presbyteries ought to insist, they can arrive at the most satisfactory conclusion upon the great point they are examining, namely, the reality of a divine call, at the same time that they are training their candidates for the highest degree of usefulness of which they are capable. Neither do I judge it to be proper, in this connexion, to discuss that momentous question—which perhaps it is already too late to debate—the best method of training young men for the gospel ministry. I confess, if it was an original question, I would hesitate about the wisdom of putting theological education on the model it has assumed amongst us; and I am so far from believing that model to be perfect that my firm conviction is the whole business of Theological Seminaries like ours is yet but an experiment, one of the most dangerous and immense experiments ever ventured on by any Church. Thus far, at least, it might be possible still to control the subject, that men trained to the pastoral work, and imbued with the true spirit of that work, should be constantly appointed teachers in these schools; the pastors for the Church being trained by such pastors as the Church had already tried, and was satisfied to have all like them; and so the inherent dangers of the system might be averted, if possible, by the peculiar endowments of those who conduct it. I say this might be possible; but I fear it is so no longer. For the local influence of the Seminaries is already

often superior to that of the church courts; and the Seminary at Princeton gives name to the party which at the present moment supposes itself to be predominant in our Church, while the *Review* edited there is the great light of that party in all its ramifications. In the temples of some of the ancient deities there were oracles to which the worshippers without listened as to the voice of God himself; but those who obtained access to the secret places of the degrading worship perceived that they had adored only a delirious pythoëss. Surely the analogy is not altogether fanciful to those amongst us who suppose the opinions which are manufactured for them always proceed from persons of learning, excellence, and experience amongst them, who, through long and arduous labors in the cause of the blessed Saviour, have acquired at once the evidence of his favor and a title to the affection of his people; when in reality their party oracles are not unfrequently uttered by those whose title and qualification, such as they may be, for guiding the flock of Christ have been acquired amidst deliberate and long-continued alienation from the work to which they had bound their souls and devoted their lives by solemn vows to God and irrevocable covenants with his Church.

III. The particular object of this discourse being to vindicate the divine vocation of the pastors of the Christian Church, and to illustrate the nature of the evidence which has been divinely appointed to establish that vocation, it is not necessary to prolong it by a discussion of the work, the duties, and the qualifications of these pastors; each of which general divisions would require as much to be said to explain and enforce it with any tolerable fidelity as the whole of what has yet been advanced. In every rational contemplation of the question of a divine call—as for the substance of it—the whole pastoral work to which the individual may be looking must be in some good degree properly conceived of both by himself and all others whose decision is to influence his conduct, before either his judgment or theirs can be of any value. I have therefore, in the beginning, set down in a summary way the general compass and nature of this work, under the great functions of the pastoral office. The fixed purpose to discharge with fidelity, with singleness of mind, and as the great

business of life, the solemn, nay awful, duties of the pastor's office, and that as one who is to give an account of souls at the bar of Christ in the great day, is implied in every honest, much less every pious and earnest, endeavor to enter upon this vocation as under the divine requirement; and its existence is assumed as *real* in every favorable decision rendered by the Christian people and the church courts. The qualifications for the office are clearly laid down in the Sacred Scriptures, not only point by point in many detached passages, but also in compact and lucid treatises written by perhaps the greatest of the apostles to his own sons in the ministry, teaching them how and what they ought to preach, and what description of persons, with what kind of endowments, the pastors of the Church ought to be (1 Tim. iii., Tit. i.), and in every examination of the proof whether or not a man be called of God—whether that examination be made by himself, by a congregation, or by a Presbytery—these scriptural qualifications constitute the divine standard of judgment. The fact and the proof of a call of God can therefore never be contemplated apart from the nature of the work to be performed, the duties which its performance will enjoin, and the qualifications declared to be indispensable for their faithful and edifying discharge; however we may, as I have herein attempted, independently of any enlarged or express treatment of them, discuss the reality of such a call, and its nature and indispensable necessity, together with the character and amount of proof required to establish its existence in any particular case, and the persons and tribunals who are to render binding decisions upon that evidence, and give to it, by election and ordination, official sanctions and seals.

But there are some general considerations growing out of the subject as it has been presented which are of very great importance, and may be briefly stated. The first is the necessity of arousing the attention of God's people more generally and more earnestly to the fact that the order of his house is not a question left to us, but is one distinctly settled by himself. The Lord Jesus Christ is King in Zion; the whole model and working of his kingdom are matters of revelation; the complete execution of the mission of his Church is absolutely impossible, until she



puts away all carnal devices and puts on the whole armor of light; and we have no more warrant from God to make a church government for him and in his name than to make any other part of his religion. It is idle to talk about church government being *jure divino* in its great principles and not in its details; or as they say, in the *abstract* and not in the *concrete*. The truth is, it is both; for not only are the great principles laid down for us, but the officers and the courts are named; the nature and duties of the one, the qualifications, vocation, and powers of the other are set forth; the relations of all the parts to each other and to the whole are precisely set forth. A government in general, the kind of government in particular, the officers and courts in special, their duties and powers in detail—this is what God has set before us, by revelation, for the Christian Church. And while there is no part of his revealed will concerning which his professed people have been in general and in all ages more foolishly and sinfully heedless, and none by neglecting which and walking in the light of their own eyes, they have more uniformly or more sorely come to trouble, there was never perhaps a period when it was more important to their interest and more clearly incumbent upon them, as faithful to the kingly rights and office of the Lord Jesus, than it is at the present moment, that they should come back to the simplicity and power of the heavenly institutions which they have defiled by their additions and defaced by their mutilations, and build once more, purely and precisely after the model sent down from God. The institutions of man have lost their power; it is time to try again those of our covenanted Saviour. The human mind is tossed to and fro between the extremes of fanatical licentiousness and Popish despotism; it is time for the banner of the free and glorious commonwealth of Israel to be boldly advanced to the forefront of the battle. The barriers of the nations are broken down, the dust of centuries thickens over the shrines of all false gods, the ruins of falling temples and idols send forth the sound of their destruction from the utmost depths and the farthest verge of the kingdom of Satan upon earth. Let us rise up and put on our strength, and in the name of the King eternal possess this vast heritage. Who

knoweth whether we are come into the kingdom for such a time as this; or whether, if we altogether hold our peace at this time, though God bring enlargement and deliverance from another place, we and the Church of our fathers may not be destroyed? (Esther iv. 14.)'

This still more forcibly presents the extreme importance of those reforms which immediately relate to our own interior condition. What can such ministers do for us as have mistaken their calling? What good is to be expected of such as have falsely intruded into a work for which they have no heart? What can the best of our ministers do without a charge? What can our hundreds of vacant congregations do without pastors? The first office in the Church of God for dignity, importance, and usefulness, is the pastor's office. If matters go ill with us here, the action of every part of the system is impeded. There is a great class of our ministers—perhaps the most meritorious class of all—who are struggling with poverty and toiling amid a thousand cares and discouragements in pursuits they would willingly avoid, and all that they may by these means be still enabled to preach Christ. These noble and beloved men need and deserve more of their flocks; and the Church at large ought to look more diligently after the comfortable maintenance of the great body of its pastors, equalising better the general support, and discountenancing sternly the metropolitan excess and luxury which are beginning to show themselves in divers places. Unsettled ministers ought to be urged more and more to take pastoral charges, and vacant congregations to settle pastors. Ministers who are immersed in pursuits inconsistent with their vows ought to be subjected to discipline, and be compelled to do the proper work of their calling; or if they will not, let them be deposed. There is doubtless a large class of employment eminently suitable to such ministers as are disabled in the service of the Church, or by advancing years or by bodily infirmities; and these they can gracefully and most usefully adorn, but it is an injury to this most deserving class, as well as a reproach to the name of a Christian minister, for men in the vigor of life, in the perfection of their powers, and without any previous service to the Church, to be

crowding into situations which withdraw them from their proper work, which they cannot fill with a good conscience, and which in a sort belong to others as at once an honorable refuge and a useful charge. And perhaps above all other practical reforms we need the most one in regard to the improvident ordination of ministers of the gospel; a reform which shall put an absolute end to all ordinations *sine titulo*, which shall limit the ordination of evangelists strictly and truly to persons who will be evangelists, which shall constantly demand sufficient evidence of a man's call and fitness before the irrevocable step of his ordination is taken. It is impossible to deny that we have erred, as a Church, grievously, on all these points. The controversy which ended in the schism of 1838 was one of the fruits of those errors; and unless something effectual can be done to arrest their continued operation, it is as obvious to me now that the Church must relapse into some condition analogous to that from which it was so lately extricated, or submit to another convulsion, as it was in 1831 that its total corruption or speedy reform had become inevitable. It is this deep conviction which has filled me with that anxious solicitude to see the office of ruling elder, as one of the grand safeguards of the Church, restored to its scriptural position, and induced me to take the course in regard to that controversy which has subjected me to a system of attack altogether as ferocious as that I had to encounter during the Semi-Pelagian controversy, and what is not to be forgotten, in part from the very same quarters. My trust, my principles, my aims, and to some extent my opponents, are the same now as ten years ago. I certainly do not mean to assert that the Church is exposed to a danger so great or so immediate as she was in 1831; nor that her present condition is analogous to what her condition was at that period. I thank God that neither of these things is true. But unless I greatly deceive myself, the whole state of opinion upon the subject of church order has sensibly receded from the truth since 1838; and the decisions of the Assemblies of 1843 and 1844, coupled with prevailing practices touching the ordination and employment of ministers of the word, afford ample ground for serious inquietude to all who believe in the divine authority of Pres-

byterian church order. For I believe it will be impossible for the most diligent student of antiquity to produce any thing in the early Church half so broad as a foundation for the first beginnings of Prelacy to be erected upon, as the decisions of those two Assemblies furnish. And I mourn to add that the reasonings and conclusions in the former of those Assemblies have not been more decidedly condemned by the stricter sort of Presbyterians than they have been applauded by the highest Puseyite Prelatists. I have not the smallest idea of imputing wrong intentions to any church court, nor of pursuing any irregular or even divisive measures in attempting to correct decisions which I consider extremely dangerous, or to redress measures which I have felt to be both unprecedented and oppressive. Nevertheless I shall not fail, if the Lord will give me grace, of an earnest endeavor in the present as in the former controversy to acquit myself to my friends as a faithful ally, to my opponents as an honest man, to the Church as a diligent office bearer, and to my Master as a servant who values nothing in comparison with his approval.

One of the most impressive considerations suggested by this solemn topic, is the extreme importance to the people of God that they should have pastors after his own heart. The distinct reservation to himself of the vocation and mission of pastors proves to us the importance he attaches to them, the tender care he exercises over his flock, and the utter impossibility of any means or preparation that is less than divine accomplishing the end intended in their institution. When we consider, moreover, the copiousness, the variety, and the conclusiveness of the proof which he has required his people to demand, in order that they may be satisfied that he has indeed raised up their pastors, it is manifest that the subject must be environed with difficulties of a peculiar kind, and that exact obedience to God's positive institutions is the only security we can have, that we are not deceived ourselves, and that we are not helping to delude others. There are few denunciations in the sacred oracles more emphatic or more reiterated than those against false teachers; and even the apostolic office was not free from the intrusion of those who being tried by the flock of Christ were found liars (Rev. ii. 2). No reproach to

religion is so grievous as unworthy ministers; the poison which is most fatal to the Church is that which is distilled in the vessels of the sanctuary; a bad life is the very worst heresy to which a religious teacher can give currency; and unconverted pastors are the sorest curse which can fall upon the flock of Christ. And these are the very things we are justified in expecting, when we lightly esteem the agency of God in this great work and presumptuously set aside the means he has provided against their occurrence. On the other hand, in the very distinctness of his divine appointments, we perceive how surely it is his purpose to keep covenant with those who will keep covenant with him. His arm is not shortened, his ear is not heavy, nor is it in him that it is possible for us to be straitened. The ascension gifts of him in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, are not exhausted; and he who spared not his only begotten Son has nothing beside too costly to bestow. And of all outward gifts there is not one more precious and indispensable than pastors sent of God; since, as they cannot preach except they be sent, so neither can we hear except they preach, nor believe unless we hear, nor call on him in whom we believe not, nor be saved except we call on the name of the Lord (Rom. x. 13, 14). Oh, then, how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth! (Isa. lii. 7.) And he will reign in the heavens which have received him until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the world began (Acts iii. 21); and then will the Lord himself descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God (1 Thess. iv. 16); and then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father (Matt. xiii. 43), and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever (Dan. xii. 3). Oh, what a work is it to win souls for Christ! What a blessedness to stand with them close by the glorious high throne of the exalted Redeemer in the great day! What a reward to dwell with them,

in his presence, in his fruition to all eternity! Oh, that God would shed forth upon us abundantly the spirit of this work! Then indeed would the set time to favor Zion have come, and the glory of the Lord be risen upon her! (Ps. cii. 13-22; Isa. lx. 1-5.)

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### THE EVANGELIST IN FOREIGN FIELDS.<sup>1</sup>

The Committee appointed to prepare an answer to the overture touching the powers of the evangelist in foreign fields sent down by the Assembly of 1883, would present the following recommendation to the Presbytery of Lexington, based upon the following grounds:

The overture (see Minutes of Assembly, p. 60) is that—

Chapter IV., Section II., Paragraph 6, Book of Church Order, be so altered as that after the word "ordain," it shall read: "to all the offices required to make them complete; and also with a view to the extension of the Church, he has power in foreign fields to ordain other evangelists."

The Committee recommend that this overture be answered in the affirmative, with a restriction imposed by the addition of some expression limiting the power of the evangelist in the home field to the organisation of churches and the ordination and instalment of ruling elders and deacons, and recognising the just relation of the joint power of the Church to the work in the evangelistic field, both foreign and domestic.

The first principle which bears upon the subject is the well recognised principle of the parity of the ministry. The term "office" is frequently applied to designate both the evangelist and the pastor. Such an application is, however, loose and inaccurate: the office of both is nothing more nor less than the one equal office of the Christian ministry. In strict accuracy of speech, the term

---

<sup>1</sup> This Report is published in accordance with the request of the Presbytery of Lexington.

“office” is not properly applied at all in the designation of either evangelist or pastor. The term “evangelist,” like the term “pastor,” represents a relation and not an office; both describe a relation in which an office is exercised, but not the office itself. In the Presbyterian system, the office of the ministry is absolutely one and equal; but it is exercised in different relations, for the regulation of which the written Constitution of the Church provides, allotting certain duties which may and must be done in a certain relation by one minister which cannot be done by any other minister in a different relation, though their office be absolutely one and the same ministerial capacity. As examples of this arrangement, the pastor of a church is required ordinarily to moderate the Session; no other minister, though holding the same ministerial office, can assume the function unless specially invited to do so. The moderator of a Presbytery or a Synod has duties assigned him which no other member of the court can do. It is clear that the only modification of the co-equal powers of the one ministerial office recognised in our system is dependent upon the relation in which the office is exercised as regulated by the Constitution.

The term “evangelist,” like the term “pastor,” defines one of these relations determined by the Constitution, but not an office. The pastoral relation defines the use of the ministerial office under a fixed connexion with one or more settled churches. The term “evangelist” defines the use of the ministerial office under an unfixed relation to regions yet to be furnished with the gospel. Both of these relations are absolutely necessary to the work of the Church of God. The grand end of the organised Church is to propagate the gospel in order that men may be saved—to propagate it more and more deeply in the souls of the saints; to propagate it on a scale limited only by the conversion of the whole world, in all regions beyond its own pale. This one grand end involves as a matter of necessity the two great duties of maintaining all ground won and of perpetually winning new conquests. The maintenance of the ground already gained develops the necessity for a fixed employment of the ministerial office, and determines the relation of pastor. The perpetual obligation to extend

her conquests develops the necessity of a regular and sustained system of aggressive labor in fields unreached by the gospel, and develops the relation of evangelist. Both of these relations are indispensable to the work of the Church, and both are as permanent and obligatory in the policy of the Church as the work which has been given her to do.

The question raised by the overture concerns the power of the evangelist in foreign parts to ordain pastors in churches founded among the heathen and native evangelists to extend the work still farther beyond. The amendment proposed contains two distinct clauses: one empowering the evangelist, already authorised to organise churches and ordain elders and deacons, to complete the organisation, which can only be done by the ordination and installation of pastors; the other empowering him to ordain other evangelists. The question to be settled in the answer to the overture is whether there is any power in the evangelist to ordain ministers and determine the relations in which the office is to be exercised. This involves the investigation of the nature and origin, grounds and limits of the power.

It is admitted he has power to ordain ruling elders and deacons: this is fully recognised in the Book. The power to ordain to all offices is essentially the same. What, then, is the nature and origin of this power? Two theories, or perhaps more correctly three theories, exist on the subject. One makes the power inherent in the office of the ministry in the relation of evangelist developed by the exigencies of his work, or, as some prefer to express it, under the absolute necessities of the work. The second theory makes it in all cases the delegated joint power of Presbytery, and denies altogether the implied several power in the office of the ministry in any relation. The third theory, if distinct at all from the first, affirms the several power as co-existing with the joint power—ordinarily yielding precedence to it, yet available for use whenever really needed. It is conceived by some advocates of the several power that it emerges only under the pressure of an absolute necessity. Beyond all doubt the exigencies of the work both at home and abroad often make the power already recognised in the evangelist to ordain elders and deacons highly important,



in a certain high and material sense necessary to the work with which the evangelist is charged. But it is dangerous to the hope of establishing the several power to condition it on an absolute necessity. Such a necessity would undoubtedly develop the power. To deny this would affirm that the Church did not possess the power indispensable to do her work. This admission would be too absurd for a moment's credit. But in point of fact no such necessity exists, nor is it at all essential to assert it.

Joint power may always be made available in the field of the evangelist in two ways—generally by both, always by one. It may be made available under suitable constitutional arrangements, whenever two or more evangelists are in the same field. It may always be made available, even when there is but one evangelist in the field, by the delegation of the joint power of the Presbytery. This method is equally available when there are two or more evangelists in the field. The Constitution distinctly provides for the appointment of commissions for judicial and other business, and the power is articulately granted for commissions to ordain. If not, it would be easy to provide it, and constitute the evangelist a commission of Presbytery. In fact, this seems to be the view of some advocates of the overture, and indeed of the very parties who have offered the overture to the consideration of the Church. They say in so many words, after quoting the paragraph proposed to be amended: "It is the joint power of the Presbytery delegated to him." Joint power delegated to a single individual does not change its nature or cease to be joint power.

It is obvious that such a déléation of joint power is essentially different from a true several power inherent in the office of the ministry in the relation of evangelist; and only emerging under the exigencies of his work. The advocates of this several power in the ministerial office suppose it to be determined by the relation in which the office is exercised, and only determined in that relation by the real and commanding necessities of their work. The majority of the evangelists in Brazil who have proposed this overture giving power to the foreign evangelist to ordain, speaking by Mr. Boyle in his late pamphlet, construe this second method to be the one dictated in the existing provision of the Book touch-

ing the evangelist at home and abroad, even in the ordination of ruling elders and deacons. They construe the word "entrusted" as synonymous with "delegated," and consequently recognise the power in the evangelist as already defined in the Book, as a delegated joint power and not as a power inherent in the office of the ministry in the relation of evangelist. If this construction is correct, it would seem to be altogether superfluous in them to discuss the question of several power at all: joint power is available and actually provided for even in the case of elders and deacons. The power of the evangelist in all ordinations is joint power delegated by the Presbytery. Whether the evangelist is construed by this theory as generally endowed with this joint power by the mere force of his appointment as evangelist, or whether it is supposed he must apply for it in every case where there is call for the use of it, it is joint power delegated; and as this delegation is possible to any evangelist under any circumstances, with delay and injury to the work it may be, but still possible, it follows that the several power of the evangelist to ordain cannot be construed as developed under that form of necessity which may be properly demonstrated a necessity absolute. On this account some who are jealous of any discount of the fundamental principle of the Presbyterian system—government by joint power—are disposed to regard any ascription of a several power of ordination in the evangelist as not only superfluous, but as incapable of any recognition whatever. They regard the recognised power of the evangelist to ordain ruling elders and deacons at home and abroad as delegated joint power entrusted to the evangelist and as in no sense a several power of the ministerial office in the relation of evangelist, developed by any necessity in his work absolute or less imperative.

But the question cannot be settled in this peremptory fashion for weighty reasons. In the first place, a necessity less than absolute may develop the several power in question. An absolute necessity is one which exists where no other resource is available. Another form of necessity exists which springs from the want of proper availability in another resource existing, but not adjusted to the actual demands of a work at a given crisis. Yet another

form of necessity is created by the best interests of a work, and any organised association of men is defectively organised when their powers are so granted as not to permit the maintenance of the best interest of their work. That some necessity does exist for the use of the evangelist in the ordination of elders and deacons, is already recognised in the Book in the paragraph to be amended. Yet, as we have already seen, this necessity is not an absolute necessity, for joint power is available by delegation. It is clear, then, the necessity recognised by the Book is a necessity of the second or third form just defined, or of both combined. It is a necessity springing from the want of prompt availability in another resource existing or from the best interests of the work. The very purpose for which the evangelist is sent out is to found the Church. He must have power either in his office and relation, or as delegated to him, or his mission is an absurdity. If he cannot do it in the exercise of his office and relation, his office and relation would seem to be defective. If he must refer back in every case to the Presbytery to receive a delegation of power, inconvenience and injurious delay must always embarrass and frequently seriously interfere with his work. Every time he has to organise a church or ordain an elder or a deacon, he must from the foreign field send back thousands of miles and wait on the meeting of Presbytery, it may be for half a year before he can act. The Book has settled the point that even in the home field, where less violence of pressure is on the work, it is for the interest of the Church that the evangelist should be empowered to act. The necessity is not absolute in the absence of any other resource available, but a commanding necessity in the interests of the work, and in the more ready utility of another resource equally in reach. Denying the several power, the work must frequently be seriously embarrassed.

That a necessity less than absolute may develop the several power is evident also from the analogy of office in the civil sphere. So long as the colonel of a regiment commissioned by the civil government to command in action is able to be at his post, no subordinate officer has a right to assume his authority. But if he falls, the next in rank is required to take his place. If that

subordinate falls, the next in rank below assumes the command, and so *seriatim* down to the lowest office in the series. The necessity for this is real and commanding, and often indispensable to the public service. Yet it is not an absolute necessity; for the commander in chief may order another officer of rank similar to the rank of the fallen leader to take his place, thus superseding the assumption by the next in rank and the succession of the whole series. In like manner no absolute necessity in the absence of any other resource is needful to develop the several power of the evangelist: it may be developed by a form of necessity less imperative, though equally real and equally practical in the interests of the Church.

But does not the language of the Book preclude the conception of a several power developed by no matter what form of necessity by asserting the power to ordain elders and deacons to be delegated joint power? It is so supposed by the authors of the present overture; but it is by no means unquestionable. The language of the Book is, "and to him may be intrusted power to organise churches and ordain ruling elders and deacons therein." Our Book is new and the meaning of many of its terms has not yet been determined by the construction of the courts. To construe the word "entrust" as synonymous with "delegate," or as necessarily involving a delegation of power, is, to say the least of it, not immediately obvious. To "entrust" may refer to discretion in the use of power already existing as well as to delegation of power. It is possible to trust or not trust the discretion of an agent who may be recognised as having full power to do a thing. It is one thing to delegate power; it is another to trust discretion, and the latter expression recognises power as existing. If the word "entrust" refers to discretion, it seems to recognise a power in the evangelist independent of delegation. If the several power does exist, either by the necessities of the case or by the authority of scripture precedent as we hope to show, the language of the Book must refer to discretion in the agent. In all cases where joint power is delegated as it may be even though the several power is recognised as co-ordinate or co-existing with it—in such cases the "entrust" of the evangelist will imply both the delegation of power and the discretion to use it.

It is obvious, then, that the language of the Book is not necessarily to be construed as merely delegation of power, and consequently is not to be construed as definitely repudiating the several power. It may involve in certain cases a delegation of power; it may embrace the notion of a delegation of power in part, but only in part. It also involves the notion of discretion and with this carries the recognition of a power existing independent of special delegation. The language of the Book ought always to be construed in consistency with the precedents of Scripture, the necessities of the work of building up the kingdom, and the most efficient use of all the powers granted to the Church or implied in those grants. We conclude, then, from the nature of the work committed to the evangelist, that its necessities warrant the recognition of a power in the office of the ministry in the relation of evangelist to organise churches and ordain ruling elders and deacons therein.

But a still more effective argument may be drawn from the precedents of the Scriptures, which not only clearly vindicate the power of the evangelist to ordain to the office of the elder and the deacon, but to the office of the teaching elder which is sought to be recognised in the overture of the Assembly—precedents which not only vindicate the use of the power by the evangelist, but clearly define the nature of the power as several in the office, and not merely limited as a delegation of joint power. These precedents are presented in the cases of Timothy and Titus. It is universally admitted that these two apostolic men held the same office, and discharged it in the same relation, whatever this office and relation might be. Titus was left in Crete by Paul “to set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every church.” The character of these elders is defined, among other qualifications, by being “able by sound doctrine to exhort and convince gainsayers,” as teaching elders. Timothy is besought to abide at Ephesus and entreated “to lay hands suddenly on no man,” and to commit the things heard from Paul to faithful men “who shall be able to teach others also.” It is clear, then, that Timothy and Titus were empowered to ordain singly, not only elders who ruled well, but those who were to minister

in word and doctrine. Their ordination of deacons is also clear on the face of the record. What function did they exercise in these ordinations? Four theories in explanation are proposed. The first of these is the Episcopal or Prelatic theory, which makes Timothy the Bishop of Ephesus and Titus the Bishop of Crete, exercising the power of a modern diocesan in a regular diocesan relation. This view is advocated by vast numbers of Episcopal scholars and may be termed the standard view of the Episcopal Church. The second theory represents them as acting under an extraordinary commission to exercise the delegated power of the apostle under whose orders they acted. A third theory construes them as doing the work in their recognised functions as evangelists, construed as an extraordinary office. These last two views are advocated by numbers of writers, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Romanist, some preferring one, and some the other, but all agreed in repudiating the Episcopal theory and in construing the function exercised as extraordinary—as an extraordinary delegation of apostolic authority, or the legitimate use of an extraordinary office. This third theory is held by Willett and Stillingfleet, by the Jesuit Salmeron, and by other adherents of the Prelatic system.

This is the view taken by the celebrated Dr. John M. Mason in his controversy with Hobart. After consenting to the enumeration by his antagonist of the acts of Timothy and Titus at Ephesus and Crete, he says they “could do all these things without being diocesan bishops. An apostle could do them in virtue of his apostolic office; an evangelist as Timothy,<sup>1</sup> and consequently Titus, undoubtedly was, could do them in virtue of his office as an evangelist, and yet be very unlike a diocesan bishop.” He says again: “In ordaining presbyters he was doing the work of an evangelist.”<sup>2</sup> Again he says in a general conclusion of his argument touching the official character of Timothy and Titus: “What were they then? We answer, they were extraordinary officers known in the apostolic Church by the name of evangelists; and employed as travelling companions and assistants of the

---

<sup>1</sup> See 2 Tim. iv. 5, Dr. Mason's Works, Vol. 2, p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> Mason's Works, Vol. 2, p. 195, *Ibid* pp. 200, 201.

apostles in propagating the gospel. For this purpose their powers, like those of the apostles, were extraordinary ; their office, too, was temporary, and therefore their superiority over presbyters is no precedent nor warrant for retaining such superiority in the permanent order of the Church." He then proceeds to cite the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius in support of his position. "And moreover very many of the disciples of that day travelled abroad and performed the work of evangelists, ardently ambitious of preaching Christ to those who were yet wholly unacquainted with the doctrine of faith, and to deliver to them the Scriptures of the divine Gospels. These having merely laid the foundations of the faith and ordained other pastors, committed to them the cultivation of the churches newly planted, while they themselves, supported by the grace and co-operation of God, proceeded to other countries and nations."<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that in the time of Paul, and afterwards of Eusebius, evangelists did singly ordain pastors, and in the case of the evangelists mentioned by Eusebius there is no pretence even of "delegated power." It will not be necessary to discuss at length the theory of the function of Timothy and Titus as exercising an extraordinary delegation of apostolic power. It is sufficient to observe that if it were delegated power, it was not delegated joint power ; it was power inhering in a single supreme authority. It may be also remarked that nothing in the record carries this idea of delegation. The language of entreaty used to Timothy is positively inconsistent with the notion of delegation. The more positive form of command used to Titus—"as I had appointed thee"—is altogether as consistent with the recognition of the power in Titus as with a delegation to him. But the conclusive argument is found in the real nature of the evangelist function. If in reply to the theory of the evangelist as an extraordinary office, we can make it appear that the exercise of the function of evangelist is an ordinary and permanent function of church power, it would be superfluous to discuss it as an extraordinary delegation of the power of the apostleship. It would have been

---

<sup>1</sup> Mason's Works, Vol. 2, p. 201.

a superfluous delegation of power, if the power of Timothy and Titus as evangelists carries all the power which was needed.

The discussion of the point stated brings up the fourth theory already classified. This theory is that the function of the evangelist is not an extraordinary one, but a regular and permanent function in which it is necessary the Church should do its work in regions beyond its pale. That the work of the evangelist is not extraordinary, but a regular part of the Church's work, admits of no dispute. The relation is determined necessarily by the obligation of the Church to advance its conquests perpetually in the regions beyond its pale; this purpose cannot be executed without an organ to do it, and marks the office as regular and permanent. The regular and ordinary character of the evangelist is a recognised principle in the Presbyterian system and standards. Dr. Mason altogether mistakes its true nature when he pronounces it extraordinary. He seems to have felt it to be necessary so to define it, in order to avoid the concession to the Prelatic theory of the diocesan character of Timothy and Titus on the one hand, or on the other to sacrifice the fundamental principles of the Presbyterian system—the parity of the ministry and the government of the Church by joint powers. But neither of these alternatives was at all necessary. The diocesan theory of the official character of Timothy, and consequently of Titus, is set aside by the direct title of evangelist given to Timothy; by the migratory character of their work as close attendants on the apostles in their travels whereas the diocesan bishop is confined to a certain fixed district; by the special form of expression used by Paul in assigning them to the service to be rendered in Ephesus and Crete; and emphatically by the pointed ascription of the episcopal function to the presbyters of Ephesus by Paul himself when he met them at Miletus.

That no danger is involved to the fundamental principles of the Presbyterian system, the parity of the ministry and government by joint power, either or both, is evident under the following consideration. The several power stands based upon a clear scriptural precedent in Timothy and Titus. It is thus demonstrated to be entirely consistent with the principle of joint



power elsewhere established in the Scriptures and permanently co-existent with it. It consequently is entirely distinct from Prelatic power. The prejudice existing among us against the several power in ordination as essentially identical with Prelatic power is founded altogether in the mistake that the exercise of power by individual offices identifies the power and confounds the offices. But this is obviously a misapprehension. The power of a magistrate is different from the power of a sheriff, though each is exercised by a single person. The power of an absolute monarch is different from the power of a prime minister, though each acts singly in the discharge of his function. The power of one is the supreme power lodged in the crown by the law of the realm; the power of the other is the power granted under law to a specified office; and the circumstance that each power is singly exercised cannot possibly identify the power as the same. A colonel and a corporal can both control a thing falling within the authority of the subordinate; but although exercised about the same thing, and singly exercised, the power of the one officer cannot be confounded with the other. It is obvious that the mere circumstance of a single exercise of two kinds of power cannot confound the difference in the nature of the power. The power of a prelate is the power of a superior order with authority to appoint to all inferior offices. The power in the evangelist is a power common to one equal order, and claims no superiority in the exercise. It is the power of rule which inheres in an equal office, a power ordinarily to be exercised jointly, yet capable of single exercise in special conditions, according to the precedents of Timothy and Titus. If the power of a colonel and a corporal are competent to do the same thing in a certain class, although different, so the power of an evangelist and the power of a prelate may be competent to do the same thing, and yet be different. The one feature in common—single exercise—cannot possibly, logically, involve any identification of the power employed.

It is no offence to the parity of the ministry, for the office of the evangelist is the one office of the ministry, and the difference in its exercise is due only to the difference of relation and the conditions of the work. It is no offence to the principle of joint

power, because it only emerges in the absence or in the lack of a suitable availability of joint power, and as an alternative resource when the exigencies of the Master's service demand it. If Paul did not delegate his apostolic power to Timothy and Titus, and recognised in their function as evangelists the full competence to do the work in Ephesus and Crete, he nevertheless might have done so, his not doing so did not at all prejudice his power and right to do it. Both resources were available to him and he had choice of either. By a parity of reasoning it may be competent to a Presbytery to delegate its joint power; but if the power is also determined by the relation of the evangelist and certain conditions of his work, it is evident the Church is possessed of two resources, either of which may be employed according to the expediences of the case. Both of them ought to be recognised and regulated by regular constitutional enactments. Neither ought to be abandoned, and the Church ought to secure the use of either, as the best interests of the work may demand. The power of the evangelist ought to be recognised in due deference to the scripture precedent of Timothy and Titus, and on account of those practical exigencies which may emerge in the progress of the great work of founding the Church when the use of this power, if not absolutely necessary, may nevertheless be of eminent practical necessity. The joint power also exists, and as the grand permanent and universal principle of government in an established Church state, will and ought ordinarily to take precedence of the contingent and remote several power of the evangelist. But while arrangements ought to be made for the use of this joint power by delegation, settling its method and securing its precedence, it ought not to be so placed and construed as to extinguish the single power of the evangelist, as recognised in the precedents of Scripture, and sometimes signally vindicated in its superior practical usefulness. The power to create a commission for the employment of joint power is already clearly recognised in the law of the Church. The use of the other may be gained by this overture.

It is obvious, then, as a general conclusion, both from the practical necessities of the work of founding the Church and from the

precedents of the Scriptures, that the power of the evangelist "to organise churches and ordain elders and deacons therein" is capable of vindication as a several as well as a delegated joint power. If therefore the evangelist is competent in several power to organise a church in part, there would seem to be no good reason why he should not complete it. If competent to ordain ruling elders and deacons, which is ordinarily to be done by joint power, why not to ordain teaching elders? The precedent of Timothy and Titus is emphatically a precedent for the ordination of teaching elders and bishops by the evangelist. The success of the evangelist's work in the foreign field is mainly dependent upon the ordination of pastors in the churches organised by him. Without a teaching elder in the relation of pastor, the organisation is incomplete, and the deficiency is in the very office by which its main work is to be done. Without the power of the evangelist is equally extended to the ordination and installation of ministers as pastors as well as to the ordination of ruling elders and deacons, a church may be founded in a heathen land and remain incapable of discharging the main business of a church for want of an organ to do it much longer than would be at all consistent with its duty or its interests; or else must resort to the power of other churches laboring among the heathen, to complete its needful organisation. Surely neither of these results is to be contemplated as emerging in the regular course of our work as a Church without feeling an imperative call to prevent it. It would seem, then, that the first clause in the overture looking to the ordination of ministers as pastors is supported by the precedents of Scripture, and rests upon the same logical ground with the ordination of elders and deacons, only intensified in force, and consequently should be answered in the affirmative. Every reason which would justify the paragraph proposed to be amended as it now stands in the Book would justify the first clause in the amendment proposed by the overture.

If the power proposed to be recognised in the first clause is admitted, it will be comparatively easy to settle the legitimacy of the power proposed to be recognised in the second. This second clause provides for the power of the evangelist to ordain other

evangelists in the foreign field, with a view to the more rapid extension of the Church and the greater extension of his own usefulness. The first clause empowers him to ordain and instal ruling elders, deacons, and pastors in the foreign field; the second, to ordain other evangelists, all under the same proviso, the want of any properly available joint power and the necessities of the Master's work among the perishing multitudes. Now, if the evangelist is competent to ordain and instal a native pastor in a heathen land, assuredly the main difficulty in his ordination of native evangelists is swept away. He can ordain to the ministerial office and set it to work in a particular pastoral relation, why may he not ordain to the same office for employment in a different relation under the same general proviso which authorised the other? In the Presbyterian mind, fixed as it is in the conviction of joint power in ordination as in other functions of government, the main difficulty is to recognise the single power to ordain to the office; and the settlement of the relation in which the office is to be exercised is a purely subordinate question. If the one is allowed to the evangelist, it would seem to be superfluous to deny him the other. If he is not only allowed to ordain to the office, but to establish a pastoral relation in which it is to be exercised, it would appear to be an unnecessary nicety to refuse him the power to ordain to its exercise in a relation, to say the most of it, of no dignity superior to the relation of pastor. The second clause in the amendment is justified by the same reasons and to the same extent which justify the first.

It is clear from the relation between the regular joint power of the Church and the several power of the evangelist, the use of the former ought to be supreme and exclusive of the latter in all cases where the availability of the joint power is equal or superior to the availability of the several power, or in other words in all cases where there is no real and commanding necessity for the use of the inferior power. This principle will limit the power of the evangelist in the home field to the ordination of ruling elders and deacons, and prohibit his ordination of ministers, while it will admit of the ordination of all by the foreign evangelist. Ministers may be ordained in the home field at a dis-

tance from the churches of which they are to take charge, and be installed afterwards by a commission or a committee. It is therefore proper to require their ordination by joint power and prohibit it to the evangelist. Elders and deacons, on the contrary, are to be ordained and installed on the ground, and their ordination may be properly committed to the evangelist in frontier settlements and in the destitute parts of the Church at home. Both ministers and other officers in foreign fields are not easily accessible to the regular joint power of the Church, and their ordination may be properly committed to the evangelist employing either the single power of his office and relation or the delegated joint power of the Church. The difference in the practical necessities of each case will properly determine in all cases the power and procedure to be employed. Where two or more powers are granted to the Church, she may employ either. She can lawfully employ no power except what is granted by her Head; but she can use all granted by him as the policy of each case may determine.

To prevent any obscuration of the power of the domestic evangelist to ordain ruling elders and deacons which might be the result of adding the words of the overture as now arranged, and to prohibit his ordination of ministers which would be equally granted by the words as proposed to be inserted to the home as to the foreign evangelist, it would be advisable to make some change in the arrangement. Instead of blotting out the words "ruling elders and deacons therein" and inserting the addition proposed after the word "ordain," leave the words as they now stand, which will clearly define the power of the home evangelist, and insert after the word "therein" the words "and in foreign fields native ministers also, both as pastors and evangelists, when necessary." The clause would then read: "Ordain ruling elders and deacons therein, and in foreign fields native ministers also, both as pastors and evangelists, when necessary."

To these words the Committee recommend the addition of the following paragraph, in order to recognise and define the relation of the joint power of the Church to the evangelistic fields both domestic and foreign; they also recommend that the Assembly

be requested to have the necessary steps taken to have this addition appended to the amended form of the overture: "Provided that, in the ordination of native ministers as pastors and evangelists, no joint power is available in timely consistency with the best interests of the work; and where two or more evangelists are in the same field, no such ordination shall be accomplished unless by the recommendation of a majority of the evangelists in the field."

Respectfully submitted,

C. R. VAUGHAN,  
J. T. L. PRESTON,  
*Committee.*

---

We would add in the form of an appendix, because not strictly in a line with the object and argument of the report, the following views as suggestive to the reflection of the Church:

That the terms "pastor" and "evangelist" describe a relation and not an office, is clear, first, from the fact that in setting apart any ordained minister, either as pastor or evangelist, no ordination to office is employed; an office already granted is simply determined to a specified use. It results, secondly, from the recognised parity of the ministry; the office is absolutely one and equal. To construe the pastor as holding one office, the evangelist as holding another distinct and different, the teacher as holding a third variety of office, is inconsistent with the conception of one office of the ministry absolutely equal and the same. It results, thirdly, from the very nature of the case: both pastor and evangelist holding each the same office are, as matter of fact, set apart to the use of their office in different relations, and the reference of the titles obviously as different, is not to the office, which is the same in both, but to the relation in which alone any difference appears. The conception of pastor and evangelist as terms of relation and not of office is fully supported by the terminology of our system. To form a pastoral relation and to set apart to the work of an evangelist, are familiar in our usage. The bear-

ings of this distinction are important, as will appear in the immediate sequel.

But before proceeding to develop this, we will call attention to certain distinctions which bear strongly, not only on this question of the evangelist, but on the question of the eldership now exciting a renewed interest in the Church. The distinction of "order," "office," "rank," and "relative power," and the relation of "work" to all these have been so mixed up and confounded as to prevent all clear uses of discrimination and lead to erroneous conclusions in opposite directions as the necessary result. Some will suppose that the phrase we just used as familiar in our usage, "set apart to the work of an evangelist," concludes against our view of evangelist as descriptive of a relation and not an office. They construe office as determined by work actually done or to be done. Whoever does the work is construed as holding the office set apart to do that work. A single moment's steady consideration will show this to be one of those half truths which have the effect of a whole error in the discovery and settlement of permanent principles. The only possible way to reach satisfactory conclusions in matters of this description is not to attempt to settle them by mere consideration of abstract terms, but by taking concrete cases in actual life and then abstracting the terms from the concrete case. Now, it is perfectly true that office does bear relation to work; a military office stands related to military work, a financial office to financial work, a teaching office to the work of a teacher. But what relation does it bear? A colonel of a regiment is on leave of absence, his duties are discharged meanwhile by a subordinate; but the office of the colonel has not been vacated, nor has it been assumed by his subordinate though doing the work. A professor in a college is temporarily laid aside by sickness, his son takes his place and does the work; but the professorship is still held by the father. From these instances, what does office appear to be and what is its relation to work? Obviously it is not to hold an office merely to do the work. Office is the legal instrument with authority to do a work carrying with it obligation to do it, responsibility for doing it, and a right to the privileges and rewards attached to it by the

VOL. XXXV., NO. 3—12.

law which establishes the office. Neither capacity to do the work, nor opportunities to do it, nor the actual doing of it, places a man in office. A teller in a bank temporarily doing the work of a cashier disabled by sickness does not supersede him in office. Office, then, does bear a relation to work; but it is the peculiar relation of authority, obligation, responsibility, and privilege, and not merely the actual doing of the work. A man may do the work of an office and yet not be invested with it.

Yet further, if office is determined merely and altogether by the work to be done, so that he who does the work must be construed as holding the office, it will logically follow that any change in the work will result in a change of office, and a minister must be construed as holding a different office when he preaches in public and when he visits his people in private. It is intrinsically obvious that an appointment to do a particular work is not synonymous with an appointment to office. A minister sent to rectify the disorder in a particular church is not thereby ordained to a new office; he is only appointed to a special work for which the office he holds renders him competent. Yet further, the relation in which an office is discharged is determined often by the work to be done. Work has as much to do in determining the relation in which office is to be exercised as in determining the nature of office itself. The work of preaching the gospel in one settled church determines the pastoral relation; the work of preaching the gospel in regions beyond clearly determines, not a difference in the work to be done—preaching the gospel; not a difference in the office to be employed—the one office of the ministry; but a difference in the relation in which the work is to be done, and the office is to be exercised in doing it.

The bearings of this view of the term "evangelist," as descriptive of relation and not of office, are full of significance. In its strict construction it confines the use of the evangelist to the regions beyond the pale and boundary of the organised Church. At the same time it may be asserted with a pointed degree of truth that these two grand divisions of the work of the Church—maintaining the gospel in a settled church state and extending it in an unlocalised relation to the regions beyond, the one deter-



mining the pastoral and the other the evangelist relation—logically compels all use of the ministerial office outside of the pastoral relation to fall under the relation and denomination of evangelist. The logical division of use under two relations comprehensive of all the uses of the ministry seems to be complete. All these uses are either within a pastoral relation or without it. This completeness of the logical division of the relations of the ministry is also recommended by the practical advantages which would spring out of the recognition of two divisions of the relation of evangelist.

The necessities of the Church frequently determine uses of the ministry which are found difficult of definition and seem to defy reduction under any clear scriptural denomination. It would assuredly be an advantage if it were possible to place them all under one clear and positive scriptural relation and name. Such a recognition of the relation and name of evangelist would supersede the awkward and unscriptural designation of "stated supply," as applied both to the regular supply of vacant churches, in which this use of the ministry is seriously objectionable as a general rule, and to the temporary supply of a vacancy, in which this use of the ministry is both proper and necessary. It would define the position of professors, teachers, editors, and executive officers under a scriptural term expressive of a lawful use of the ministerial functions in those methods of work—professors, editors, and teachers employing chiefly the teaching function of their office and executive officers employing chiefly the governing functions of the office, and both under the scriptural relation of evangelist.

It would also give a color of absolute propriety to a use of evangelist labor which is not conveyed by the strict interpretation of the relation of evangelist—the use of the evangelist as a mere co-worker with settled pastors and in organised churches. While it may be true that in the case of churches organised, and especially when falling to decay for want of stated preaching, a regular evangelist would be in the line of his duties as a teacher of the regions beyond, it is also true that it is felt by many to be a serious innovation on his recognised function when his work is to a great extent done in coöperation with pastors and in organised churches. Yet such work is often eminently proper and eminently

necessary and ought to be provided for in some recognised way and without subjecting the noble character of the regular evangelist to any discount or question in rendering such service. The labors of such a man as Nettleton or Stiles, devoting his life under wise and well-regulated rules to the aid of settled pastors, are of eminent value and ought to be recognised and provided for in the regular order of the Church. This class of workers, however, ought to be men of great wisdom as well as great piety and skill in preaching the gospel, and ought always to be designated by the Church itself to this branch of service. Otherwise they may do great and irreparable mischief, and can be held to no just responsibility. But no system of church administration ought to prohibit such labor, or the temporary supply of a vacant church, or the visitation of churches falling into decay; on the contrary, ought to provide for such uses of the ministry under a regular arrangement and designation of the service.

From these considerations there would seem to be a practical as well as a logical propriety in construing the relation of evangelist as falling into two distinct divisions—one under a broader and the other under a stricter construction. Coming under the broader significance, all ministerial labor outside of a pastoral relation would be brought under a scriptural relation and a scriptural name. Coming under the stricter construction, the term “evangelist” would positively and sharply define the relation, falling as a distinctly defined species under the genus evangelist, in which the strictly propagandist or aggressive function of the Church in the regions beyond its pale might be exercised. A discriminating term might be easily invented, to be employed with the common term “evangelist,” which would instantly mark the difference between those who were discharging their ordination vows in the miscellaneous but legitimate methods of work outside of the pastoral relation, and those who are strictly engaged in preaching the gospel beyond the ascertained pale and boundary of the organised Church. The term “general” and “particular,” “irregular” and “regular,” evangelist would instantly and clearly discriminate the two divisions of the relation of evangelist.

## ARTICLE VIII.

## THE CHIEF GLORY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

It is now some fifteen years since the first publication of the masterly Lectures on Foreign Missions by Dr. Rufus Anderson, for a long period Secretary of the American Board. The lecturer himself and his Lectures received unstinted but most richly deserved laudations then, in the pages of this REVIEW, from one who is altogether competent to express himself as touching both the author and his subject, being thoroughly well acquainted with both. What was true fifteen years ago is true still, that perhaps no volume has appeared comprising "in so short a compass as much solid and valuable information in relation to the work of Foreign Missions." Dr. Anderson rested some years since from his life-long devotion to the practical but profound study of this work. It may therefore well be repeated here and now that he certainly was one of the greatest men of our times. Certainly no man living, either in this country or in Europe, on heathen or on Christian ground, has done more for the glorious cause of the foreign propagation of our faith. It occupied all his mighty energies for over forty years. And he had peculiar advantages for acquiring a knowledge of this subject. His official position, his personal acquaintance with all the missionaries sent forth by the American Board, his constant correspondence with them during all his life, and then the opportunity to visit for personal inspection the missions in Turkey, Syria, India, and the Sandwich Islands, make him a high authority on all the questions which relate to Christian work amongst the unevangelised. A recent examination of these Lectures for the second time has deepened the conviction of their inestimable value, making imperative the expression in these pages of the earnest wish that the Southern Presbyterian Church and every other Church could come to be well acquainted with this masterly work. It could not fail, with the divine blessing, to exalt their conceptions of the grandeur and importance of that enterprise which certainly constitutes the chief glory of our age.

Dr. Anderson's first Lecture is entitled "An Opening World;" his second, "An Uprising Church." Fifty years ago no well informed man would have said that any part of Turkey or India or China was fairly open to Christian Missions. No well informed man now will deny that these countries are in this day quite open with few, if any, partial exceptions. Yet these countries contain a population of over six hundred millions.

Fifty years ago, what was it needful for divine Providence to bring about in Turkey that that empire might be prepared to admit Christian missions? First. England must have given to her the predominant influence in the governments of both Turkey and Persia. Secondly. The persecuting Patriarchs of the Oriental Churches must somehow be shorn of their power to persecute readers of the Scriptures. Thirdly. The death penalty for abjuring Mohammedanism must be abrogated. All these things Providence has brought about in Turkey.

What must it effect in India that the gospel might freely enter? First. The Mohammedan power, which was nearly supreme over the whole land, must be broken down. Secondly. The power of Brahminism, resting on caste and having the sanction of ages, must be overturned. Thirdly. The East India Company, after that great selfish corporation had fully answered its purpose in providence, must be brought to an end. All these results have been brought about in India.

What must Providence do that Eastern Asia might be opened to the gospel? It must unite the great Christian powers of the world in securing a free commercial and religious access to China and Japan and the neighboring countries. This wondrous opening has been effected.

Now, the hand that moves the world, and none else, has wrought all these changes in order to give access for the gospel to these extended and populous regions. Not one of these events attracted very special attention at the time, but now as we look back, God's providential working can be plainly seen opening the world to the Christian Church.

Answering to this opening of the world to the gospel has been the rousing of all the Christian Churches to the avowed expecta-

tion of the conversion of Turkey, India, and China, and all the heathen countries to Christianity, and to the avowed purpose of striving, by all possible efforts, to bring about that end. Nor will any reflecting person readily pronounce which of these two providential operations, answering so precisely to each other, was really the most wonderful.

Passing over the Danish and the Moravian missionary efforts of the eighteenth century, just as we do those of the evangelical Nestorian Church at an earlier period, it may be said that modern missions, the general aggressive movement of the Protestant Churches, had its beginning in October, 1792, in the little town of Kettering, Northamptonshire, England, when a few Baptist ministers met together and resolved to form a society for the propagation of the gospel abroad. At the centre of this movement, it would seem, stood William Carey, then a Baptist minister, who was previously a poor shoemaker, but whose soul was strangely fired with zeal for the conversion of the heathen world, and on whom his Maker had bestowed a wonderful facility for acquiring foreign languages. Whose thoughts fail to recur to the Saviour's calling fishermen to convert men at the beginning, and to his endowing them with the gift of tongues? Little encouragement did Carey find, however, amongst his ministerial brethren—especially the older ones. At such a ministers' meeting, Mr. Ryland, Senior, who presided, called on the young men around him to propose a topic for discussion. William Carey rose and proposed "The duty of Christians to attempt the spread of the gospel among heathen nations." The old minister, amazed at the wildness of the idea, sprang to his feet, denounced the proposal with a frowning face, and thundered out: "Young man, sit down. When it pleases God to convert the heathen, he will do it without your aid or mine."

In like manner when, in the year 1796, after both the Baptists and the Dissenters in London had embarked in the work, it was moved in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to establish a foreign mission, immediately and bitterly, and by leading ministers of the body (such as Dr. George Hill, of St. Andrew's, author of the celebrated Lectures on Divinity), was the

motion denounced as being "a revolutionary design" and "fraught with danger to the Church of Scotland." It was thirty years after this that this General Assembly did enter vigorously upon Foreign Missions, and still is active and zealous in the cause.

As for William Carey, he was in all respects truly a wonderful man. Gaining an extensive knowledge of the Eastern languages he devoted himself to the work of translating the Christian Scriptures. His extraordinary acquirements procured for him a professorship of Bengalee and Sanscrit in the Government's College of Fort William, at a salary of over \$500 per month, or £1,500 per year, which position he filled for thirty years. And what use did he make of all this money? Before replying to this question let reference be made to Dr. Anderson's Appendix, No. 1, where will be found some extracts from a speech by the Rev. Dr. Norman McLeod, of the Established Church of Scotland, after returning from an official visit to the missions of that Church in India: "I met a man (says Dr. McLeod) the other day at a dinner party, a man who had been to India, and who told me the missionaries there had done nothing. Now those mysterious men are always turning up; men who have been in India and who tell you missionaries have done nothing. I have often met this remarkable phenomenon. . . . A European who has been in India, and who will pass the claret at table and say: 'I assure you missionaries are doing nothing; I know all about it.'" Now there being so many of this sort of men who have been to India

---

<sup>1</sup> NOTE.—It will be well to copy here the extract from Dr. McLeod in full: "But you may say, You have come to tell us about India; how do you know your facts are correct? I met a man the other day at a dinner party, a man who had been in India, and who told me the missionaries there had done nothing. Now those mysterious men are always turning up: men who have been in India, and who tell you missionaries have done nothing. I have often met this remarkable phenomenon. Well, in order to ascertain all we could, Dr. Watson and myself put ourselves in communication with men of all classes, and first of all with missionaries. And with reference to the missionaries I will mention this, that they know more of India, that their knowledge is more correct, and their accounts are far more fair regarding India than you can get from any other source. But we do not confine ourselves to missionaries. We had letters, I need not say, from government which gave us access to many

and know that the missionaries have done and are doing nothing, and so many people in Christian countries who are quite ready to believe such representations by such parties, for their sakes the question is a pertinent one, what the *quondam* poor cobbler, William Carey, now that he is a missionary, and has a fine chance to indulge himself (like missionaries generally, as some suppose) in every sort of luxurious living, what did he do with all this money, forty-five thousand pounds sterling, over two hundred thousand dollars? And what did his associate, Ward, who earned as much more in their printing office, and his other associate, Marshman and his wife, who made an equal amount with the school they taught; what did they all do with all these funds? The answer is, by a solemn written agreement in the early times of their work these Baptist missionaries of Seram-

---

sources of information among civilians—men who had long been in the country, men who had intelligence and knowledge. We did not confine ourselves to Christians, but went to natives also. We had access to what I may call the representative men, and the kindness and courtesy we met with from these gentlemen, I shall never forget. We heard all their opinions frankly and fully. We did more than that; we called two great meetings, one at Madras, the other at Calcutta. They were attended by the first men in the country; in Calcutta by the viceroy, the commander-in-chief, the governor of Bengal, and all the heads of departments. The same in Madras. We asked missionaries of all denominations to come upon the platform and read a *vidimus* of their work, what they had done, each in their own department, what the Baptists had done, what the Independents had done, what the Church Missionary Society had done, The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Free Church, etc. And upon the platform in Madras and Calcutta I stated this, that one great reason why we requested the meeting was, that after we had labored and worked, and thought we had a thorough understanding of the state of matters, some man, knowing no more about it than any European who had never been in India, might pass the claret at table and say, 'I assure you missionaries are doing nothing; I know all about it.' Yet this man might not know perhaps a single missionary in the parish in which he lived. I said that, in the presence of editors of European papers in India, in the presence of editors of native papers, in the presence of intelligent Hindus, in a meeting as crowded as this, we asked those reports and challenged contradiction on the spot. We challenged it in Madras and Calcutta, and if the missionaries were not true, we wished to have that contradiction there if we could have it. We did not

pore covenanted thus: "We give ourselves up unreservedly to this glorious cause, never counting our time, gifts, strength, families, or even our clothes, as our own, but all God's and the Church's. We shut out for ever the idea of laying up a penny for ourselves or our children." And so they ate at a common table, and for many years each drew only six dollars a month for personal expenses, while the remainder of their incomes went to cast type and translate with native help and print the Scriptures. The Chinese version alone cost, for native teachers and translators and printers and types and presses and paper, over \$100,000. In many other languages did these Serampore Baptists give God's word to the Eastern Asiatics.

Besides the English Baptists, the English Independents and Episcopalians and Wesleyans and Scotch Presbyterians and the Dutch, the German, and the Swiss Evangelicals have all for a half century been working in the heathen field, and with them have been for periods of various length all the Evangelical Churches of this broad land.

Now the work all these Christian people have undertaken is one

---

go to India to get up a fine story; we did not go to gather facts only agreeable to ourselves and put them aside. In God's name we wished to know the truth, and nothing but the truth. And could we do more than I have mentioned to find out the facts? Now I ask you, is it not a very hard thing after we have gone, not to one spot, not to a civilian who has stuck in one spot, not to a missionary who has stuck in one spot, but after we have gone through all the presidencies and met with a great many missionaries and other people, trying to find out the real facts, and after, too, we have called meetings and challenged contradiction, that all this should be put aside as the mere talk of ministers? Ask the man who says that missions in India have done nothing what mission station he ever visited. Ask him if he ever spent an hour in his life trying to understand missions. Ask him what interest he takes in or what knowledge he has of missions at home. You will invariably find that the man who lives in Glasgow and talks in the manner I have indicated concerning missions abroad, is just as ignorant about them as a man in Calcutta is of what the Free Church, or United Presbyterian Church, or the Episcopal Church, or the Established Church, are doing for the advancement of religion in Glasgow. This, then, in answer to the heckling question: 'What have you done to ascertain facts, and on what ground do you ask us to have any confidence in you?' "



of such magnitude as would be appalling were it not enjoined on us by divine command, with the promise of all needed aid from above; and were it not for the almost miraculous interventions of Providence which have forced it on the Church's mind and heart; and were it not also for the unexampled facilities for carrying on the work which the same divine Providence has multiplied an hundred fold.

But what is it we undertake to do? Probably many suppose that we undertake to send forth and support enough missionaries from this and other Christian lands to preach the gospel to every creature. Gordon Hall, one of the first and ablest of the American missionaries, writing more than sixty years since in his celebrated tract, entitled, "Claims of Six Hundred Millions," held that the work was to be done by sending one missionary for every twenty thousand souls. One missionary to every twenty thousand souls, and nine native preachers to every missionary would give the heathen, says Gordon Hall, as many Christian teachers as the United States have at this day. The Rev. Dr. Arthur Pierson, of Philadelphia, says, in *The Gospel in all Lands* for May, 1884: "It has been often and clearly shown to be mathematically possible and practically feasible to *preach the gospel to every creature now living within twenty-five years*. The Moravians give *one in fifty-eight* of their members to the missionary work, and their converts number four times as many as their own brotherhood. What if all the Protestant Evangelical Christians did the same! We should have two million missionaries, enough to gather all the heathen under easy supervision, giving only a few hundred to each missionary; and if the converts should ever bear the same proportion to the laborers as with the Moravian missionaries, there would be over 464,000,000! There is no reason why one hundred millions of Protestants should not supply ten thousand missionaries and fifty millions of dollars annually to carry on this grand enterprise of evangelisation." There is certainly no flavor of extravagance about any of these calculations. But Dr. Anderson says well: "Great results depending on the providence and grace of God come about much easier and more rapidly than our previous calculations would lead us to ex-

pect. . . . . Let one reflect how soon the old Roman Empire was compelled to receive the Christian name, notwithstanding the whole force of that mighty empire was in determined resistance, and he will see how little human calculations have to do with such matters. The very wonderful opening of the unevangelised world to the gospel, and the preparation in Christendom for sending it forth, as already described, lead to the same conclusion. I therefore go into no general calculations as to the time or as to the number of missionaries necessary for the whole work. My belief is that 'the Lord will hasten it in his time.' "

But Dr. Anderson should have gone much farther than this in setting forth the needlessness of all such calculations. The missionary enterprise, as it is now contemplated by its most intelligent abettors, of whom Dr. Rufus Anderson certainly deserves to be called a leader and a teacher, has nothing in view so impracticable, from the human point of view, as the raising up and sending forth and supporting enough missionaries from this and other Christian lands to preach the gospel to every creature. It is not at all that at which the Church is aiming. All we aim at and all that is needful is to send a few (but for every reason they should be of the best) missionary workers, that they may plant the gospel, and we confidently count on its taking root and being before very long self-supporting and also self-propagating. Experience has taught us many lessons—one great one is that the foreigner must not be the pastor, but only the apostle or the evangelist. He must found, but natives build the superstructure. Did space permit, it would be easy to assign many reasons why this must be the course pursued. It is now well understood, and Dr. Anderson deserves in large part the credit of this true doctrine of missions, that the missionary is to teach and preach, and with God's blessing convert a few people and then organise them into churches. Of the best material he can find among the church members, whether they be or be not all he could desire, he must ordain elders and deacons. As soon as possible he must raise up a native ministry. Self-government and self-support he must teach the native churches to exercise from the beginning, himself employing, as soon as he has organised them, only a

paternal influence and advisory control. And then also he must indoctrinate these native churches into the idea of propagating their new-found faith in regions beyond their own tribe or island or nation. This is the science of Foreign Missions as now understood and taught and practised by the most intelligent and experienced leaders in this cause. There is seed corn in the Church's hand intrusted to her by the Lord, that the nations may all be supplied with the bread of life, but it is by no means his plan that the Church should attempt to raise on her soil all the bread required by the nations, but his orders are to go and plant the seed in every country that each nation may raise its own supply.

This will doubtless commend itself to every reflecting reader as the right theory of missions. But it is not mere theory. Let facts which are incontrovertible prove and establish it as unquestionably correct.

1. About the year 1816, a plain German laborer in London, named William A. B. Johnson, offered himself to the English Church Missionary Society to be sent as a schoolmaster to Sierra Leone on the western coast of Africa. He had only a common school education, but was rich in Christian experience. It soon appeared that he was called to the gospel ministry, and he accordingly received ordination. His was a wonderful ministry. The people he was sent to were about one thousand in number, rescued by British men of war at different times from slave ships—wild and naked and mutually hostile because of twenty-two different tribes. They could not talk with one another except through a little broken English, had no ideas of marriage, and they lived crowded together in the rudest huts. They were devil worshippers, and most of them lazy, thieving, brutal savages.

The simple-minded German Christian preached Christ to these poor wretches, and a remarkable change—a supernatural one—came over them. The Spirit of God came down on these miserable African refugees. Numbers were converted to the knowledge of the Lord Jesus. The outward changes that followed were striking. In a wonderfully short time many learned trades, and many became good gardeners and farmers. They built a stone church large enough to hold two thousand people and there these

rescued captives worshipped in decent dress and orderly manner. Their night dances and heathenish drumming ceased, also their drunkenness and stealing. Most of the adults got married and their children were sent to school. They built school houses and store houses, and even a bridge of several arches, all of stone. Twenty-four years after Johnson began his work, one-fifth of the population of Sierra Leone was at school and twelve thousand of the people, who had by repeated additions to their original numbers multiplied greatly, were Christian worshippers. But the idea of native pastors was not yet understood. About twenty more years pass, and in 1862 this great forward step is found to have been taken and with it the people have come to believe in self-support as well as self-government. Ten native parishes have undertaken to maintain their own pastors. And the idea of the propagation of their Christian faith has also been developed amongst them. No less than six different missions were sent forth from those little native churches to the unevangelised tribes beyond the colony.

2. The London Missionary Society, a body of English Dissenters, commenced in 1820 a mission in the Island of Madagascar under the protection of King Radama. Those missionaries gave to the Malagasy people a written language, a grammar, a dictionary, school books, a book of hymns, and the Bible; and they taught the people to read. Virtually, if not formally, the converts were embodied in churches. Radama's widow, who was a pagan, succeeded him in 1828. She threatened with death all who should read the Bible or practise Christian worship. In 1835 she banished all the missionaries. But the Christians still increasing, she began and for twenty-five years until her death in 1861 continued a fierce persecution. Believers of the gospel were poisoned with the Tangena water, were hanged, were speared, were stoned; they were thrown over a fearful precipice; loaded with heavy iron collars and chained together they were driven into banishment. Many were burned at the stake and some were crucified. Numbers were sold into slavery. In some cruel form or other it is reckoned that more than two thousand persons suffered during this persecution.

Now, as far as was possible during this terrible storm these

Christian believers in dark Madagascar were associated together in churches, and there were some of their number intelligent and courageous enough to act as pastors and teachers, always at the peril, sometimes at the sacrifice, of their lives. And so through all the persecutions did the cause make secret progress, and the blood of the martyrs become again, as always, the seed of the Church. One year before the Queen's death and the end of the persecution, the Society in London had good reason to believe there were then at least five thousand Christians on the Island, the fruits of the divine blessing on the teachings of native believers and the secret study of God's word.

The first Christian martyr of Madagascar was a woman named Rasalama, who was put to death August 14, 1837. Speared to death by executioners, her body was left on the ground to be devoured by dogs. The Queen then issued orders to her soldiers to put all Christians to death at once wherever they might be found, by digging pits, tying the Christians' hands and feet, thrusting them head downwards into the pits, and then pouring boiling water on them till they perished. One day eighteen were condemned to death—fourteen to be hurled over the precipice and four to be burned alive. To the missionaries, after they were suffered to come back to the Island, eye-witnesses of the burning of the four brethren gave the following very graphic and touching account: "They tied them by the hands and feet to long poles and carried them on men's shoulders. And those brethren prayed as they were carried along and they spake also to the people. And some who looked on them said their faces were like the faces of angels. And these Christians as they were carried sang the hymn, 'When our hearts are troubled, then remember us.' And when they came to Faravohitra, there they burned them fixed between split spars. And there was a rainbow in the heavens at the time. They prayed as long as they had any life and they died softly and gently. And all the people were amazed who beheld the burning of them there."

Of the heroic fourteen who were doomed to the fatal rocks, this is the account: "With cords passed round their bodies, they were suspended over the awful precipice to make them taste of

the hideous death before them. To each one mercy was then offered on condition of their renouncing the Christian faith. As each one uttered a firm refusal, the doomsman's axe flashed and fell. The crowd stood in solemn hush, and in the deep silence all could hear the snig of the parted rope and the dull thud of the mangled body on the cruel rocks below."

Now, from 1836 to 1862 there were no foreign missionaries on the Island except when Mr. Ellis and Mr. Cameron were sent by the London Missionary Society in 1853, and Mr. Ellis again in 1856, to ascertain if there was any opening for their return, but finding none, they had to take their departure. During all this time the Queen's decrees against the Christians were in force, but the leaven of gospel truth was nevertheless all the time working. Meetings of believers were held in secret. Sometimes they would recognise each other by one quoting Jeremiah xxxviii. 15, and the other following up that quotation with the succeeding verse.

3. Another illustration of the power of the gospel to sustain itself wherever planted is found in the steadfastness of the native Hindu Christians in the great Sepoy rebellion of 1857. When the Sepoys mutinied, it swept away 2,000 native Christians at the twenty missionary stations involved. They had to flee for their lives; they were beaten and plundered; eleven of them were put to death; and all of them were urged by Moslems and Hindus to apostatise. But they all stood firm except six, and these came humbly and penitently back after the dreadful mutiny was quelled. Does not this shew out of what sort of material Hindu churches are gathered, and with what life Hindu believers are instinct?

4. Let us now see what manner of converts are produced among the Armenians in Turkey. Look at the city of Harpoot, on the upper Euphrates, where missionary work was begun in 1856. A church being gathered, it was supplied with a native pastor from the Armenian mission at Constantinople. They at once guaranteed a portion of his salary, and the next year they doubled that amount. Eleven years from the organisation of that native church, it had thirteen offshoots, with 418 church mem-

bers, having eleven native pastors, more than half of them supported by their own people.

Has not enough been written to shew the true nature of the work to be done for the heathen world, viz., to preach, and teach, and convert, and then organise native churches in the centres of pagan life; these churches to be trained from the start to self-government and self-support, and pastors trained for them, not of our blood, but their own? The seed corn thus planted and cultivated our Master will cause to grow and multiply till the whole world is fully supplied with it.

But in our little Southern Presbyterian Church very earnest discussion is now rife as to the powers belonging to, or to be conferred on, the foreign missionary or evangelist. The native pastor and the native evangelist, of how much value are they? what place are they to occupy in our system? how are they to be raised up, and especially at this time? how and by whom are they to be set apart or ordained? These are questions of great interest amongst us just now. The argument from experience and history, the argument from facts, should be weighty. It may therefore be timely and useful to let Dr. Anderson introduce to the reader some native preachers, pastors, and evangelists:

The first one shall be a convert of the Baptist mission in Burmah, a Karen named Quala, which name signifies *hope*. Dr. Judson's first Karen convert began immediately to preach, and the first sermon of this convert was in the house of Quala's father. That sermon was blessed to the conversion of this boy, and "the first impulse of his spiritual life was to declare what God had done for his soul, and to invite all whom he could reach to believe and live." For some years he was employed by the missionaries in assisting to translate the New Testament into the Karen language. For fifteen years he accompanied the missionary in his jungle tours, extending sometimes three and four hundred miles, and "they together laid the foundations of many Karen churches," and so he was well "prepared for more responsible service."

"It is a striking instance," says Dr. Anderson, "of the excessive caution of early missionaries in putting native converts into

VOL. XXXV., NO. 3—13.

the ministry that Quala did not receive ordination until fourteen years after his reception into the Church." Some time after this he felt strongly moved to enter on what proved to be the great work of his life—a mission to the Karens, in the province of Toungoo. He reached his field in December, 1853. The first baptism he administered took place the next month. "Before the close of that year his converts numbered seven hundred and forty-nine, organised into nine churches. In less than three years the number of churches was increased under his ministry to thirty, with an aggregate of two thousand one hundred and twenty-seven members, more than two thousand of whom were baptized by Quala himself. Nor do those converts appear to have been admitted to the Church without due consideration. His labors and fatigues were truly apostolical, and so was his success. His singleness of purpose was like Paul's." He received no salary. One and another of the native disciples gave him a garment when he needed it, and having no house, he got his food where he labored.

The wild mountain Karens in "regions beyond" sent him a petition to come and tell them of the "Eternal God." The English Commissioner offered him a salary if he would become the head and overseer of that wild tribe. Quala replied: "Sir, I cannot do it. I will not have the money. I will not mix up God's work with government work. There are others to do this thing. Employ them. As for me, I will continue the work in which I have been engaged." The Commissioner asked: "Do you not like money? We will give you money and you may continue your work as teacher as heretofore. Will not that make it easier to you?" Quala answered: "No, sir; when I eat with the children of poverty my heart sleeps. I did not leave my dear wife and come up hither in search of silver or agreeable food. I came to this land that its poor people might be saved. Be patient with me, sir. Were I to take your money, the wild Karens would turn against me." "Admirable man!" says Dr. Anderson, "where shall we find his equal in devotion to the cause of Christ!" He adds: "Still we recognise him as a Karen, and as owing all that he was and is to the grace of God, who can



easily raise up many such apostolic men from among heathen converts."

Next, let the Rev. John Thomas, a distinguished missionary of the English Church Missionary Society in Southern India, having the care of ten thousand native Christians, tell of a native preacher among the Shanars: "I have no hesitation in saying that if such sermons as are generally preached by him were delivered in any pulpit in London, the church would be crowded to overflowing." This man died in 1860. Mr. Thomas says: "His affection, his simplicity, honesty, and straightforwardness, his amazing pulpit talents and profound humility, endeared him to me more than I can describe. The last sermon I heard from him was, without exception, the greatest sermon I ever heard. The text was, 'Enduring the cross, despising the shame.' Never did I hear Christ so exalted by human tongue. The effect was perfectly overwhelming."

Dr. Anderson's third specimen is a blind native preacher at the Sandwich Islands, named, when he received baptism, Bartimeus. From the lowest physical, intellectual, moral, and social degradation and wretchedness whilst he was a heathen, Bartimeus rose under the new creating power of the gospel to be a devoted, active, eloquent, and successful minister of the word. His calling to be a preacher was evidently of God. The late Dr. Armstrong, a judicious and able missionary (who was personally known to the writer of these pages), said of Bartimeus: "Often while listening with exquisite delight to his eloquent strains have I thought of Wirt's description of the celebrated blind preacher of Virginia." He died in 1843. One of the missionaries, writing soon after his decease, speaks of the man's extraordinary memory and the wonderful knowledge he had acquired of the contents of the Scriptures. Shortly before his death, he was called on to preach at an evening meeting, and took for his text Jer. iv. 13: "Behold, he shall come up as clouds and his chariots shall be as a whirlwind." In vivid colors did Bartimeus portray the anger of the Lord against the wicked and the terrible overthrow of all his enemies. He seized on the terrific image of the whirlwind as the emblem of their ruin, and presented this image in all its majestic

and awful aspects. He enforced his remarks with a variety of passages of Scripture in which this same image is presented, such as Ps. lviii. 9; Prov. i. 7; Isaiah xl. 24; Jer. xxx. 23; Hosea viii. 7; Nahum i. 3; Zech. vii. 14; always quoting chapter and verse. "I was surprised," says the missionary, the Rev. Mr. Clark, "to find that this image is so often used by the sacred writers. And how this blind man, never having used a Concordance or a Reference Bible in his life, could on the spur of the moment refer to all these texts was quite a mystery. But his mind was stored with the precious treasure, and in such order that he always had it at his command. Never have I been so forcibly impressed as while listening to this address with the words of the apostle, 'Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord we persuade men,' and seldom have I witnessed a specimen of more genuine eloquence."

Dr. Anderson observes: "These three remarkable men were from the lowest grades of heathen life. What they became was the result of the grace of God through the gospel; and I bring them forward that our hopes may be raised as to what God may be expected to do through a native ministry. We must not, however, expect such eloquent native preachers to bear a larger proportion among the ministers of their own respective countries than such men do in our own. . . . My own estimate of the value of a native ministry has been rising for more than a score of years. A large number of the Christian islands in Central and Western Polynesia are properly reckoned among their trophies. They have been the fearless pioneers of the white missionary, facing dangers which to him would have been fatal, and which were sometimes fatal to themselves; and many a beautiful Christianised group in the broad Pacific is now manned solely by native missionaries and pastors."

Confirmatory of all that Dr. Anderson has said on this point, let reference now be made to the remarkable career of the Rev. George L. Mackay, M. D., and D. D., a missionary of "the Presbyterian Church in Canada." This ecclesiastical body dates only from the year 1875, so that it is a younger sister still than our little Church among the Presbyterian Churches of this con-

inent. It is composed of the four Presbyterian Churches in the Dominion, which, after four or five years of anxious negotiations, severally resolved to unite themselves into one Church. The whole number of ministers thus brought together was only some six hundred, and of congregations about one thousand. It has five distinct fields (for the smallest of the four Churches in one of the smallest of the provinces began foreign missionary work as long ago as 1844), which are as follows: (1) The New Hebrides in Polynesia; (2) Trinidad, West Indies; (3) The Indians of the northwest territories of Canada; (4) The Island of Formosa, China; (5) Central India.

Some twelve or thirteen years ago a young man, an enthusiast as to missions from his boyhood, was very quietly, that is without any flourish of trumpets whatever, ordained in a small church in Montreal, Canada, to go forth as a medical missionary to China. Principal Grant, of Queen's University, Kingston, happened to be in Montreal and witnessed the ceremony. He says the committee, rightly estimating the amount of interest in foreign missions, selected a small church for the service and it was not filled. "The missionary elect, a small, dark young man, seemed to make little impression on the congregation, 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 the young man was walking by faith, and that wherever faith was, even miracles were possible." There were few to bid the young missionary God-speed, but some even then were impressed by the quiet *intensity* with which he spoke at meetings he addressed before leaving the country, and felt that he was especially characterised by apostolic faith and fervor. In 1880 he returned home on a visit, and then the hearts of thousands in Canada were deeply stirred by his simple, unadorned recital of his experiences in Formosa, which sounded very much "like a chapter from the Acts of the Apostles."

Let it be noted as a remarkable circumstance in the history of this missionary that he was *left free to choose his own particular*

field of labor by the committee which sent him to China. He chose the northern half of the island of Formosa, the southern half being occupied by missionaries of the English Presbyterian Church. The island is 250 miles long and ninety miles wide, with three millions of Chinese colonists, who commenced settling there in 1652. Besides these, some eighty or ninety thousand Aborigines still inhabit the mountain fastnesses, a fierce warlike race of Malay origin, at deadly feud with the Chinese. Dr. Mackay, who has travelled over the continents of Europe and America, and a large part of Asia, speaks in glowing terms of the beauty of the island, with its glorious mountains, lovely valleys, placid lakes, and picturesque ravines. Its beauty led the early Portuguese explorers to name it *Isla Formosa*, which name it has ever since retained.

The lonely missionary made his headquarters on first reaching his chosen field at Tam-sui or Hobe, a town of 8,000 inhabitants. But there was no room for him in the place. His first home was a small damp bathing-house, which he soon exchanged for a hut, or cabin, used by an Englishman formerly as a stable. His first object was to learn the language, but the people avoided him. He went out to the hills where boys were herding cattle and sought to make them his teachers. At first they, too, fled from him as a "foreign devil," and cast stones at him, but gradually he won their friendship and learned much from them. His bitterest foes were the *literati*, or educated classes, who spared no pains to excite the ignorant people to the utmost hatred of him. These were 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 up these acquisitions in boxes to be sent to England for the manufacture of opium! Soldiers, sailors, and all the lowest of the people would come to his hut to revile him and spit upon him, with all other imaginable insults.

Undaunted and undiscouraged, gradually, and by means of his medical skill, he won the confidence of the people. One summer he gave advice and medicine to 3,000 patients. At last there comes to him by night, like Nicodemus, a stalwart young man, asking questions and bringing written objections to the Christian

doctrine the missionary had been teaching. After many conversations he had the joy of hearing this disciple declare that he was ready to follow Christ, even to death. Long and patiently Dr. Mackay had waited for his first convert, and he says that he felt the salvation of this one soul an ample recompence for all he had endured. And A-hoa has proved invaluable ever since as a helper in the work. "He has remarkable power in preaching, and any church in Canada would listen to him with pleasure and profit." With his assistance, after nine months of patient teaching, the missionary is enabled to put into execution his long cherished plan of an evangelistic tour through northern Formosa. It was the rainy season, but the two men braved the rain. As they walked from village to village they were met everywhere with insulting cries, pelted with mud, and had the dogs set upon them. One place to which they came was in wild commotion, excited by noisy heathen rites then going on. No sooner had they obtained temporary quarters than Dr. Mackay received peremptory notice, in substance as follows: "You foreign devil, with your disciple, must either leave here to-morrow morning by day-break, or stay in the house for three days, for we are going to sacrifice to our ancestors." Promptly, in the true apostolic spirit, the missionary replied: "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 on your streets for several days." Next day he did preach as he said, after dispensing medicine to those who would receive it; and they held their ground, although the excited mob surrounded his house and climbed on his roof, shouting for his destruction. One of his first converts was a man who stoned him, and another was the leader of the mob. The first is now one of his native preachers, the second is the best elder in the place.

Usually they began their preaching by singing a Christian hymn in Chinese. Night after night he studied 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, then sang a hymn and preached salvation through

Christ. With his faithful A-hoa he penetrated to the haunts of the fierce barbarian tribes in the mountains and successfully preached the gospel to them.

But passing over very many other interesting details, the most important point to be set forth is Dr. Mackay's plan of training his converts to become native preachers. In this, as in other things, his idea is to follow closely in the footsteps of our Lord. He would take his disciples with him on his pedestrian mission tours in parties of from five to fifteen, teaching them by the way, and expounding to them the Scriptures. He taught his peripatetic college other things besides the gospel. The little band would sit sometimes under a shady bamboo, sometimes on the rocks by the sea shore, sometimes on the mountain side, and he would teach them botany, geology, natural history, geography, or anatomy. He would drill them also in theology—they studied Horne's Introduction, along with Boston's Fourfold State, and they were made very thoroughly acquainted with the history of missions.

Besides Tam-sui, Dr. Mackay has many mission stations. His single colleague is now the Rev. James Janneson, who reached Tam-sui a few months ago. There are twenty-six native trained teachers and preachers, and many chapels where he counts ere long on self-supporting native congregations. There are over three hundred Chinese professing Christians, and some five thousand who have renounced idolatry.

Here, then, is a solitary foreign evangelist, for though he now has a colleague, and for short periods had two others before this one (the health of both of whom speedily failed), still it may be fairly said that practically he has been alone all the time, so far as concerns counsel or help from colleagues. And there by himself, only his Lord with him, he has carried on a truly wonderful work. In the number of this REVIEW for October, 1882, (Vol. XXXIII., No. 4) there is a pretty full account of it, written by Agnes M. Machar, and published first in the *Catholic Presbyterian*. The author well styles Dr. Mackay "An Apostolic Missionary." It should be stated that besides his chapel at Tam-sui, he has also there a well equipped hospital, the gift of a lady

in Canada. He has another one at Kelung. At Tam-sui he also has a training college with accommodations for fifty students, and there is also a new large girls' school in the course of erection. These particulars are obtained from an article in *The Gospel in All Lands* for April 10, 1884, by James Croil, of Montreal, Canada. More full and exact accounts of this wonderful work would be very acceptable. Dr. Mackay must of course make great use of his native helpers in carrying it on. But with only such meagre accounts as are now before us, there looms up in magnificent proportions one notable fact: that this solitary missionary (as Agnes M. Machar reports him to have stated in one of his addresses in Canada) had travelled, previous to his last return to America, not less than 45,000 miles, mostly barefooted, over hills and dales, preaching the gospel; had baptized, after long and careful instruction, 323 natives; had established a number of little native congregations, and had trained (Mr. James Croil tells us) twenty-six native teachers and preachers.

These facts, it may now be asserted, do set forth and illustrate great and important principles in the science of Foreign Missions. Here are native churches and native pastors and native evangelists in different countries, all set apart by one missionary, or else preaching without any formal ordination, and God's blessing is on them. Here is the wonderful work of Dr. Mackay. It speaks impressively to our Church.

Are there not sundry important points respecting which misapprehensions are quite general in our communion:

*First.* What is the true and proper evangelist *in the fullest sense* of that term? All Presbyterians will admit that he is one that carries the Church and her ordinances to the "regions beyond," and builds on no "other man's foundation." He goes outside of the settled church state, and by himself plants the gospel where there are no church courts, no ruling elders, and possibly not a single missionary colleague. He is *extra* or *beyond* all the ordinary circumstances and beyond all the ordinary rules. None of them can be applied to him or will suit his case. We frequently call men missionaries and evangelists who labor within the bounds of Presbyteries, where they enjoy the counsel and

aid of their brethren and can be easily brought under their direction, rule, and control. But in such cases the name is not applied in its strict sense, for the only *proper* missionary labors outside of the Church, whether in this country or in foreign lands.

*Secondly.* How do the "regions beyond" differ from the settled church state? Many who have been partaking in the recent discussions do not seem to keep this distinction in mind. Whenever the Church is set up and established in its completeness the Lord has ordained for it, as all Presbyterians hold, a compact and thoroughly arranged system. He has *revealed* a government for his Church, both in its main principles and also its details—both are not expressly written down, but both, as we all hold, are *jure divino*. He gives *Order* for the protection and support of *Doctrine*. But outside of the settled church state, this system does not yet exist, and there the affairs of his kingdom are to be differently administered. Even in the settled church state, however, the system Christ has revealed, as Dr. Samuel Miller often said, is not *iron works*. It has the needful elasticity. But in the "regions beyond," the ordinances of Christ must possess and manifest very great elasticity. There, emergencies continually arise. And the revealed system of church government could not be such, could not be *jure divino*, if it were not fitted to operate just as well, though on different principles, in the regions beyond as in the settled church state. Here, mature preparation for the ministry is demanded by the Church and that for many reasons: advanced culture amongst the people requires teachers who can still further instruct them; and thoroughly trained ministers are needed to meet and overthrow thoroughly trained adversaries of all sorts. But in the regions beyond, the exigencies of the work are greater and its demands for training in the workers much lower. In the beginning men were put forward immediately as evangelists although uninspired, as Philip and others. So in every new country, and among every barbarous or semi-civilised people, a less carefully trained ministry will always be found, and found to be suitable enough. True, these inadequately trained pioneer workers will sometimes make great mistakes. Zeal with indiscretion will lead astray both the native evangelist and the



evangelist we send abroad. They frequently lead us astray who work here at home. Our church courts, even the highest, make many and sad blunders. From the beginning the Church has been liable to these evils, but has survived them, and will suffer them to the end, but survive them. The apostles ordained the best men they could get to be presbyters, without giving them any long training, because they were *planting* the Church in "regions beyond." There was no other way for them to do—there is no other way for us.

*Thirdly.* Many insist that it is Prelacy for the foreign missionary to ordain natives with the imposition of his hands alone. But what is Prelacy? It is putting one minister over other ministers and over churches that have not called him. It is denying the parity of all presbyters. But how can there be Prelacy where there are no churches and no presbyters, either ruling or teaching? Prelacy is a poison known only to the settled church state. The solitary missionary goes outside where there are absolutely none for him to claim jurisdiction over. There cannot be anything like Prelacy there. As soon as he organises a church and ordains ruling elders, he can thenceforth, according to Presbyterianism, do no act of rule whatever within that little church's bounds. And whenever he ordains a native pastor or evangelist, he ordains him to be his own full equal in every respect. There is, therefore, on Presbyterian principles, absolutely no room whatever for Prelacy in the regions beyond.

*Fourthly.* A great deal has been said, apart from this charge of Prelacy, against the ordination of evangelists by a single missionary. There is more or less of what deserves, in a sense, to be called *superstition* amongst a good many Presbyterians about ordination. What is ordination? It is simply the official and authoritative setting apart formally of a man, the devoting of him, by proper church authority in the name of the Church and her Lord, to some church work and office. Is it any more or greater than Baptism or the Lord's Supper? Is it any more or greater than the organising formally a church? May not our Church perform this simple act in regions beyond through an evangelist as well as gather and organise a church there by him?

Timothy and Titus, both mere uninspired evangelists, ordained men, each singly and with no colleagues in the act. But those ordinations were only of elders and not ministers. Indeed! And does our Church acknowledge more than two orders of office bearers, viz., elders and deacons? Do not ministers and elders belong to one and the same *order*, and does the Church ever ordain a man to the ministry except as she makes him a presbyter? Is there any more power or any different power employed in the ordination of a minister than in the ordination of a ruling elder? Do not ruling elders take part in the one just as in the other ordination? And in the settled church state is there any ordination whatever that one minister or one dozen ministers can legitimately perform without the presence of at least one ruling elder? Alas, there is great fear about Prelacy in the regions beyond where Prelacy could not enter amongst Presbyterians, but Prelatic tendencies are rife here at home in all this unscriptural and unpresbyterian talk about ordination.

*Fifthly.* Much is said about Presbytery's "intrusting power" to the foreign evangelist. Our venerable Secretary of Foreign Missions says properly that our Book is defective in limiting the ordaining power of the foreign missionary to *ruling* elders, but he finds no fault with its idea that he is to be *intrusted* by the Presbytery with power to ordain. On the contrary he talks of authority to ordain being "delegated to him," and quotes *Potestas delegata non potest delegari*, and concludes that the evangelist may not delegate his ordaining power to a native evangelist, nor he to any other "until the power to do this has been conferred upon him by a regularly organised native Presbytery, or by the order of the General Assembly in the exercise of its essential and inherent power." (See REVIEW for January, 1884, p. 71.) And so (on p. 64) we read of the Presbytery "conferring powers on the foreign missionary" and saying to him, "We authorise and empower you in going to Africa or China to preach the gospel, etc., and we delegate to you the power to organise churches, to ordain ruling elders and deacons, and *in extraordinary cases* to ordain ministers," etc. Now, we do not hesitate to pronounce all this claim of *delegating, conferring, and empowering* to be utterly un-

scriptural and unpresbyterian. The Lord creates the evangelist's office and gives to it all its powers. The Presbytery only fills the office. The Presbytery is just as truly the creature and the servant of the Lord as the evangelist is. The Presbytery has its field and its own legitimate powers, so has the General Assembly, and so, too, has the evangelist. He does not get from the Presbytery his authority to go to Africa or China and do his Lord's work there. He gets it from the Lord, from whom alone the Presbytery gets its legitimate power of any kind. Presbyteries have a certain authority over missionaries, so have Synods over Presbyteries, and they alone can constitute them, as Presbyteries alone can ordain missionaries. But how would it sound to hear a Synod say to the Presbytery, "We authorise and we empower you to do the Lord's work and we delegate to you the right to do what the Lord requires of a Presbytery"?

The Lord requires the evangelist whom he has called to go to a heathen land, and he empowers him to do what is necessary in order to plant the Church there, and it is thus the foreign evangelist gets the right to ordain other evangelists without leave or license from any Executive Committee, or General Assembly, or Presbytery. This power is inherent in his office, and all that Presbytery has to do with it is that he is put into the office by that body. But it has no more right to direct him as to where or of what materials he shall organise a church, or as to when or whom he shall or shall not ordain as pastor or evangelist, than the Synod has a right to come into the bounds of a Presbytery and direct its exercise of its own legitimate authority.

If the evangelist in "regions beyond" be not inherently possessed of the powers in question, how is he ever to acquire them? The Presbytery has no power over people or persons outside of its own bounds. The General Assembly has no authority to wield over churches in foreign lands. Who gave either of them such authority? They are both representative bodies—how can they rule believers in India or elsewhere abroad who have never chosen them as their representatives? Our Assembly in Savannah decided that it may not make or control a Presbytery in China. How can it, then, make or control, or how empower any

one to make or control, an evangelist in China? And how can it forbid or prevent any one's making or controlling an evangelist of whatever blood or race there? In fact, no Presbytery and no Assembly has any power at all in India or elsewhere abroad except whatever legitimate authority they may have over their missionaries there.

What is that legitimate authority? .It is to inspect their life and conduct, their doctrine and doings, as well as they can at such a distance, and to exercise lawful discipline upon them whenever needful and in every way that is possible. They cannot direct the missionary in his organising or his ordaining work, and there never was a more preposterous idea than that any foreign evangelist should hesitate to ordain an evangelist or a pastor abroad until he can write back to his Presbytery, meeting but twice a year, or to the Assembly, meeting but once, in order to get the authorisation of either. If he were to seek thus and obtain permission from Presbytery or from Assembly, what would be the real worth of it when obtained? He, the solitary evangelist, knows far more of the merits of the case than any Assembly could be made to comprehend. Think of Dr. Mackay's waiting to hear from his brethren in Canada before he could sanction A-hoa's preaching, whether with or without ordination! Think of the admirable Quala, or the eloquent Bartimeus, having to be examined by a Presbytery five thousand miles away! Oh, let us

"Fling out our banner! Let it float  
Skyward and seaward, high and wide!"

We are not straitened in our divine system or its divine Author. He says, "Go, and lo, I am with you." Every true evangelist is a free servant of Christ away out yonder in the desert, where church courts cannot go with their power or their rules except in very limited ways; but his Lord is with his servant there. Let us trust our Lord to take especial charge of those who go to preach his word, and organise churches, and ordain presbyters to rule and teach, and evangelists to carry the truth to "regions still farther beyond." This business of the foreign propagation of the faith the Lord does especially direct. Mis-

takes will be made, but he can and will overrule them for good. Let us not be too timid or cautious or distrustful of Providence, or too anxious to direct and control our poor missionary brethren abroad, so long as the question is about preaching the word, and organising churches, and ordaining pastors and other evangelists. When it comes to the spending of money, then let them feel the control of the authorities at home. When the question is about big things, colleges, and seminaries, and printing presses, and hospita's, then let them seek permission and power from Baltimore, armed and supported with the consent and approbation of what is called "the Mission"—the whole body of the brethren within reach. But so long as it is the direct spiritual work on which the Lord sends out his servant, let us leave the missionary to his Lord's direction. Why all this discussion about the control of our poor solitary, faithful brother? Why so much said about his being "empowered" by his Presbytery, and then "turned over" to the Assembly (REVIEW, Jan., 1884, p. 64), and then controlled by the Executive Committee, and then directed by "the Mission," and then, according to the latest invention, made dependent on "a regularly authorised Evangelical Commission"? Do we mean to govern him to death? Do we wish to have our evangelists tied hands and feet? Let our missionaries loose from this over-much control. Red tape, if we use too much of it, will kill our missions. The foreign evangelist generally must not lose time and opportunity both, in writing back to get the sanction of either Presbytery, or Executive Committee, or General Assembly, before he ordains a native evangelist; and if he should seek their sanction, neither of them have any sanction to give him—it is out of their bounds and beyond their control. He has inherent power of jurisdiction in the "regions beyond" just as fully as they can have it in the settled church state.

These things are proper to be said, and said out loudly, because there is manifest tendency to exalt the home supremacy over foreign missionaries. Why, in the last Assembly there was a report from a much respected Committee which actually went so far as to call foreign missionaries "the *employés* of the Executive Committee." This is a kind of language the old Boards

never dared to use. Employés of the Executive Committee indeed! Well, why not, if they have no powers except such as a poor fallible body of ministers and elders "confer on them"? The language in both cases is very bad. There is certainly a mild flavor—nay, let us speak out plainly and call it a strong de-coction—of Prelacy in that expression; and we could wish that the excellent Chairman of the Executive Committee, instead of merely saying (as reported), "I do not like the expression *employer* or *employé* as setting forth the relations of the Executive Committee and the missionaries," had objected to it in very positive terms as every way reprehensible.

*Sixthly.* There is a new question set afloat by the theory originated at Baltimore of the "Evangelical Commission" to ordain evangelists. The esteemed author of this new theory admits (see REVIEW, January, 1884, p. 77) that "to deny the power of the evangelist, or evangelists, to ordain pastors over the churches they may gather would be nothing more nor less than an estoppel of the missionary work." But he wishes very much to let the solitary evangelist be confined in the exercise of this power to *extraordinary cases*. Not regarding him as really carrying the power of jurisdiction in his single hand to the "regions beyond" (this being his inherent and necessary right and duty according to the appointment of the Lord himself), our venerable and beloved Secretary of Missions desires to "have it understood that the act of ordaining pastors and evangelists abroad must be done by the body of evangelists on the ground." But what is such a body? Can it be a Presbytery? No; confessedly not. What then? Here comes in the new theory, the last invention or discovery: they are an "*Evangelical Commission*."

In preparing the way for this Commission, the Secretary maintains that our Assembly can really "go beyond the bounds of the settled church state and commence a work there unrestricted by any of those constitutional laws or limitations that govern in the home field, . . . and can organise churches, ordain ministers . . . and perform any function whatever that belongs to any one of the four courts." He also holds that the Assembly can interfere in the internal affairs of one of these native churches just as

a Presbytery at home in one of its congregations. Alas, for the liberty of the poor evangelist and the poor native churches when the General Assembly, with its *unrestricted* powers, comes where they are! But how does the Assembly get there? "By a regularly authorised *Evangelical Commission*" (p. 65), "any two, four, or ten foreign evangelists in the same field" (p. 72).

Now, it cannot be admitted for a moment that this is the true doctrine of our Assembly's powers. It certainly is a new doctrine which the venerable Secretary did not know of when he joined in presenting to the Assembly at Savannah the report on the so-called "Presbytery of Hangchow." Then he held that our Assembly is that of "the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and represents in one body all the churches thereof;" that it could not superintend nor represent any other; that it could not have *under its care* any churches in foreign countries except as those churches might send commissioners to represent them in all its deliberations. This was certainly true then and it is true now. The Assembly's powers are all set down in our Book. It has power "to concert measures to promote the prosperity and enlargement of the Church," meaning evidently *in our own country*, for the next clause is, "to erect new Synods." It has power "to institute and superintend the agencies necessary in the general work of evangelisation," and "it can commit the various interests pertaining to the general work of evangelisation to one or more Commissions"—meaning, as everybody knows, our *Executive Committees*. All the expressions of our Book put together do not warrant the new Baltimore doctrine that our Assembly can go to China, or any other outside country, and organise and superintend churches, and ordain elders, by what is called "*an Evangelical Commission*" of ten preachers. Our Book does not authorise the Assembly to appoint Commissions to act as *quasi* Presbyteries in examining candidates for ordination. The Assembly at Savannah acknowledged that it cannot erect a real Presbytery in China—much less, then, may it set up a *sham* one. If it could send a real and true Commission outside of its own bounds to perform acts of jurisdiction, it would have to be composed not of ministers only, but of ruling elders as well.

What a world of trouble to invent new theories of the Assembly's powers just to get rid of acknowledging that he who goes to the "regions beyond," where he "builds on no other man's foundation," carries in his single hand, by the Lord's own authority, every power of every kind that is necessary to *plant* and to *found* outside of the settled church state! What is inherent in the evangelist must be taken from him to be unlawfully used in fixing up a *body* that the Scripture and our Church know not—a body which, if it is to have ordaining power, should of course be a representative body made up of elders of two kinds, who have some church or churches whose representatives they are, and which church or churches have lawfully elected them to attend the meetings of that body; failing both of which characteristic marks, such a commission or court of the Church is no true representative assembly, and can have no legitimate authority in our Church.

*Seventhly.* There seems to be a doubt with some whether to call the evangelist's power of jurisdiction *several* or *joint* power. Must we not all agree, if what has been maintained about his office is true, that it is the very same sort of power which in the settled Church must always be jointly exercised by a Presbyterial body of rulers, but that, inasmuch as he is sent to the "regions beyond," it is committed to him in all its fulness as a *several* power? Whenever, then, it comes to pass that other evangelists, gifted like himself with such power, are gathered together in one place when ordination is to be administered, it may surely be left to the courtesy of the evangelist upon whom the ordination devolves to invite his brethren to lay on hands along with him, it being understood of course that the sole responsibility of the action lies upon him.

JOHN B. ADGER.



## ARTICLE IX.

## THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF ORDER.

The fundamental distinction between Prelacy and Parity does not depend upon the extent of the diocese occupied by the system, but upon the equality or inequality of the rulers who legitimately administer the authority of the Church. A diocese may be co-extensive with a kingdom, or limited to a single city or congregation. The principle is one, whether it is applied to a large or a small sphere, and it is possible to have a congregational episcopacy as repugnant to the Presbyterian theory as that of a fully developed hierarchy. If the control of a Presbytery were wanting, the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons might subsist, in all their relative preëminence and subordination, in any local church. The germinal idea of a gradation of orders, is independent of territorial bounds and numerical limitations. It conceives of a subordination of the presbyter to the bishop, or of the ruling elder to the minister, in respect to rank or order; and it is difficult to discover any fundamental difference belonging to the titles we may choose to apply to them.

It is evident that this doctrine of an original subordination of orders in the Christian Church has been only crippled, and not killed, by the force of progressive investigation. The candid concessions of the most eminent recent authorities in the Church of England have efficiently contributed to weaken its vitality and encourage the hope of its extirpation; but the strange phenomenon is observed, on the other hand, of many ministers in the Presbyterian Church, who cling with extraordinary tenacity to the principle of a subordination of orders, and insist upon parity only in the *same* order. The parity of the *ministry* is their object, but they repudiate that which the Episcopal authorities have conceded—the scriptural equality of the ordinary rulers of the Church. There is now no longer any room for debate concerning the absolute identity of the *πρεσβύτερος* and *ἐπίσκοπος*, the elder and bishop of the New Testament. It would be rash in any writer to maintain the contrary. But, notwithstanding this unity

of opinion concerning the terms, we find many Presbyterians disposed to insist that the class of rulers to which these terms indiscriminately belong, consisted, originally, of two different orders, as distinct as the diocesan bishop and his presbyters, and just as completely subordinated, the one to the other. Indeed, a dispassionate observer cannot fail to discover in the actual condition of our churches many things apparently contradictory to our traditional principles. We look in vain for a church organised like that of Philippi; or that of Ephesus, with its bench of presbyter-bishops, among whom no distinction exists, except the slight difference implied in the intimation of 1 Tim. v. 17, that some do not labor as fully as others "in word and doctrine." In our provincial courts we adhere with great fidelity to our principle of parity, so far as the control of individual churches is maintained by those courts. The several authority of the minister is not allowed to appear in their transactions and decisions, and we make our boast of this exclusion of the one-man-power from our general polity. But when we turn to the actual organisation of local churches, we discover a scene of a totally different character. A single presbyter is solemnly installed as pastor or bishop over the flock, and the other presbyters are expected to accord to him a preëminence of which the Scriptures do not furnish a shadow of precedent. We are taught to regard such a minister as belonging to a higher order and possessing far more exalted powers. His ordination is peculiarly imposing, and his person is supposed to be invested with a sanctity unknown to his brethren. In his presence the other elders are not allowed to preach the gospel, preside over the session, celebrate marriage, or bury the dead. They are strictly forbidden to administer the sacraments, and only permitted to serve the tables at which the ministers preside. The gulf between them is greatly increased by the difference of the qualifications prescribed, by the learned leisure, the forensic experience, and the non-secular habits required of the minister. A distinction which, in the New Testament, is so slight as to require no difference of designation, has by insensible degrees become a disparity for which different titles are a necessity. Indeed, the elders "who labor in word and doctrine" in our modern

churches, enjoy a primacy of prerogative and influence unknown to the college of apostles, and one that cannot, without violence, be imputed to any of the local churches which they founded.

So much difficulty has been engendered by this general tendency to differentiate the orders, that some Presbyterian writers have even suggested, without proof, that the ruling elder has no official designation in the New Testament, being dimly represented but once by the obscure term "governments." This suggestion appears to be a desperate resort of the imagination to escape from inconsistency. Urging the principle of parity in the controversy with prelatists, its authors have found it necessary to exclude the order of ruling elders from view, that the parity of Presbyterian ministers with one another may be successfully vindicated. Under the influence of this tendency to maintain a subordination of orders, not only had a vast hierarchy and a culminating papacy emerged in the Christian Church previous to the Reformation, but the order of ruling elders had entirely disappeared, and when revived by some of the Reformed Churches, was regarded by most Protestants as a useless and unwarranted innovation. The Lutheran and English Churches altogether ignored it, and continue to this day without recognition of any such institution.

If the suggestion were true that the ruling elder is not contemplated in the apostolic terms, *πρεσβύτερος* and *ἐπίσκοπος*, the characteristic features of the Presbyterian system would be sadly marred. The word "governments" would be left alone to sustain our argument for such an institution. But this is so vague a term, borrowed from nautical phraseology and of uncertain application to the organisation of churches, that little emphasis can be placed upon it. It would leave the very existence of such a class doubtful, not to say incredible. For it would then be unaccountable that St. Paul addressed his epistle to the bishops and deacons at Philippi, and omitted all reference to these subordinate elders governing the church. It would be impossible to understand his instructions to Timothy, in which the qualifications of the *deacon* are described as almost identical with those of the

presbyter-bishop, whilst no instructions are given concerning the ruling elders, unless they are embraced in the order of presbyters.

So overwhelming are the objections to this exclusion of the class of ruling elders from official recognition, that we are compelled either to deny its existence or to give it its just importance in the organism of the Church. The existence of such an institution is a question with other denominations, but it can hardly be entertained by Presbyterians. The very liberties of our Church are involved in it. A government by the clergy exclusively, whether in one or three orders, would be a restoration of priestly domination, from which Christ hath made us free. A resort to *lay* representation in our courts would be an invasion of the order established by the apostles, who obviously provided that the Church should be governed by a special class of rulers set apart for the purpose. The presbyters were ordained in every church to have the rule over the flock, and they were either all teaching elders, or only teaching elders in part. Representatives of the people, other than these ordained rulers, have no divine authority whatever. The appointment of such delegations to Episcopal and Baptist Conventions and to Methodist Conferences rests upon human expediency alone.

The existence of a divinely warranted spiritual body in the Church, whose function it is to rule it in some sense, is clearly beyond dispute in our Presbyterian system. The only question that can be raised relates to the number of orders of which it consists. Did the presbyter-bishops of Philippi and Ephesus embrace *two* orders or only *one*? There is no possibility of discussion without agreement in the use of terms. It must first be determined what an *order* is, before our question can be answered. In the sense of the ecclesiastical phraseology of England, derived from Rome, orders are a sacerdotal character indelibly impressed upon the subject by the imposition of apostolic hands. But Presbyterians cannot use the term in any such sense. The utmost extent to which they can go is to attribute to the word a distinction due to *ordination*, by which a greater or less degree of authority is conferred. In this sense a superiority of order implies higher and more extensive powers. But ordination in the New

Testament was either to office or to some special work. An ordination to office conferred order, or rank and power, whilst an ordination to a particular duty imposed obligation. No new order was acquired by Barnabas and Saul at Antioch. They were separated from, but not elevated above, their brethren, for the "*work*" to which they were called. On the other hand, the elders ordained in all the churches were appointed to official position, and not only charged with work, but clothed with authority. They acquired a certain rank with especial powers for the government and discipline of the churches. The nature of these powers we are not disposed to consider at present, but it is evident that the order to which the individuals were raised was not a mere mission, but an elevation to a new sphere of usefulness and dignity.

The discussion must be conducted with this understanding of the term, and no modern phraseology should be allowed to throw our minds into confusion. The word *order* is such a phrase, and has no place in the New Testament in the sense usually attached to it now. The only scriptural trace of it is in the word *ordain*, and "taking orders" in English usage is nearly equivalent to receiving ordination. When, therefore, we inquire whether the presbyter-bishops of the New Testament were invested with one order or two, the answer must depend upon our understanding of the ordination they received. Setting aside all preconceptions impressed upon us by existing ecclesiastical systems, and relying upon the light furnished by the New Testament, we may be enabled to reach a definite conception of the original constitution of the primitive churches. If we confine ourselves to this light, as Presbyterians have always insisted should be done, we cannot but observe that two classes of agents were employed for the propagation and maintenance of the gospel in apostolic times. One class exercised their functions transiently and temporarily; the other was resident and permanent. The apostles and evangelists constituted the former class; the presbyter-bishops formed the latter. With the ordination of these elders our present inquiry is concerned. It is the main question whether they were one order or two; or, in more scriptural language, whether they were ordained

to two offices, the one above the other. As we have already intimated, ordination accomplished two things. It elevated to power, and it appointed to work. The work assigned to individuals may have been diverse. The language of their ordination may have distinguished the duties of each. But the authority conferred by it was that of a class, to be jointly, not severally, exercised. The plural number and common title show clearly that the essential character belonged to them all. Individually, they may not have performed the same duties, and in their separation to office it is possible that different functions were designated. But in a collective capacity they were all invested with one order and authority. The diversity of their duties is not emphasised in the Scriptures, and the indication of it is so faint that, were we limited to this source of information, our conclusion would be almost entirely confined to inference. The one order is marked off from others by many repeated applications of the same titles. The same body of officers is often called elders or bishops, and never are the two names applied to different classes in the same passage. The notion of two distinct orders, whenever advanced, has a ludicrous effect upon the logic of its advocates. It compels them to resort to a laborious circumlocution in order to express it. They find St. Paul addressing the bishops and deacons in the church at Philippi, and are obliged to interpolate in that address the *ruling elders* as an intermediate order, that their threefold cord may be preserved. They imagine the apostle to say "to the saints which are at Philippi, with the bishops, *the elders*, and the deacons." They find him exhorting the elders of the church of Ephesus at Miletus as the bishops (*ἐπισκόπους*) of the flock, and are obliged to imagine that the church was vacant and temporarily in charge of its elders who were acting as its pastors from necessity. He is therefore understood to mean that the Holy Ghost had made them *temporary* bishops, to serve until a true pastor could be procured. The same apostle declares that he left Titus in Crete "to set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city." The advocates of two orders are forced to construe this as an instruction to Titus to ordain and instal a pastor or pastors over each church, and also a bench of

elders as his assistants; but, unfortunately, to Titus as to Timothy, the instructions point out the character and qualifications necessary for pastors and elders as identical, and it becomes necessary to force into the passage from without the extraneous distinction of *teaching* and *ruling* elders.

The contrariety of this theory and of our practice to a large extent, becomes apparent on the slightest inspection. An apostolical Epistle, intended for the First church in New Orleans, or the Second church in Richmond, could not now be addressed with any propriety "to the bishops and deacons." An evangelist sent to our vacant churches, with instruction "to set in order the things which are wanting, and ordain elders" in every community, would not complete his work by fulfilling the latter part of his commission. A great want would remain so long as the vacancy or absence of a pastor continued. It is plain that this contrariety, or want of correspondence with the primitive organism, has grown up in the modern Church, or remained in it as an inheritance from Rome, in consequence of exaggerated conceptions of the clerical office. Distinctions that were not even named in the Scriptures, soon sprang up, after the death of the apostles, in the one order of presbyters, and became the fertile germ of hierarchical usurpation. Even yet, four centuries after the dawn of the Reformation, we find a lingering trace of the same unwarranted distinctions in the purest ecclesiastical systems. The pastoral office is unduly magnified at the expense of the presbyters. It is almost universally conferred upon a single individual, and he is popularly and officially recognised as the depositary of the most important spiritual interests of the flock. The church is *his* church, and the elders are *his* elders, and they and the deacons and private members are so many satellites revolving around him as a central sun. The gulf between him and the rest of the body is so vast that language cannot bridge it, and a phraseology is created which the New Testament knows nothing of.

Not only does this *hiatus* exist in the relations of the one pastor to his subordinates and the congregation, but in the local Presbytery, or Session, where the equality of rule is nominally

accorded by our Constitution to all the presbyters, including the pastor, the distinction is rigidly preserved in the provision which makes the pastor the permanent president of the body, and requires some other minister to be called in, if convenient, as his substitute whenever he is absent. The expediency of this regulation is a question we do not propose to discuss. It is referred to as an illustration of the truth of our allegation, that our modern system differs widely from the scriptural model. For surely it is impossible to discover any restriction of the kind in the Acts of the Apostles, or the Pauline Epistles. But even supposing the permanent moderatorship of a pastor over the Session to be susceptible of vindication, there is no similar reason for the further provision excluding all his co-presbyters in his absence. We can conceive of an argument for the presidency of one who "labors in word and doctrine," in preference to those who do not, on the plausible ground that he is a pastor to the whole flock in a preëminent sense, and the other elders may be numbered among the sheep under his care. A special provision of this kind may be urged as a matter of expediency that the subordination of all the members of the church to the pastor as such may be preserved. We do not concede it, but for the present pass it by. But, on the other hand, we would ask on what principle it is required that, in the pastor's absence, the pastor of some other church, or even one who is not in the pastoral office, shall be invited to preside, in order that the presidency of a ruling elder may be avoided as a calamity? We can conceive of no reason whatever but an assumption that the ministers and ruling elders are two distinct orders, whose relative rank must be preserved with undying vigilance. This subordination is no longer expressed in our standards, but it evidently underlies a number of specific regulations as an unwritten article of the Constitution. We have, in fact, announced the general principle that all the members of all our courts are of "equal authority;" and it is a fundamental rule in our polity that, in voting or balloting in such assemblies, the will of the ruling elder shall avail as much as that of the minister. But not only in the Session is this equality confined to the act of voting. An exclusive discrimina-



tion pervades all our courts, and all their proceedings are so shaped as to impress upon the ruling elders a sense of inferiority which is the fruitful source of the inefficiency with which they are so often charged. The alleged ineligibility of a ruling elder to the moderatorship in a Presbytery, or Synod, cannot be defended without *assuming* two orders of presbyters in the body, the one above the other. The analogy drawn from the pastor's permanent presidency of the Session is of no avail, because the ministers in a Presbytery are not in any pastoral relation to the ruling elders. If they are not a superior order, they cannot claim superior privileges. The fact that the moderatorship is *elective*, would otherwise be sufficient to warrant a choice from the whole body. It would be a mockery to authorise a free choice from a company of equals and then confine it to a limited number of them. The restriction is vindicated on the ground of superior rank, notwithstanding the admitted fact that all the members are of equal authority. A wide distinction is thus made between the authority and the privileges of the presbyters. The former is represented as limited to their votes. Even in the Session, by a strange anomaly, the voices of the majority, consisting of ruling elders, are paramount over that of the pastor. The acts and decisions of a court are determined by the will of a majority, irrespective of order, and in practice we recognise the supremacy of this will in the most momentous concerns. But, in remarkable contrast, the co-equal presbyters, who are clothed with the highest powers, are inhibited by an incidental provision from the inferior privilege of choosing their moderator freely. The most unfit of the ministerial rank are eligible; whilst the most competent of the ruling elders are excluded. This indirect exclusion of the latter class harshly clashes with the fundamental principle of equality. It is difficult to reconcile the two. We do not maintain that any class of presbyters enjoys a right to election, but the line is drawn upon a false and pernicious principle, and without reference to qualification. The right to choose implies the right to exercise judgment as to the fitness of the selection. But such judgment is not allowed a free exercise, in consequence of certain special requirements. If there is dis-

crepancy in our Constitution on this subject, it lies between these special provisions and the fundamental equality of the presbyters. The removal of such incongruities can only be effected by a modification in minor points, which should conform to the general principles of our system of government.

But conformity to scriptural precedents is of immeasurably greater importance than the harmony of a human code. We turn with confidence to this more sacred authority and find in it an overwhelming proof of the unity of the order of presbyter-bishops. If all our prepossessions are laid aside, all ecclesiastical traditions forgotten, and a fresh examination of the Acts and Pauline Epistles undertaken, but one impression can possibly be made upon a candid inquirer, and that is, that the local churches were placed under the management, not of a pastor and a subordinate Session, but of a body of ordained men, styled indifferently presbyters or bishops. The words are not synonymous, but are applied to the same persons. The former is used to indicate the rank, and the latter the chief duty of the office. It is beyond question that this duty relates to the flock intrusted to their supervision. The oversight is not directed to another class of presbyters, as Prelacy presumes, but to the church itself. "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops" (Acts xx. 28). This language was addressed to the presbyters of Ephesus by an inspired apostle, and leaves no doubt that the divine Spirit had called a certain number of men in that church to exercise spiritual oversight over its members. This was the function of all the presbyters, in their character of bishops, "to feed the Church of God." In other words, they were all pastors, as the word translated "feed" evidently imports. But it signifies far more than the simple act of furnishing spiritual nourishment. Our language is inadequate to convey the full meaning of the original. Ποιμαίνειν expresses the whole duty of a shepherd—oversight, care, sustenance, guidance, and control. The one pastor of a modern church is well understood to be charged with these duties, and our present system differs from the primitive one established by the Holy Ghost chiefly in this concentration of

the pastoral office in the hands of one man, and the consequent reduction of the other presbyters to a position and attitude of comparative insignificance. There is no possible escape from the conviction we have that the modern constitution of a local church does not resemble those of apostolic times in many important features. In the latter, the pastorate resided in a body of officers always represented as equal. The supremacy, or even the presidency, of one man is nowhere intimated. Such a relative position is indeed contrary to the spirit of the gospel. There was no primacy in the college of apostles. The sons of Zebedee were rebuked by the Lord for entertaining the thought. The polity of the primitive Church was marked by no more prominent feature than the equality of those into whose hands the management of its affairs was committed. And this constitution is in its essence a divine ordinance. The details of organisation are not revealed to us, and there is ample room left for the use of expediency and the exercise of practical wisdom. But this one thing is revealed in language that cannot be misunderstood, that the presbyter-bishops were constituted an order of equal spiritual officers by the Holy Ghost. This is the divine warrant of Presbytery, as opposed to Prelacy and Congregationalism. Independency is rejected on other grounds, less explicit, though equally satisfactory.

Whatever liberty and diversity in minor matters may be allowed in the organism of local churches, this fundamental establishment of a permanent order to exercise authority over them, cannot be legitimately dispensed with or radically changed. Those churches are obviously defective in which this order is not to be found. Those in which it has assumed a form from which the primitive equality has disappeared, should aim at a restoration of the institution. The perversion has been a growth in insensible degrees. The restoration can only be effected in a gradual manner. Progressive reformation is far better than sudden revolution. The equality upon which we insist is not an equality of person or function in individuals, but that of rank or authority in the Church of God. This authority is to be exercised jointly by the presbyter-bishops, or severally by their commis-

sion. We may conceive of a distribution of duties among the persons composing the one body, according to their gifts. Public offices may have been assigned to some and private offices to others in the very act of ordination. The conduct of public worship, the instruction of the people in their collective capacity, and the administration of the sacraments, may have been committed to a portion of the body, whilst others were charged with the visitation of the sick and the more private instruction of the members. But all these arrangements were effected by the united wisdom and discretion of the senate of the church, which was the fountain of power. That a single pastor did not preside over the congregation in the preëminent sense adopted in our day, is obvious from the negative and positive facts that abound in the New Testament. No reference is made in any of the Epistles to such a personage. The "angels" of the churches in the Apocalypse were functionaries of whom we know so little, that any inference would be unwarranted. The term itself suggests a transient character rather than a permanent pastor. But no importance can be attached to it in this connexion. Since we find in St. Paul's address to the elders of Ephesus, who are recognised as the joint pastors of that church, no allusion whatever to any one of preëminent authority amongst or over them, it seems absurd to presume that such was the case. The very opposite is implied. If a pastor, in the modern sense, had been present, he would have been referred to. If there had been a vacancy in the modern sense, that fact would, with equal probability, have appeared in the narrative.

But the positive considerations are equally satisfactory. They amount almost to demonstration. The character and qualifications of a presbyter-bishop, as prescribed by the apostle to Timothy and Titus, instead of indicating two orders belonging to two different spheres, point out one order and one sphere, in unmistakable terms. It is incredible that so complete a description as that in 1 Tim. iii. was applied to two orders without discrimination. But it is evident that the order portrayed was not precisely the same as the modern elder, or the modern pastor. The presbyter-bishop must be "apt to teach," which is not a requisite

now in the selection of elders; and he must not be "a novice," but one who has lived long enough in the church and the community to have acquired much experience and established a high character. The young divine, fresh from the schools, unmarried, and unfamiliar with the scene of his labors, can scarcely be said to represent the character there delineated. The actual order lay somewhere between these extremes. The presbyter bishop was not a youthful importation from abroad, nor a silent assistant of the pastor. When his order was ordained, the church was completely organised. There was no vacancy. "The things that were wanting" were "set in order."

It is true that some of these elders labored more than others "in word and doctrine." Whether this is to be attributed to regular appointment, to a difference of gifts, or to a difference of zeal, does not appear. "Double honor" was the reward offered to this class of elders with especial emphasis. It is possible that this emphasis refers to their greater earnestness in the public ministry of the word. But it is also possible that there was an official distinction of classes by which a higher dignity belonged to one kind of work than to others. However this may be, the distinction pertained to the *work*, and not to the *order*. They were all presbyter-bishops, they were all clothed with the same authority, the whole work was theirs, because it was performed under their joint superintendence. It was the distinguishing principle of Presbyterianism in that day, as it is recognised in our Church now, that all authority flows downward from its elevated source in the united body of presbyters. The Presbytery, whether local or provincial, is the fountain of power, and all actual administration of it must be authorised by this body. The Presbytery is supreme. Individuals are its agents, commissioned to execute its will. This will is the will of the majority, and the majority is ascertained by simple enumeration. There is no voting by classes or orders. One vote equals another, irrespective of its source. The equal authority is so thoroughly recognised that the ruling elders always control the action of a Session, and, in a Presbytery or a Synod, by combining with a minority of the ministers, they may often defeat the clerical will.

Our Book of Church Order very properly declares that the ministry of the word "is first in dignity." It is compared with other forms of ministry in the Church, and considered as a work confided to some, and not to others in the eldership, it is entitled to especial honor. But this does not imply a comparison of any form of ministry with the ruling power from which it emanates. This would be equivalent to saying that a stream is higher than its head. All ministry is service, and the minister of the word is a servant of the Church. The body of presbyter-bishops is the authority by which all service is due. It is this body that ordains to every form of ministry, and the servant cannot be above his lord. It is clear, therefore, that, by a fundamental principle of our Church, founded upon Scripture, the collective body of elders constitutes the supreme governing court to which all individual officers are subordinate. The several ministries in which they are employed are its agencies, and its members, when in session, are invested with powers which they do not possess at other times. On general principles, we may say that the members, when thus organised, are no longer distinguishable into classes, but are simply a company of presbyter-bishops. The *work* of a court is not to preach or administer ordinances. These duties are performed at its bidding; but the appropriate business of the court is that which it accomplishes during its deliberations. Consultation and decision are the occupation of the members, and their recognised equality implies the suppression of all class distinctions. No precedence is allowable of one over another. All the privileges of the floor and all parliamentary rights are equally enjoyed. On the general principle thus recognised, we should say that no distinction exists among them.

A body so organised has certain rights which it may properly exercise unless forbidden by express provision. It has a right to select its own agents for conducting its proceedings. Our Constitution limits this right in the lowest court, but recognises it in all the higher courts. The moderator of the Session is required to be a minister. That officer is declared to be *elective* in Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies. But the general principle is a recognition of the right of the body to elect without restriction.

In the absence of any such declaration the right would still flow from the freedom of its constitution. On this principle the eligibility of any of the equal members to the office of moderator would be indisputable; not on the ground that a member has a right to be chosen, but because the body has a right to choose according to its judgment.

The fundamental doctrines of our Constitution in this matter approximate very closely to the scriptural model. But in many special provisions we depart from it. The Session is prohibited to choose its own presiding officer, even in the absence of a pastor; and the other courts are limited in their choice to the clerical class, not in express terms, but by implication—an implication from a subsequent provision altogether incidental, and involving no principle whatever. All the ministerial duties required of a moderator could with equal propriety be discharged by another member at his request. The force of the implication is evidently due, not to the necessity of the case, but to the current of precedent and the theory of two orders. But it has been abundantly shown that the order is one, not only in the Scriptures, but according to our own Constitution. The restriction is therefore inconsistent with both, and sadly mars the symmetry and simplicity of our system of government. The unity of the order is beyond dispute, as appears from Ephes. iv. 11, where “pastors and teachers” are enumerated together as *one* of the gifts of Christ to his Church. For Dr. Charles Hodge has well shown that the two words, ποιμένας and διδασκάλους, convey a complex conception, forming one of the units in the enumeration, each of the units being introduced by the emphatic article τοὺς δὲ, which is not repeated before διδασκάλους. By a grammatical and logical necessity, therefore, the two words express one order. But if this reasoning were fallacious, it would follow with certainty, from the gradation of terms employed by the apostle, that the pastors or shepherds are represented as of a higher order than the teachers. The presbyter-bishops were the shepherds of the Ephesian church, and the teachers here spoken of were evidently equal or inferior to them. Our position as a Church governed by equal presbyter-bishops, is therefore based upon the clearest scriptural

proofs. What we need is not radical change, but a removal of inconsistent features from the system.

The form of an ecclesiastical organisation is a matter of far less importance than the spirit associated with it. The question of one or two orders of presbyter-bishops would be comparatively insignificant but for the tendency it engenders to preserve in the Church the spirit of caste. Our ministers as a body are less disposed than most of their profession to cherish an unbecoming *haut-teur* towards their brethren. But, in theory and practice, we are not entirely free from an undue assumption of superiority over the ruling eldership. In theory, they are not laymen, but they are nevertheless regarded as belonging to an order far inferior to the clergy. A deep gulf is supposed to separate them, and a certain sacerdotal sanctity is imputed to the one order and denied to the other. The theory pervades certain parts of our Book of Order, notwithstanding the general principles upon which it is constructed. And it is pertinaciously defended by many of our leading divines, as a vital distinction which it would be fatal to abandon.

The effect of such a theory upon the ministry itself cannot be otherwise than injurious, since it contains the very germ of priestly assumption, from which so great a multitude of hierarchies have sprung in the Latin, the Greek, and the Oriental Churches. But it is chiefly to be deplored on account of its influence upon the eldership. It is astonishing to observe how large a proportion of this great spiritual body have imbibed from tradition and education the same notion of a subordinate office that is entertained by many ministers. In fact, the great mass of our elders have hitherto acquiesced most heartily in the assignment of their order to a secondary place, and whatever progress has been made towards the primitive equality, is due to the efforts of the ministers themselves. That the effect of this acquiescence upon the ruling elders has been an unhappy one, must be evident when we consider the fact that the Holy Ghost has made them the overseers of the church in spiritual matters, but in practice they have been, to a great extent, supplanted by another order of men. To be released from responsibility is agreeable to human nature, and our ruling elders are everywhere found more or less



inclined to surrender into the hands of the so-called clergy the spiritual duties to which they are called in the Scriptures. The consequence has been that most of our ruling elders have been absorbed in secular pursuits, and the spiritual work of each congregation has devolved upon the single pastor and a few volunteer assistants. The elder's duty is regarded as performed when he sits in council and gives his opinion.

One of the most pitiable objects in the world is a small Presbyterian church in the country, lying "vacant" for years for want of a preacher. "The things that were wanting were set in order" long ago, when a bench of elders and a board of deacons were ordained; and yet it is considered by its own members and by the public a *vacant* church, for no other reason under the sun than the fact that the preacher has gone, and the other "pastors" know not what to do. Why do they not *feed* the church, as the apostle charged their prototypes at Ephesus, and as they were called to do by the Holy Ghost? There is no answer possible, if they indeed belong to the order there referred to. If they do not, then where is the warrant for such an institution? If the presbyter-bishops were all ministers of the gospel in the modern sense, we would find no trace of such a body as our ruling elders in all the New Testament. The elders who "ruled well," but did not "labor in word and doctrine," might be understood to represent them, had not all the elders been required by the apostle to be "apt to teach," and all been charged to "feed" the flock. There is a sense therefore in which ruling elders may feed the "vacant" churches. There is a sense in which they may act the part of faithful shepherds in the spiritual fold without prominently laboring in the work of the ministry. It is this erroneous impression that the worship of God must cease and the instruction of his people must be arrested whenever a minister resigns, that we most earnestly reprobate as the prolific cause of so much desolation. It is manifestly due to an exaggerated view of the necessity for a superior order to occupy the pulpit, and to an undue depreciation of the importance of the eldership.

Looking to the Scriptures alone we find the scene in the primitive Church very different from one of our "vacant" churches

We find it fully organised with a bench of presbyter-bishops and a board of deacons. The worship of God proceeds with regularity on every Lord's day. Several of the presbyters conduct the public services and discourse to edification, either by original preaching or by reading from other sources. These elders "labor in word and doctrine," perhaps by special ordination. Others are engaged in private instruction, in visiting the sick, in watching and tending the sheep. They rule well (or act as guides), but are less conspicuous in the public services of the sanctuary than their associates, who are appointed to "especial honor." In all this we can discover no vacancy, no incompleteness, no inequality of order, nothing but a shade of difference, due to the greater sphere of one class compared with the other. All the presbyters are bishops, all are pastors, all are teachers; but owing to a diversity of gifts there is inequality between man and man, whilst there is none between rank and rank. For a difference of order would have from the first necessitated a difference of name, and the common designation of presbyter-bishop would not have been employed.

A similar divergence from the original principles of organisation is observable in the higher courts of the Church. We boast of our representative system as causing the general sentiment of the people to be reflected in these courts through their chosen commissioners. But we are no longer an example to the Church at large. Almost all Protestant denominations have adopted what they call *lay* representation in their deliberative bodies, and this element comes forward as an efficient and prominent factor in their proceedings. Many influential laymen take an active part in the consultations and decisions of these bodies, and are becoming better and better acquainted with ecclesiastical affairs. The presbyter-bishop is not a layman, but a spiritual officer, and yet in our higher courts his influence and activity, instead of being greater, is probably less than that of the lay element in other Churches. As a class they display but little interest in public questions, little acquaintance with ecclesiastical business, and for the most part maintain an ominous silence in discussion. Their views are little sought, and it is not usual to intrust important

business to their care. They are appointed on committees apparently to fill up a prescribed number, and are excluded from almost every position of dignity. They may be jurists of experience and eminence, expert parliamentarians, able statesmen, or accomplished professors. But they shrink into modest silence in the presence of the clergy, and appear to understand that only a subordinate part is expected of them. All this is the manifest effect of our system and our usages. It is detrimental to the Church. It is contrary to the Scriptures. If the zeal and energy of this important element were in normal exercise, the progress of our Church would be vastly accelerated.

The spirit of ultra-conservatism is apprehensive that this class of church officers would be a dangerous power to set free in the counsels and the administration of the Church. Their want of qualification and experience, as sometimes betrayed in our courts, is an unailing argument against a departure from present usage. But it is a sufficient answer to say that the system is the cause of these defects. It is the system that paralyses the tongues and hands of the most competent and humble of our elders. Encouragement, and not repression, is the dictate of a wise policy. It is impossible to estimate the beneficial results that might be expected from a restoration of this great body to its proper sphere.

Far be it from us to suggest revolutionary changes. It would be difficult to remove all obstacles at once. But it is certainly conservative to advocate a progressive return to principles founded in the word of God, and long lost sight of in the practice of the Church. Especially is this true when we have at last begun to recognise them in our fundamentals of government. Our Book of Order, in its earlier chapters, lays down the scriptural doctrine on the subject with fidelity. The obstacles are chiefly found in the more minute provisions, and in an unwritten law which is assumed to be authoritative. For example, the Book does not require the moderator of a Presbytery to be a minister, but assumes the restriction as already established, without any ground for the assumption but that of usage. It is a reasonable expectation that the Church will correct this discrepancy, either by a positive prohibition or by a removal of the restriction. The

latter measure would far better accord with the general principles of the Constitution. The Church would be no loser by such an effort to give consistency to its regulations, and the practical effect of an obliteration of the restriction would be calculated to restore the eldership to something like its primitive dignity. It would seldom occur that a ruling elder would be chosen as moderator. The ministers are almost always in a majority, and their greater familiarity with business of that kind would usually suggest a selection of one of them. But it is unreasonable to prohibit such a court to elect, according to its judgment, a ruling elder of eminent fitness to preside, on the erroneous ground of an inferiority of order. The sooner this impression is removed from their own minds, the sooner will they enter upon that career of spiritual usefulness which is their sacred calling.

There is such a thing as excessive conservatism. The spirit that would blindly adhere to old abuses, rather than return to the Scriptures, is one of the most baneful that can be cherished in the Church. Innovation should always be resorted to with the utmost deliberation; but we propose nothing of the kind. If the Church, after inquiry, can be assured that the Scriptures recognise two orders in the presbyter-bishops of the New Testament as distinct as the modern pastor and the ruling elders, we would submit without a murmur to its judgment. All we aim at is a candid examination of the subject. An indolent satisfaction with the condition of our Church and its slow progress argues very little interest in its welfare or its mission. Something is wanting, and it is not sufficient to say that this something is a general revival. Such an answer would be equally suitable on every occasion. It would mean no progress whatever in the use of the instrumentalities placed in our hands. The Church is ever under obligation to improve its methods of action. It has no right to assume that it has attained perfection, and especially is it bound to compare itself in all its stages of growth with the faultless model of the Scriptures.

JAMES A. WADDELL.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

We give the place of honor this time to the posthumous work <sup>1</sup> of the illustrious Swiss savant and Christian apologist, the late Professor Arnold Guyot of Princeton. The lamented author's previous treatise, "Earth and Man," contributed largely to fix his reputation as one of the first of living geographers. His school text-books in the same department have exerted a wide influence, and have shown that (like our own Maury) this great man could make his almost unequalled knowledge intelligible to plain minds. Professor Guyot was a colleague of Agassiz at the College of Neuchâtel and afterwards (for a while) at Harvard. These two great masters of natural science were life-long friends, and both of them valiant and irresistible champions of biblical theism. Arnold Guyot was, like Brewster and Faraday, an humble disciple of Christ. His chosen field was that of physical geography; but he was equally at home in the kindred subject of geology. He adopted the theory of interpretation which regards the days in Genesis i. to be undefined periods, and held that the "Mosaic Vision of Creation" was much as Hugh Miller has described it. He paid extraordinary attention to his class pictures and diagrams, which were of great size and superb execution. This sound exegete holds that the original creation of matter, that of life, and that of man are certain. Professor Guyot was as simple and warm-hearted as he was learned and eloquent. He dispensed a charming hospitality, and riveted his old pupils to him in an attachment that was organic, not mechanical. The name of this devout student of the earth's crust deserves to be inscribed in the Church's register of men of consecrated powers and exceptional achievements. The present work will rank with the books of

---

<sup>1</sup> Creation; or, The Biblical Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science. By Arnold Guyot, Blair Professor of Geology and Physical Geography in the College of New Jersey, author of "Earth and Man," Member of the National Academy of Science of America, Associate Member of the Royal Academy of Turin, etc., etc. 1 vol., 12mo, with full page wood cuts and lithographic plates, \$1.00. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

Professor Dawson, of Canada, as a masterly defence of the faith on grounds of physical science. We are pleased to note the fresh volume in the series of the Pulpit Commentary.<sup>1</sup> As we said before, the different volumes are of unequal merit; there is too much homiletical matter; on points of detail (and in one or two instances on larger questions), there is an unpardonable "bowing in the house of Rimmon." Dr. Westcott's name is a good endorsement of the new and critical exegesis of John's Epistles.<sup>2</sup>

Our method in these crude exercises of editorial snap-judgment is to direct attention to a book as soon as ever the edge of its disk appears above the horizon. Afterwards we are apt to return to the theme and retouch the original statement. Sometimes, as honest critics, we are constrained to revise our first impressions. A closer acquaintance with Professor Briggs's brilliant disquisition on Biblical Introduction<sup>3</sup> has convinced us that (like the technical symphony heard by Dr. Johnson) it is one of those difficult things that ought to have been impossible. It makes nothing of the external Canon, and subordinates the clear teaching of God's inspired word to the mystic oracle of the so-called "Higher Criticism." "The last German" has *apparently* more weight with Dr. Briggs than the *ipse dixit* of Jehovah, though the learned author would say that "the last German" alone can give us that *ipse dixit*. This settlement of theological questions by a rough count of Teutonic noses is a sort of traditionalism for which we confess we have no stomach. In a former number we expressed

---

<sup>1</sup> The Pulpit Commentary. Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M. A., and the Rev. Joseph Exell, M. A. 1 Samuel. Exposition by the Rev. R. Payne Smith, D. D., Dean of Canterbury. Homiletics by the Rev. Professor C. Chapman, M. A., Western College, Plymouth. Homilies by various authors—the Rev. D. Fraser, D. D., and the Rev. B. Dale, M. A. Fifth edition. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co.; London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

<sup>2</sup> The Epistles of St. John: the Greek Text, with Notes and Essays. By Brooke Fosse Westcott, D. D., D. C. L., Regius Professor of Divinity and Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883. 8vo, pp. lxi., 360.

<sup>3</sup> Biblical Study: Its Principles, Methods, and History. Together with a catalogue of books of reference. By C. A. Briggs, D. D., Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York. Charles Scribner's Sons, N. Y.

our admiration for much that was worthy of praise in Professor Ladd's two octavos on a similar subject,<sup>1</sup> but intimated our dissent from his radical positions. We now reiterate and emphasise that dissent. It is sad to find a *confrère* of the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, and a member of the same Faculty with Professor Fisher and President Porter, gone so far astray from the paths of orthodoxy. We regard this as a very dangerous book. Dr. Toy's<sup>2</sup> new work on the New Testament Quotations we had hoped would have been free from the rationalistic (or semi-rationalistic) virus that poisons so much of the theological literature of the day, and that had poisoned the earlier effusions of this very writer. In this expectation we have been signally disappointed. If it should turn out (as we trust will be the case) that Professor Lumby's "Popular Introduction to the New Testament"<sup>3</sup> is not liable to strictures of the same kind, that convenient volume may be lauded without serious qualification. It is chiefly admirable, as it would seem, for its succinct comprehensiveness and its popular elegance. We go back to "Mitchell's Handbook"<sup>4</sup> (though it is by this time hardly a recent publication) to bespeak for it the confidence and approval of our unskilled readers, and of our skilled readers too, who are unacquainted with it, and to recommend it for its practical serviceableness. The only drawback to it is that there is so little of it, and that little rather fragmentary. Hackett's "Smith"<sup>5</sup> is of all others the one to have.

<sup>1</sup> The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture. By George T. Ladd, Professor in Yale College, author of "The Principles of Church Polity." 2 vols., 8vo, \$7. *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> Quotations in the New Testament. By C. H. Toy, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Hebrew in Harvard University. 1 vol., 8vo, \$3.50. *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> A Popular Introduction to the New Testament. By I. Rawson Lumby, D. D., Norrissian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. Crown 8vo, cl., 365 pp., \$1.50; by post, \$1.65. A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

<sup>4</sup> The Critical Handbook. A Guide to the Study of the Authenticity, Canon, and Text of the Greek New Testament. By E. C. Mitchell. Illustrated by diagrams, tables, and a map. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1880.

<sup>5</sup> Smith's Bible Dictionary. By William Smith. Unabridged, enlarged, and corrected. Edited by H. B. Hackett, D. D., and Professor Ezra Abbott. 4 volumes, 3,667 pp., with 596 illustrations. Price, in cloth, \$20; sheep, \$25; half morocco, \$30; half Russia, \$35; full morocco, \$40; full Russia, \$45. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

If we were called upon to name *one work* that could best supersede all others in English in the departments of Biblical Interpretation and Literature, we should be tempted to mention this edition of Smith's Bible Dictionary. For example, Woolsey's short note on Cyrenius is the most complete and decisive argument that can be met with in the same compass against the conclusiveness of A. W. Zumpt's solution of the harmonistic problem presented by Luke ii. 2. Even this great work, however, is not wholly exempt (and from the nature of the case hardly *could* be so) from the same baneful foreign bias that characterises so much of what would otherwise be the best writing of the era in which we live. Dr. Terry's treatise on Hermeneutics<sup>1</sup> is a scholar-like one, and on the whole creditable to the learning and position of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The offset is that the book gives too much countenance to the transcendental "Criticism." Dr. Terry has revived the time-worn theory that the millennium is now in progress.

We imagine that this "Study of Origins" is the greatest of Dr. Pressensé's books.<sup>2</sup> We estimate this honored writer's name very highly indeed; much more highly on the score of his intellectual prowess and rhetorical subtlety and finish than we did before the appearance of this volume. The venerable President of the College of New Jersey seems to be devoting himself chiefly at this time to the construction and dissemination of the smallish volumes making up his "Philosophical Series,"<sup>3</sup> and which appear to be designed (as they are admirably adapted) to meet the

---

<sup>1</sup> Biblical Hermeneutics: A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. By Milton S. Terry, S. T. D. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

<sup>2</sup> A Study of Origins; or, The Problems of Knowledge, of Being, and of Duty. By E. De Pressensé, D. D., author of "Contemporary Portraits," etc. Translated by Annie Harwood Holmden. Large crown 8vo, 515 pp., \$2.25; by post, \$2.45. Randolph, N. Y.

<sup>3</sup> Certitude, Providence, and Prayer. By James McCosh, D. D., LL. D. 50 cents. Being No. IV. in Dr. McCosh's Philosophical Series. The earlier numbers are: I. Criteria of Diverse Kinds of Truth. As Opposed to Agnosticism. Being a Treatise on Applied Logic. II. Energy, Efficient and Final Cause. III. Development: What it can do and what it cannot do. Each one vol., 12mo, paper, 50 cents. The Scribners, N. Y.



current of scepticism that has for sometime been coming in like a flood. Dr. McCosh, we regret to say, is not as stiff as he once was in opposing the transmutation hypothesis. We have referred in a previous number to Dr. Fisher's important work entitled "The Grounds of Theistic Belief."<sup>1</sup> That work deserves to be signalised yet more. There is a wonderful revival of the apologetic spirit and aim in the religious literature of our time; and Professor Fisher is one of the best informed and most successful of the recent defenders of the Christian faith. This volume is the fourth in a series of books on cognate subjects. The first of this goodly fellowship of publications, and the one that made the author's fame, was styled "Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity, with special reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tübingen School." If anybody wants to understand Strauss and Baur, and to see them demolished, he should go to that robust octavo.

The University of Berlin, both from its prestige and the present ability of its Faculties, may reasonably lay claim to the position of the leading University in Germany. The chair of Systematic Theology in such an institution might well be expected to add lustre to the name of its occupant. In the instance before us the name of the venerated teacher gives more celebrity to the chair he occupies than he borrows from it.<sup>2</sup> If a vote were taken throughout the globe, Dr. Dorner would probably be declared to be the first of living theologians. Dr. Dorner, too, is richly evangelical: yet, as we have warned our readers, Dr. Dorner is by no means sound on all points as soundness is rated in the strict Presbyterian bodies. The Leipsic author,<sup>3</sup> who has once more entered the field of sacred history (this time in a more fragmentary way than before), is said to be a fascinating and thoroughly expert writer. His sympathies are rather with humanitarian paganism against the early Church. One of his most interesting dis-

<sup>1</sup> *The Grounds of Theistic Belief.* By George P. Fisher, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. New York: *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> *Gesammelte Schriften aus dem Gebiet der systematischen Theologie, Exegese, und Geschichte.* Von Dr. Dorner. Berlin. 1883.

<sup>3</sup> *Kleine Schriften religionsgeschichtlichen Inhalts.* Von Dr. Adolph Hausrath. Leipzig: S. Hirzel; New York: B. Westermann & Co.

quisitions treats of Luther's marriage and married life. We are content to leave such theological potsherds as Dr. Littledale and the Ven. Archdeacon Farrar to be ground to pieces by such an iron vessel as Principal Rainy.<sup>1</sup> The astute ritualism of the first and the taking latitudinarianism of the second are no match (in argument at least) for the sturdy force and solid orthodoxy of the third. Our prayer should be to be delivered from such freedom as to faith as is so mellifluously proclaimed by Mr. Munger.<sup>2</sup> A doctor of philosophy of Oxford has now given us one of the ablest and most learned and most satisfactory of the lives of Christ.<sup>3</sup> It is the fruit of seven years of toil.

The latest of the numerous books that are pushing themselves into notice on the subject of sermons and sermonising,<sup>4</sup> strikes us less favorably than any of its predecessors. This is hardly more than saying that several of these have been books of rare and exceptional merit. There is nevertheless a lack of fine critical discrimination in some of the estimates of the men referred to in this volume, and altogether too narrow a sweep taken of what may be fairly called the homiletical horizon. Yet the treatise has its value and its interest: few treatises on this theme have not. A new volume of sermons by that master of the arts of making sermons and volumes, Dr. Wm. M. Taylor,<sup>5</sup> will be hailed with gratification. Much as is said about the importance of preaching to children, it is to be feared that the duty and privilege are

---

<sup>1</sup> The Atonement. A Clerical Symposium; or, "What is the Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement?" By the Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, Principal Rainy, Dr. Littledale, and others. Cr. 8vo, cl., 275 pp., \$1.25; by post, \$1.40. Randolph, N. Y.

<sup>2</sup> The Freedom of Faith. By T. T. Munger, author of "On the Threshold." \$1.50. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston, Mass.

<sup>3</sup> The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. By Alfred Edersheim, M. A., Oxon., D. D., Ph. D. In 2 vols. New York: Randolph; London: Longmans, Green & Co.

<sup>4</sup> The Preacher and his Sermon. A Treatise on Homiletics. By the Rev. John W. Etter, B. D., pp. 581. United Brethren Publishing House, Dayton, Ohio.

<sup>5</sup> Contrary Winds, and Other Sermons. By William M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1883.

sadly neglected by not a few of our ministers.<sup>1</sup> Some never so much as turn aside to say a word to the little folks even when addressing the grown people. But this is not enough. It is of the nature of children to listen twice as well when the sermon is announced for them. The art of speaking to the young can be acquired by anybody that has a head on his shoulders and a heart in his bosom. Much depends on the tone of voice, and on brevity, variety, plainness, and a judicious use of explanatory illustration. Graphic representations before the mind's eye are not essential, but of high importance. Stories are not necessary, but give delight, and properly employed may be turned to good account. We call attention again to the revived interest in Quietism, and to the book ushered into notice by the author of *John Inglesant*.<sup>2</sup> *Luther's Hymns*<sup>3</sup> is an excellent topic for a volume in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of Luther's birthday. Luther's "Judgment Hymn," in its naked original form, as sung by a whole congregation of earnest Teutons, has a majesty like the chant of the sea-waves, and has been made the basis of some of the most complex and brilliant music of our own day. Luther's melodies are of Gregorian plainness, and would not gratify the jaded palate of our fashionable church-goers. Matthew Arnold<sup>4</sup> is the prince of literary egotists. He has actually talked men into the belief that he is not only an eminent and scholarly poet, but almost the only living example of sound opinions on all subjects that can be expressed in perfect prose. His literary merits are indeed of a high order. His poems are full of masculine strength and beauty, though also of a sort of pessimistic scepti-

<sup>1</sup> *Outlines of Sermons to Children*. With numerous anecdotes. New York: *Ibid.* 1883.

<sup>2</sup> *Golden Thoughts*. From the *Spiritual Guide* of Miguel Molinos, the Quietist. With a Preface by J. Henry Shorthouse. 1 vol., 12mo, \$1.25. The Scribners.

<sup>3</sup> *The Hymns of Martin Luther, set to their Original Melodies, with an English Version*. Edited by Leonard Woolsey Bacon, assisted by Nathan H. Allen. One volume 4to, with vignette likeness. Published in commemoration of the Four Hundredth Anniversary of Luther's Birthday, November 10th, 1483, by Charles Scribner's Sons.

<sup>4</sup> *Matthew Arnold's Prose Works*. Seven volumes, in a box, price, \$10.50. New York: Macmillan & Co.

cism, and his prose style is really almost unequalled for its exquisite clarity and precision, and for a certain nameless satisfying charm. His opinions are of varied quality. In literary criticism, he is a close follower of *Saint Brève*, and like his French prototype often singularly felicitous. Even here, however, he is sometimes as perverse and Quixotic as Ruskin, and on other subjects he is sometimes as fantastic as Malvolio, if not as mad as Lear or Hamlet. Mr. Arnold is admirably fair and temperate in his discussions, though in all his writing too much enamored of certain crotchets and pet phrases—one, at least, of which has been known to give offence. His vaunted theology of culture is nothing but the extremest form of sublimated rationalism strongly tinged with the conservative glow of a warm attachment to the institutions and monuments, including the Prelatic Church, of England. We regard Mr. Arnold as on the whole one of the most fascinating, and at the same time (on important subjects) one of the most dangerous and pernicious thinkers and writers of our time. Dr. Schaff's great history<sup>1</sup> is undergoing a process of rewriting, rather than of mere revision. This volume covers the period from Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great, and finishes the account of Ancient Christianity. It is stated that the "History of Mediæval Christianity" is in press, and will be issued before the end of the year. A volume on the "Protestant Reformation and the Papal Counter-Reformation" will follow, and another on "Modern Church History" complete the work. This (certainly if considered as the sequel of the author's "Apostolic History") is Dr. Schaff's *magnum opus*; and judging by so much of it as has yet appeared, we are warranted in saying that while it does not aim to supersede the great works of Neander and Gieseler, and does not altogether displace the classic work of Mosheim or even the later histories of Guerike, Hase, and Kurtz, the "Christian History" of the learned and able writer now under review is better up than any of them to the requirements of the age, and better adapted to the wants of American readers. The Queen's journal of additional events in the Highlands certainly does honor

<sup>1</sup> Christian History. By Philip Schaff, D. D. Revised edition. Vol. III. 8vo, \$4. Scribners.

to that royal lady's heart and character, and has been thrown into a readable form. Too much space has been devoted to the faithful gillie, the celebrated John Brown. These unpretending notes have a pathetic shadow cast upon them by the death of Prince Leopold.<sup>1</sup> Sir Theodore Martin is a skilful as well as practised literary artist, and now comes to the rescue of the fame of the American-born waif of fortune who was three times Lord Chancellor of England, against the charges of Lord Campbell.<sup>2</sup>

The zeal and ability with which English studies are now pursued by certain Southern scholars has won approving words from such men as Professor March of Easton, and, in the mother country, the great Shakespearian critic, Professor Furnival. Doctor Hunt's "*Caedmon*"<sup>3</sup> is only part of a larger work, of which Professor Thos. R. Price, now of Columbia College, but formerly of Randolph Macon and the University of Virginia, contributes a liberal and highly important share. Professor Harrison, of Washington and Lee, is engaged in the same general effort, and has displayed a kindred enthusiasm and a kindred talent and knowledge, and gained similar plaudits from the select few whose praise he would value. Mr. Ashton is doing good service to the future historian of England. He has availed himself of rare opportunities as a first-hand collector of historic and literary curiosities, and in a manner worthy of the subject. His previous volume on the "*Chap Books of the Eighteenth Century*," and on "*Social Life in the Reign of Queen Anne*," were fit precursors of the present work.<sup>4</sup> Horace Walpole<sup>5</sup> finds a discerning portrait

<sup>1</sup> *Her Majesty's Diary. More Leaves from the Journal of a Life in the Highlands, from 1862 to 1882.* Scribners. 1884.

<sup>2</sup> *The Life of Lord Lyndhurst, Three Times Lord Chancellor of England, from Letters and Papers in Possession of his Family in England and the United States.* By Sir Theodore Martin, K. C. B., author of "*The Life of the Prince Consort*." London: John Murray.

<sup>3</sup> *Caedmon's Exodus and Daniel.* Edited from Grein. By Theodore Hunt, Ph. D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Language in Princeton College. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. 1883.

<sup>4</sup> *Humor, Wit, and Satire of the Seventeenth Century.* By John Ashton. New York: J. W. Bouton. 1884.

<sup>5</sup> *Horace Walpole and his World.* By L. B. Seeley, M. A. New York: Scribner & Welford. \$2.50.

painter and critic in the author of "Ecce Homo." Without joining in the denunciatory tone of Fox, Lord John Russell, or Macaulay and Croker, Professor Seeley is rather a delineator than a panegyrist. The accomplished author's well known literary art would naturally awaken expectations which this book does not disappoint. The little fashionable coterie in which Walpole moved is, we suspect, thrust into somewhat undue prominence; and the masculine side of Walpole's character, his political and literary individuality, not sufficiently brought out into relief. Horace Walpole was a man of many petty whimsies and vanities, but he was virile as well as effeminate; he was downright and fixed in honest opinions on great as well as little subjects, and was the raciest, the tersest, the most epigrammatic, of English letter-writers. He was, notwithstanding, intensely worldly and a social voluptuary. The work of Sir William Sterling-Maxwell is a marvel of exhaustive research and skilful presentation.<sup>1</sup> Since Dr. Channing no Unitarian has stood higher in the field of what must be styled theological belles-lettres than has the late Dr. Dewey.<sup>2</sup>

Ancient Sculpture<sup>3</sup> is a theme that is handled in a satisfactory manner by one who shows herself well acquainted with her subject. It was to have been hoped that the Comte de Paris, who served on Gen. McClellan's staff, would have risen at length to the serene station of a thoroughly fair, if not wholly impartial, student of events. We grant, indeed, that he has consciously aimed to occupy this enviable position, but it must be added that he has not succeeded in doing so.<sup>4</sup> His work, though, is of great value as an honest record by a trusty professional soldier who witnessed many of the battles which he describes.<sup>4</sup> Every new

<sup>1</sup> Don John of Austria. By Sir William Sterling-Maxwell. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Dewey's Autobiography and Letters. Edited by his Daughter. Roberts Brothers, Boston. \$1.75.

<sup>3</sup> A History of Ancient Sculpture. By Lucy M. Mitchell. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 1 vol, 8vo. \$12.50.

<sup>4</sup> History of the Civil War in America. By the Comte de Paris. With maps faithfully engraved from the originals and printed in three colors. Three volumes now ready. 8vo, cloth, \$3.50; red cloth extra, Roxburgh style, uncut edges, \$3.50; sheep, library style, \$4.50; half turkey morocco, \$6. Porter & Coates, Philadelphia and New York.

biographical dictionary is received with spontaneous expressions of welcome.<sup>1</sup> Some of the old ones are very defective, and all of them fall short of the demands of the hour. Mr. Lea's masterly work on "Sacerdotal Celibacy"<sup>2</sup> is one of the most damaging to the Papal system that has appeared in our day. It is one of the ablest and most readable books withal bearing on the history of the Latin Church that have issued from the press since the publication of Milman. "The Creators of the Age of Steel"<sup>3</sup> is an interesting account of such men as Sir Henry Bessemer, Sir William Siemens, and Sir Joseph Whitworth. The author of "My House: an Ideal,"<sup>4</sup> tells very entertainingly how one may manage to secure a combination of what is simple, what is comfortable, and what is elegant, in house-building. Captain Richard Burton is one of the most versatile men of the present generation, and this<sup>5</sup> is said to be one of his most original and striking books.

Such delightful spirits as Mendelssohn Bartholdy<sup>6</sup> afford a mine of enjoyment to the lovers of biography. Doctor Quarles has written a deeply interesting life of the late Professor Kemper,<sup>7</sup> who for many years (both as a College Professor and the Principal of a large school) stood in the front rank of Christian educators in Missouri and in the South. His just claim was to be (under God) "a maker of men." There were features of some novelty, and at the same time of great and proven advantage, about some of Professor Kemper's methods of instruction and discipline.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas's Comprehensive Biographical Dictionary. 12mo, cloth extra, \$2.50; sheep, marbled edges, \$3; half morocco, gilt top, \$3.50; half Russia, gilt top, \$4.50. *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church. By Henry C. Lea. Second edition, considerably enlarged. In a handsome 8vo vol. of 582 pages, cloth, \$4.50. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

<sup>3</sup> Creators of the Age of Steel. By W. T. Jeans. Scribners. \$1.50.

<sup>4</sup> My House: An Ideal. By Oliver B. Bunce. *Ibid.* In paper, 50 cents; in leather, \$1.

<sup>5</sup> The Book of the Sword. By Captain Richard Burton. London: Chatto & Windus. 1 vol., 4to, \$10.50.

<sup>6</sup> The Life of Mendelssohn. By W. S. Rockstrow. New York: Scribner & Welford. 1 vol., 12mo, \$1.

<sup>7</sup> The Life of F. T. Kemper, A. M., the Christian Educator. By J. A. Quarles, D. D. Published for Mrs. S. H. Kemper. Burr Printing House, New York.





# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. 4.

---

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXXIV.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

*Doctrine of Original Sin, as Received and Taught by the Churches of the Reformation, Stated and Defended.* By the Rev. Dr. R. W. LANDIS. Whittet & Shepperson, Richmond, Va., pp. 541.

This is a posthumous work of Dr. Landis, Professor of Theology in the Danville Theological Seminary, Kentucky. It arose out of a discussion between him and the admirers of Dr. Charles Hodge, touching the doctrine of the latter about the manner of the imputation of Adam's sin to the race, which Dr. Landis conducted in the DANVILLE and the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEWS. He complained that the supporters of Dr. Hodge in the Northern Church, to which Dr. Landis belonged, resented all criticism of their leader in a factious, tyrannical, and popish spirit, which refused to give a fair hearing to the truth, and even punished him for daring to assert that truth against their great man. Hence Dr. Landis felt that no resource was left him, in defending God's cause and his own good name, except the publication of his full views and their grounds. He therefore devoted the latter years of his life and the riches of his own magnificent theological library to the laborious and careful composition of

this volume, which he rewrote seven times. He then bequeathed it to the Central Kentucky University, as his literary executor, to whom he also gave his collection of books. It is now published by the University, in fidelity to his memory and wishes. The intelligent reader will of course understand that the University considers itself by this act as only performing its engagement as to Dr. Landis's memory as a scholar and divine, and not as making itself a partisan on either side of the theological issue debated. That issue is one of those in which, as is generally avowed, honest Calvinists may differ without compromising their orthodoxy. We have, in our own day, seen on one side a Chalmers and a Hodge, and on the other a Landis, a Breckinridge, and a Baird. The University can therefore claim, indisputably, that, in securing for Dr. Landis a full hearing, it has broken no obligation of courtesy or discretion resting on it as a Presbyterian institution.

Dr. Landis's whole discussion is directed to a single point: the strict theory of Dr. Hodge asserting the antecedent, immediate, and gratuitous imputation of Adam's sin to his race as (in the first stage of the judicial transaction) merely *peccatum alienum*. Readers of Church history are aware that since the time of Placæus, about the middle of the seventeenth century, debate has existed among the Reformed whether this imputation was antecedent to the actual moral corruption of the race, and immediate, or whether it was consequent thereon, and mediate. The occasion for disclosing this question was an act of the French National Synod condemning any (meaning virtually Placæus and his followers) who should teach that the doctrine of original sin was limited solely to the hereditary subjective corruption of men, and should deny, as a part of the doctrine, the true imputation to men of Adam's first sin. Thereupon Placæus sought adroitly to evade the point of this condemnation by explaining that he did not deny that imputation, but only denied that it was "antecedent and immediate." He held that it was only "mediate and consequential" on men's actual, personal, and subjective corruption.

Of this explanation, the Synods seem subsequently to have

taken no notice. But sundry of Placæus's brethren remained dissatisfied, and continued the discussion. In this discussion, antagonism of feeling not unnaturally developed and fixed the ill-starred distinction, which never ought to have been stated or discussed, between Placæus's idea of an imputation of Adam's guilt only mediate and consequent on the actual personal corruption of Adam's posterity derived to them merely by hereditary descent, and the opposite view of an imputation by God of the guilt of Adam's first sin to men, antecedently, immediately, and gratuitously, God conceiving them as initially holy in their personal estate at the time of this imputation, and then visiting on them, as the penalty of this imputed guilt, the initial depravation of their subjective characters, at least so far as the *privatio justitiæ* could go, on which positive corruption would naturally and inevitably follow. Now, it has pleased Dr. Hodge to adopt this latter extreme view, and to push its consequences in the hardest manner, asserting, with his sternest dogmatism, that this, and this alone, is the doctrine, and that all the great Calvinistic leaders are with him, and those who dissent are virtually not Presbyterians at all on this point. Dr. Landis undertakes to prove, on the contrary, that none of the great leaders or symbols are with Dr. Hodge in this extreme; that he has misrepresented or misunderstood them all; that the Church has always rejected Dr. Hodge's extreme view as distinctly as she has discarded Placæus's; has refused to entertain the mischievous distinction, and has always held that the imputation, while in a certain just sense "immediate," proceeded with even step with the actual personal participation of men in the race sin, and was not "antecedent" and "gratuitous" in Dr. Hodge's sense.

This issue may seem a narrow one upon which to write a large book. But it is the hinge question. Its vital importance proceeds from its corollaries and the other vital doctrines involved. These are such as the following: the relations of reason to revelation; the sovereignty and moral attributes of God; imputation; satisfaction for human sins; justification; believers' union with Christ; effectual calling and sanctification; God's providence over the posterity of wicked men.

We will let Dr. Landis define the question (p. 111, § 13):

"Dr. Hodge teaches that the sin of Adam was made common to the race by a forensic and gratuitous imputation; while, on the contrary, the Calvinistic and Lutheran communions have from the beginning always taught that sin was imputed *because it was common*—i. e., the sin alike of Adam and his posterity. This single point presents, in fact, the *nucleus* of the whole question. For if the sin becomes common only through the forensic or gratuitous imputation of Adam's *peccatum alienum*, or merely personal guilt, then the doctrine of our participation therein is a figment, and Dr. Hodge's theory is the true doctrine, and no alternative can remain to us but to accept it with all its fatal sequences as regards our theology, and to acquiesce moreover in the exegesis by which he claims that it may be supported. But if, on the contrary, the first sin was imputed because it was common, and if such be the unvarying doctrine of the Church of God, then, of course, Dr. Hodge has left his brethren no alternative but to regard and treat his theory as a fundamental and fatal departure (as he himself has always conceded) from their cherished faith."

The old readers of this REVIEW will recognise in Dr. Landis's criticisms and exceptions a close resemblance to those advanced in the review of Hodge's theology, in the number for April, 1873.

Dr. Landis's extended discussion may be virtually reduced to three heads, in which he asserts that Dr. Hodge's exaggerated doctrine is (1) illogical, (2) unscriptural, (3) unchurchly, or against the uniform teachings of the Church's symbols and leaders from Augustine to Edwards.

I. The points wherein Dr. Landis asserts this doctrine to be illogical are chiefly these:

1. That Dr. Hodge, like other Calvinists, argues to the reasonableness of the imputation of Adam's sin to the race from that method of divine providence which now visits the sins of the parents on the posterity. But, says Dr. Landis, the essential condition of such providential dealing is, that the posterity are also actually and personally sinful. God only visits the parents' sins on the generations "that hate him." Were the case of Adam and the race, then, analogous to these providential dealings, it must be just the opposite of what Dr. Hodge represents it. For,

2. The latter asserts that, initially, the guilt of Adam's first sin is imputed to men while as yet unfallen, pure, and guiltless, as behooves them to be when issuing first from the creative hand of God. For the first depravity comes upon infants *as the penalty* of that merely imputed guilt. Dr. Hodge must hold, as indeed he says, that the newly created soul has at least an instant of innocent and pure subjective being, not only logically, but chronologically prior to its condemnation for Adam's sin and to that initial depravation which is the penalty therefor. Now, this view leaves the doctrine of imputation opposite to, instead of analogical to, the other case of children suffering for parents' crimes. So that, for Dr. Hodge, this argument is absurd, and contradicts instead of confirming him. Next, his view is as stubbornly inconsistent with fact (in another direction) as was Placæus's view, and equally contradicts Scripture. For, according to this, subjective corruption is absolutely as early in each individual case. There are as many and as strong tests which say that man is corrupt from the beginning of his life, as that he is guilty from the beginning. So that, as Placæus uttered a solecism when he represented the young soul as depraved before it was guilty for imputed sin, so Dr. Hodge utters the counterpart solecism when he represents it as guilty before it is depraved. Scripture says it is both guilty and depraved from the very first. And, once more, Dr. Hodge sins against fact, Scripture, and the invariable teaching of our Churches in not only rejecting, but ridiculing the doctrine of our *actual participation* in the first sin. Dr. Hodge sneeringly asks, How could a person participate in an act done before he had any existence? He says it is nonsense. He insists that the only sense in which the individuals of the race could have participated in Adam's sin is the formal and forensic putative sense, and that this was the only participation the Church ever held, or could hold, without stultifying herself. But Dr. Landis asserts, with equal stoutness, that the Church always did hold to the actual participation of the individuals of the race in Adam's sin; in its criminality as well as its guilt; that our divines invariably teach this as a fact, and as the essential condition of the imputation; and while they admit it to be a

mystery, inexplicable by human philosophy, they assert it as made possible by the race unity and community of nature between the head and the branches. And herein Dr. Hodge opposes Scriptures, such as John iii. 5, 6, and the Confessions, which assert that we "sinned in Adam," as well as "fell with him." Dr. Landis asserts, moreover, that his opponent is perpetually misled and misleads his readers as to what our divines mean by "Adam's sin" and the "first sin," by which they always mean that sin as common to Adam and the race, as actually, though mysteriously, shared by the race; while Dr. Hodge persists in regarding it as Adam's mere personal sin made common to men, in the first stage, by nothing but its formal imputation as *peccatum alienum*. This Dr. Landis abundantly sustains by profuse citations.

3. He asserts that Dr. Hodge's doctrine tends to make God "the author of sin." For if the initial subjective corruption is the penalty merely of the guilt of Adam's personal sin formally and forensically imputed to us, it is every way natural to conceive of God, the judge, *as inflicting the penalty* he pronounces. This is the only intelligible view of judgment and penalty: while the criminal brings about the crime judged, *the judge brings about* the penalty righteously affixed, either by inflicting it himself or efficiently procuring its infliction. This is what a judge is for. So that Dr. Hodge should consistently teach that the depraving of every soul since Adam is God's direct doing. Must he not do it with his own hand? Does he employ the holy angels to do it? Hardly. Or the devils? or the parents? The latter would be our doctrine of original race sin, which Dr. Hodge has rejected. Again, if each soul is subjectively pure when it begins to exist, it is an insufficient explanation to say that each one regularly and invariably, though freely, depraves itself. This is too much like the Pelagian theory for accounting for the prevalence of actual apostasy. And how comes it that this multitude of initially holy wills should invariably choose corruption? Why does not the result turn out, if it were simple self action, as it did among the angels, where some chose to deprave themselves and some chose to remain pure? In another place, Dr. Hodge,

floundering in the meshes of his erroneous speculation, seeks to avoid making God the author of our corruption by saying: If God saw fit simply to *withdraw* the indwelling of the Holy Spirit from the newly created soul, its depravation by the law of defect would follow. But the hard question for him is, Would God impute a *peccatum alienum* to a soul initially pure, and also privileged with the indwelling of the Spirit? And can any one believe, with the Bible in his hand, that creatures ever had that indwelling efficiently for one instant who were at that instant under the curse, "by nature children of wrath," "conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity"?

4. Dr. Hodge concurs often with all the Reformed divines and the Scripture in teaching that our federal and natural union with our head results, according to God's ordinance, in his first sin's affecting us (as being a common sin), both morally and forensically, as it affected himself. This, says Dr. Landis, is good doctrine. But now come two questions. Are we actually in race union with Adam holy, or with Adam corrupted? Certainly the latter: because Adam had no child until after his fall, and then he begat sinners, "after his image, in his own likeness." And in Adam's own person, which preceded, subjective corruption or judicial condemnation? A just God does not condemn a creature until after he sins, and in the overt sin corrupt motive must have preceded guilty action. Now, then, why do we not represent the seed, like their head, as condemned, because already actually corrupted?

5. But let us see Dr. Hodge's affirmative logic, by whose stress he feels compelled to strain his theory of imputation so high. It is, in substance, this: unless we hold that the imputation of Adam's guilt was immediate, gratuitous, and precedaneous, we cannot consistently hold the imputation of our guilt to a holy Christ, nor of his righteousness to us vile sinners. For the three imputations must be held as exact parallels. This is implied in Romans, chap. v. 11 to 21, where the apostle illustrates justification in Christ's imputed righteousness by our (admitted) condemnation in Adam, and the honesty and soundness of the apostle's argument require us to suppose an exact parallel between the two im-

putations, both in fact and in mode. But the imputation of our sins to a holy Christ, and of his righteousness to us, are gratuitous, whence the apostle must have regarded the imputation of Adam's sins to us as equally gratuitous and immediate. Moreover, let the opposite doctrine as to original sin be held, and the exact parallelism be borne in mind, and our theory of justification must be the popish one; for as Placæus held that men's subjective corruption was prior to, and in order to, the imputation of Adam's guilt to them, so the Papists teach that the believer's inherent and subjective godliness must be prior to, and in order to, the imputation to him of Christ's righteousness. Thus Dr. Hodge urges with the utmost tenacity that unless we admit his extreme view, we cannot consistently be Christians at all.

To this showing Dr. Landis objects, that the assumptions made in it are all absolutely erroneous, and the inferences of no force whatever. Thus :

That the immediate and gratuitous nature of the imputations in expiation and justification do not at all imply a similar quality in the imputation of Adam's sin to men, because two grand differences in the two cases intervene. The imputation in the fall was one of *justice*, that in redemption is one of *mercy and grace*. A righteous ruler, in dispensing free gifts and favors, properly holds himself at liberty to exceed the bounds of strict desert. In administering justice, never. To overlook this difference, in order to force on us a favorite speculation, is an amazing oversight. And, second, an essential difference in the two cases is found in this: that Christ's coming under imputation of guilt was optional and voluntary on his part. And so his righteousness is imputed to no soul for justification until that soul freely accepts and chooses it in the act of faith. We must believe in order to be justified. True, it is the merit of the divine substitute, and not the merit of the believing, which justifies; but none the less it is absolutely true that the sinner must believe in order to have that divine merit imputed to him. So that in both the imputations involved in a sinner's redemption, that of his sins to Christ and Christ's merits to him, we find *this feature of free consent in the party receiving* the imputation to be an essential element,



which, in the imputation of Adam's sins to us, would be totally lacking on our part, were Dr. Hodge correct. Dr. Hodge unwisely insists on an exact parallel between the three imputations. Well, let it be settled, for argument's sake, that they are exactly parallel. Then we must hold that the free assent of each sinning person to Adam's act as his representative is essential in order to make the imputation of his guilt any parallel at all. And we find that assent only in the old Calvinistic doctrine of *actual participation* in Adam's sin, as in order to the imputation, which Dr. Hodge so rejects.

Our author in another place carries this point farther with great acuteness. Does Dr. Hodge urge that both holy and unholy creations begin existence with a subjective disposition certainly regulative of their feelings and choices; that this law of their character does not, and cannot, originate as the Pelagians vainly fable in an act of that creature's choice, and that, hence, as to his just responsibility for acting with that disposition, it is worthless to raise the question how or whence it came to him, and we only ask: Is it *his own* disposition, and does he freely act it out? Then he is justly responsible. True, says Dr. Landis, just so. And therefore all the cavils of ancient and modern Pelagians, that a created righteousness—in Adam's creation, or the believer's new creation—cannot be a responsible righteousness, are silly and worthless. But Dr. Hodge should have noticed that the subjective righteousness inwrought in the soul in regeneration *only becomes a true righteousness as it is accepted and freely preferred by the soul born again*. The causal source of it is external to the renewed will, almighty and supernatural? Yes, certainly. But none the less is the infused holiness the freely chosen preference of the soul from the very instant it is accounted by God as a true holiness. The rule of the divine work is expressed in the text, "My people shall *be willing* in the day of my power." The very essence of the divine work within the dead soul is that it renews and quickens *the will*, causing the soul to choose and pursue freely that godliness which, in the days of its bondage and spiritual death, it had as freely rejected. It appears, then, that in no case does God account holiness or un-

holiness to a creature, except as there is a voluntary participation in it by the creature's own will. So that, to establish the symmetry Dr. Hodge so ardently pursues, and to range the imputations of the two covenants in that exact parallelism he demands, he ought to have retained instead of discarding the good old doctrine that the guilt of Adam's first sin is imputed to us, *because we sinned in him*, and have an actual participation of our free agency in his crime as well as its guilt.

This train of thought prepares the way for Dr. Landis to wrest Dr. Hodge's next point from him and turn it against him. Does he charge a tendency towards popish justification on Dr. Landis? Dr. Landis charges a more real tendency to Arminian and semi-Pelagian justification on him. For he insists that in original sin the guilt of Adam's personal sin as *peccatum alienum* is first immediately imputed to souls, viewed as so far personally pure and guiltless; and consequentially the first subjective corruption comes on them as penalty of that imputed guilt. And the three imputations must be strictly parallel! Then the application of redemption must, of course, be on this wise: first, the righteousness of Christ must be imputed to the sinner, he being still in his state of native spiritual death and sin. On this imputation is grounded his acceptance. And then, as the consequence of this acceptance and as the first merited reward to this imputed righteousness, the new birth is bestowed, implanting spiritual life and subjective godliness. But *this is Arminianism*. This ill-starred tenacity of Dr. Hodge in adhering to his speculation, despite its bad consequences, receives a striking illustration in his last work, his *Theology* (Vol. II., p. 249). Ten years after he had been warned by Dr. Landis he prints these sentences as his description of the application of redemption: "It was by the disobedience of one man that all men are constituted sinners, not only by imputation (which is true, and most important), but also by inherent depravity, as it was by the obedience of one that all are constituted righteous, not only by imputation (which is true and vitally important), but also by the *consequent* renewing of their nature, *flowing from* their reconciliation to God." These words are dangerously incautious. Doubtless Christ has purchased for

the elect by his priestly work all the blessings of effectual calling and sanctification from beginning to end. Doubtless all Calvinists hold that increase in sanctification is one of the after fruits of justification. But here Dr. Hodge says, not that subsequent growth in holiness, but the very *renewing* of the sinner's nature is "*consequent*" on justification, and "*flows from*" their reconciliation to God, apparently as though he would rather avouch the Arminian theory than recede from his favorite doctrine about imputation.

For if there is any one thing in which Calvinists are unanimous, it is that justification follows faith, and that faith is the act only of new-born souls following their renewal. And strong Arminians are equally unanimous in assigning this contrary order to the redemptive causations. First, common sufficient grace, evoking with the synergism of the self-determined will, repentance and faith. Next, justification by faith. Then, as the consequence of justification, the regeneration of the soul. And then progressive sanctification. A synergistic system calls for this arrangement of the steps. And it is equally true that this arrangement implies synergism. For the sinner must believe in order to be justified, and be justified in order to be regenerated. Of course, then, faith is an exercise of soul which an unregenerate soul is competent to put forth. Of course, then, no unconditional election of grace, no almighty quickening is needed to decide the sinner for the gospel; he may decide himself in the sovereign exercise of a self-determining will, while grace follows on and coöperates in the good change which the human will has sovereignly instituted! Is that Calvinism? But Dr. Hodge says that such must virtually be the adjustment resulting from his theory of imputation. Then his is not the theory of the old Calvinists.

The difficulty he obtrudes as to our view and its resultant popish justification by inherent instead of imputed righteousness is easily solved. No Protestant ever denied, in opposition to Papists, that all justified persons have an inherent righteousness. Our denial is, that our inherent righteousness can be, at the beginning or ever after, the "formal cause" of our justification.

We utterly deny that it is, or can be, the ground of justification by any merit of condignity or of congruity, not because we doubt whether the believer really has it at the time he is justified, but *because it is imperfect*, because a condemned creature *cannot merit*, and because the inherent righteousness is *due to God's inworking*, not to that of the man's own natural will. "What hast thou, that thou didst not *receive*? Now, if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory in it as though thou hadst *not* received it?" But saving faith, on which justification instrumentally depends, is the exercise of none but a regenerate soul. The instituting of the vital union between the dead soul and Christ is absolutely needed in order to faith. Out of that union all our life, reconciliation, and holiness flow. Chronologically, both the new birth, which is the initiation of the process of sanctification, and justification instantly follow that union. But causatively Christ must quicken us first, through the union, in order that we may put forth the true faith which justifies. Were we inclined to insist upon a perfectly symmetrical parallel, then, between the steps of our fall in the first Adam and our redemption in the second, as Dr. Hodge insists, we should be led to a conclusion opposite to his; that in each case the subjective change is in order to the forensic.

But the great Reformers did not think that Paul's argument in Romans v. proceeded on the idea of such exact parallel. They all say, as Calvin, that the one topic illustrates the other; which supposes—the apostle being an honest reasoner—that the two imputations have something in common. But that, while they agree in the thing, they obviously differ in mode. Thus, Calvin, Commentary on Romans v. 17, says: "Moreover, it is important to note here *two differences* between Adam and Christ," etc. Gomarus, the strict supralapsarian Calvinist: "Adam, by the force of nature (*vi naturæ*), communicates his sin to all and each of his natural offspring; but Christ communicates his righteousness and life to each of his renewed." "But the comparison is twofold, to wit, of a resemblance and of a difference." Polavius of Bâle: "Bellarmine deceives himself in his exposition of the analogy contained therein (Rom. v.), since Paul *does not compare*

*the modes* by which we are in ourselves either sinners or righteous, but the efficient causes whereby we become sinners or righteous before God." Andrew Rivet, the special opponent of Placæus, whom Dr. Hodge claims as wholly his own: "Yet there is nothing in this argument which forbids that we acknowledge the necessity of *inherent qualities*" (in order to imputation). "For it can only be proved" (from Paul's comparison) "that in Christ we have righteousness, as we have in Adam unrighteousness. But there is a comparison of *the causes* and not of *the mode* in which the thing is communicated to us. For the sin of Adam is communicated to us by generation; but the righteousness of Christ by imputation. Therefore, the apostle *does not compare the modes* in which righteousness is received, but the causes, effects, and subjects of each. A. Willets, "Sixfold Commentarie upon Romans," speaking of the illustration of Romans v., mentions "the disparitie and unlikeness" of the two cases: "The *manner* how these things (death by Adam and life by Christ) are conveyed *is diverse*: Adam's sin is transmitted by natural propagation, but life and righteousness are conveyed by grace." Theodore Beza, the strictest of Calvinists, Commentary on Romans v., verse 12: "But this distinction plainly appears" (in the analogy) "partly, indeed, from the whole comparison of the unrighteousness of Adam with the righteousness of Christ, to wit, of the former through propagation, of the latter communicated to us (believers) through imputation." And (unkindest cut of all to Dr. Hodge) Francis Turretin (Loc. 16): "Nor, if we are constituted unjust and guilty through the sin propagated from Adam, must we immediately be justified through inherent righteousness communicated to us by Christ through regeneration; for the method of each is most different. And Paul here institutes a comparison between the first and second Adam *in the thing, and not in the mode of the thing.*" And yet Dr. Hodge claims Turretin wholly!

We have seen how Dr. Landis charges him with misconception of what the Reformers meant by "first sin." They, Dr. Landis holds, uniformly meant by this the breach of the covenant of works in paradise, not merely as Adam's personal act, but also as the common sin of the race. They have in mind always the

mysterious fact of our actual participation in that breach. And whereas Dr. Hodge rejects this idea as "unthinkable," the Reformers uniformly advance it as a revealed mystery, above the comprehension of reason indeed, but not contrary to reason, and the very key to the whole doctrine of original sin. This is well summed up in these remarks of the recent Lutheran divine, Dr. Julius Müller: "This, therefore, is the point at which all the threads of the doctrine of the orthodox concerning hereditary sin meet, in which it must be dogmatically justified, if it is at all capable of such justification. It first of all appears as something quite incredible that in the fall of Adam all his natural posterity are supposed to have some participation. If, now, it may be shown that this is only the paradox which every deeper connexion of things has for ordinary thinking, then all further difficulties of the doctrine become involved of themselves." And Dr. Landis asks: Can the Trinity be rationally explained to our finite minds? Have not the apparent paradoxes involved in the "three in one" been the constant subjects of rationalistic cavil? Yet Dr. Hodge holds that this inexplicable mystery of the Trinity is the essential foundation of the whole doctrine of redemption, as we all do. So, says Dr. Landis, there may be an apparent paradox in the statement that "the race sinned in Adam"; the human mind may be incompetent to explicate the whole conception of a *race unity*, which is a real fact, and yet does not destroy individuality and personal responsibility. But it does not necessarily contradict the intuitive reason; and *it is a revealed fact*, and also *the clearest of experimental facts*, that *the race became actually and universally sinful (except Jesus) in Adam's sin*. And on this fact the doctrine of imputation hinges. The philosophic attempts made, from Augustine to S. J. Baird, to explain this fact have been failures; they have given us no real light; their failure probably shows—as did the failure of the scholastics to give the *rationale* of the Trinity—that the conceptions involved concerning such ultimate facts in ontology lie beyond the grasp of the human intellect. And the best philosophers see most clearly that this feature of our ontological beliefs *constitutes no objection whatever to their rational validity*. Could Sir Isaac Newton explicate

the notion of gravitation? No, not at all. Has metaphysics ever explicated the notions of substance (as distinguished from essence) of power in cause? of the unconditioned notions, eternity, infinity, self-existence, abstract number? No; yet every thinker in the world adopts these notions as essential elements of his beliefs. How strangely has Dr. Hodge, then, here betrayed himself into that rationalistic position which everywhere else he so clearly and justly condemns?

For Dr. Landis asserts next that the peculiar features of his doctrine about imputation, and of his exposition of Romans v., are precisely those advanced by the Socinians, Arians, and Arminians in the Reformation ages, and sternly rejected and refuted by the Reformers. Socinus, Curcellæus, Whitby, Limborch, and their whole schools deny the actual participation of mankind in the sin of Adam's fall; define original sin as consisting in the gratuitous immediate imputation of the formal guilt (*reatus actualis*) of Adam's personal sin, and in that alone; describe God's act in thus imputing Adam's guilt as one of mere sovereignty, and not of real judicial righteousness; so that the evils and natural death which the race incur from this imputation are not properly penal, but the results of this arbitrary formal imputation. The same was the doctrine of the papal semi-Pelagians, Pighius and Contarinus, so sternly resisted by Calvin. And, accordingly, it is in the commentaries of these Rationalists on Romans v. that we currently see those features of exposition on which Dr. Hodge insists, and in which he departs from the line of interpretation before current among the Reformed.

Now, the Socinians, Arians, and semi-Pelagians had certain doctrinal ends to pursue in setting up this theory of original sin, and they are ends thoroughly obnoxious to Dr. Hodge! Strange that he did not see whither his unnatural fellowship was leading him. The vital truths most hated by these Socinians and their sympathisers are these: that the human soul is naturally and decisively corrupted by a connate ungodliness; that hence man has no longer any self-determination of will to any spiritual good; that distributive justice is an essential and unchangeable attribute of God; that hence, there is a strict moral necessity for real satis-

faction to justice for the guilt of sins in order to their remission ; that all the natural evils men suffer are properly penal, and thus their occurrence proves the criminality before a holy God of all that suffer ; that so, Christ's sufferings during his humiliation were properly penal, sacrificial, and expiatory ; that the believer's justification is grounded in the real merit and acceptance of that vicarious satisfaction, and not merely in the arbitrary compassion of God. These are the very lineaments of the Socinian anti-Christ, from the Racovian Catechism to Dr. William Channing, as none know better than Dr. Hodge.

Let us now see how these heretics proposed to get rid of these doctrines by their tampering with the Reformed theory of original sin. Thus, if there is no actual criminality in Adam's posterity, but only the formal imputation of the mere guilt (*reatus actualis*) of a *peccatum alienum*, and God has really made that imputation and visited all natural evils on such a ground upon creatures wholly devoid of personal criminality or demerit, then it follows that natural evils may occur to responsible creatures which are *not properly penalties of sins*. Then the famous argument of the Augustinians, that the sufferings of infants prove them sinners, is shown to be worthless ; and then, moreover, it follows that God's dispensing of such sufferings is an act of his arbitrary will and not of a righteous judicial will. And this plainly implies that *distributive justice is not his essential attribute*. And thus falls the main argument of the Calvinists for their dogma, the necessity of penal satisfaction in order to remission. Again, since Paul in Romans v. establishes a strict parallelism between the two imputations, and also between the mode of the two, the imputation of believers' sins to Christ is like that of Adam's sin to his race : not a true judicial judgment, carrying over to Christ a righteous penal obligation, but a mere formal politic arrangement, dictated by God's arbitrary will, as moved by his general goodness. And Christ's sufferings were no more penal, in strict sense, than are the suffering of sinless infants when they die under the imputation of Adam's guilt. Then, there was no true sacrifice, expiation, and satisfaction for man's sins made on the Cross. And the Reformed doctrine of justification founded thereon is senseless



and false. These, unquestionably, are the logical ends which the rationalistic divines were pursuing when they vitiated the orthodox Church doctrine of the fall in Adam in the manner described. So the Reformed divines apprehended their objects, and for that reason they resisted their expositions utterly. These are the objects distinctly pursued and claimed by the Socinians and their sympathisers in these expositions. Yet Dr. Hodge adopts these perilous expositions, so uniformly exposed and rejected by the Reformers, and that in the professed defence of strict Calvinism! What are likely to be the fruits among his blind admirers? It is not charged that he himself had any Socinian or semi-Pelagian leanings; his loyalty to the truth is here unquestionable. But he is loyal to it by a happy inconsistency. And the danger is that others may work out his principles to their mischievous results, and introduce Socinian rationalism into the huge Church of which he was the Gamaliel.

II. We are now prepared to touch briefly upon the exposition of the classical passage, Rom. v. 12–21, on which this doctrine of imputation chiefly rests. The reader is requested to place the Greek of the following verses before his eye:

“12. Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: 13. (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. 14. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. 15. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. 16. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. 17. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.) 18. Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. 19. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.”

Now, as to the general scheme of exposition for this passage,

Dr. Landis charges that Dr. Hodge, following the Socinian expositions of such writers as Curcellæus, Whitby, and Dr. Taylor of Norwich, insists on making the parallel exact between the two imputations in thing and in mode. But the current of the Reformed divines, from Calvin down to our day, as represented by Alford, Wordsworth, Schaff, and Shedd, hold as does Dr. Landis, that the apostle compares the two cases, the fall and redemption, as two processes analogous in their sources and causes, but different in details of mode. In each case there is a great company of souls represented in its respective federal head, an imputation, a justification, and a condemnation of the individuals of the two companies through their federal heads' respective actions. So that men all sin and are condemned in Adam as truly as they are renewed and justified in Christ. But in the details diversities appear, some of which the apostle himself specifies. As that the corruption passes from Adam to the race by natural participation (and along with it the imputed guilt). But the restoration is wrought through Christ's righteousness gratuitously imputed. That the transaction in Adam was one of strict justice; that in Christ of free grace. That in the one case a single criminality was the source of death to a whole race; in the other a single righteousness was the source of life to all the elect. Still other differences (see Calvin's commentary on verse 12) exist, which the apostle does not specify, because it does not suit his purpose, as: "The first is, that in Adam's sin we are not condemned through imputation alone, as though the penalty of another man's sin were exacted of us; but we thus sustain its punishment because we are also guilty of fault (*culpa*) so far, to wit, as our nature vitiated in him is involved in guilt before God. But through the righteousness of Christ we are restored to salvation in another mode." \* \* \* "The other difference is, that the benefit of Christ does not reach to all men, as Adam involved his whole race in condemnation," etc. So that the great current of the Reformed have held the fact that the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believing sinner is gratuitous was not meant by Paul to show that the imputation of Adam's sin was, in exactly the counterpart sense, gratuitous.

When we come to details of exposition, Dr. Landis claims that Dr. Hodge has followed the current of the Rationalists in the following points, which he rejects in company with the current of the Calvinists. In verse 12th, "For that all sinned," ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, Dr. Hodge, with the opponents of Calvinism, makes the sinning not an actual, but merely a putative and forensic accounting as guilty with the guilt of a *peccatum alienum*. While he admits that the usage of the verb makes against this construction, yet, as it gives the only rational sense, it must be adopted, and the exposition of the remaining verses squared to it. But the Reformed expositors, with Calvin, say that ἁμαρτάνειν cannot bear that sense, that it is against all usage, and that the subjects of the verb must be held to have sinned in some actual sense. And the least we can get out of the proposition is, that death passed on all from the first sin, because all in that sin incurred subjective depravity of nature. Calvin actually enters into a specific argument to prove that the verb "to sin" may, according to Scripture usage, mean "to be subjectively a sinner;" which accords with the Reformed theology, by which subjective depravity is regarded as veritable sin, and, while not the result of previous volitions, yet personal and voluntary in the sense of being spontaneous.

On verse 14 the Socinian divines would have us understand that death's passing over on them "who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" means the forensic and formal denouncing of death on human beings personally sinless, merely for Adam's *peccatum alienum*. But the Reformed think generally that this means *infants*, who suffer and die, thus showing that they are condemned persons; while the difference between their personal sinning and Adam's is this: that his sin was overt as well as *in habitu*, while they have only a sinful disposition *in habitu*, being at the time the condemnation comes on them not capable of overt sin.

On the 18th verse, Dr. Hodge reads, δι' ἐνὸς παραπτώματος, "by the sin of one man," making ἐνὸς masculine, and thus getting an implied support for his doctrine of the gratuitous imputation of Adam's personal sin. Dr. Landis, with the best Reformed,

regards *ἐνός* as neuter, and reads, "by one transgression"—that is, by that one race sin, common by participation to Adam and his seed. And he claims the exegetical force of the *ἐν ἐνὶ παραπτώματι*, in the exactly parallel expression of verse 17, which cannot justly bear the translation, "by one man's offence," given it in the received version.

Once more, when the apostle says, in summing up his comparison, verse 19th, "By the obedience of one shall many be *made righteous*," Dr. Hodge still limits the result here stated by Paul to the putative and forensic estimation. He thinks *δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται* is equivalent to "shall be declared righteous." Dr. Landis, with Wordsworth and Schaff, thinks the words mean far more, constituting Christ's redeemed both forensically and actually righteous. Thus the concluding declaration is made to correspond with that of the same apostle in 1 Cor. 15: "As in Adam *all die*, so in Christ *shall all be made alive*." Then the counterpart result of the first member of verse 19: "As by one man's disobedience *many were made sinners*," includes not only their putative, but their actual fall.

The fact to which Dr. Landis calls our attention is certainly worthy of note: that the traits which mark Dr. Hodge's cherished exposition of the passage, so far as they differ from the old current view of the Reformed, are the very ones which the Socinians advanced and the Reformed divines contested so strenuously.

III. The third position laboriously defended against Dr. Hodge is, that his doctrine is unchurchly; that it is an innovation upon the traditionary Reformed doctrine as taught by the great divines of the Presbyterian Churches and by their Confessions of Faith. Here Dr. Landis's assertion is, not only that there is a discrepancy in the way of stating the doctrine, but that the peculiar features which Dr. Hodge claims to be essential to the consistency of our Calvinism are expressly stated, and *stated to be rejected* by the great Calvinists. The tenor of his citations might receive, as a summary and homely paraphrase, the following statement: "This view of a gratuitous antecedent imputation of Adam's sin as *peccatum alienum* we find advanced by So-

cinians and Socinianisers, or we hear cast up to us as an absurdity ; but we declare that it is not our view of the doctrine of original sin, nor that of our Churches. We wash our hands of it." Dr. Landis, moreover, complains that his opponent astonishingly misleads his readers by asserting that such and such of the great Reformed divines are expressly with him ; when, in fact, they are as expressly against him. This part of his work is, of course, chiefly a compilation of extracts. It is marked by profuse and laborious scholarship, and in most respects by fairness and discernment. He delights especially to quote against Dr. Hodge the highest Calvinists, as Beza ; those who carried the federal theory to the greatest lengths, as De Moor ; and those who especially entered the lists against Placæus and his theory of mediate consequential imputation. The reader has already seen instances of the first class in the citations made from Gomarus and Beza. This may be added from John Owen's "Display of Arminianism" (Chap. 8): "Sin imputed by itself, without an inherent guilt, was never punished in any one but Christ." And again: "Now, be the punishment what it will, never so small, yet if we have no demerit of our own, nor interest in Adam's sin, it is such an act of injustice as we must reject from the most Holy, with a God forbid!"

Under the second class, De Moor, although carrying the federal system to its greatest height, says (De Moor's *Marckii Medulla*), on the twelfth question of the Heidelberg Catechism: "Adam was considered as the representative head of the whole human kind, and we all, adorned in him with the gift of righteousness, sinned in him, so that those gifts were taken away judicially, and in the way of penalty, from us, on account of the guilt contracted in Adam, not less than from the first parent, inasmuch as we ourselves spontaneously dilapidated these gifts when sinning in Adam." As to its being Adam's particular sin, he replies: "The crime, nevertheless, is common."

As specimens of the third class, we may recall the declarations of Andrew Rivet, the leading opponent of Placæus. And we add declarations from Des Marets, who is writing with especial reference to the Synod of Charenton and Placæus: "For divine

imputation, seeing it is an act of justice, neither principally nor instrumentally produces native corruption, inhering in each one from his mother's womb." . . . "But it only subjects them to guilt and obligation to punishment on account of the sin of the first man, *which all committed in him.*" And from Wallæus, the colleague of Rivet, who endorsed his work as excellent. "The guilt of the first sin to condemnation (Rom. v. 16) cannot be imputed to posterity, unless that vitiosity of inherent sin intervene, seeing that the justice of God will not permit that the first sin should be inputed for condemnation to a posterity having no sin in themselves."

Sundry of the points of theology involved with the nature of imputation have been already indicated. Our author dwells especially upon two, among others. If Dr. Hodge's view of imputation is adopted, it must seriously modify our views of the divine justice and sovereignty. Instead of ascribing to Him a full sovereignty, regulated by infinite reason and holiness, we must believe that an absolute physical sovereignty regulates his justice. We ought, in consistency, to lean to the supralapsarian dogma, that actions are simply right, because God pleases to will them, instead of his willing them, always because they are right. That God's mere will, in a word, is the sole source of right and wrong. Certainly the answer which Dr. Hodge recommends to the anxious objection, *How can it be right* for God to punish an innocent creature for the sin of another, to which he had not consented? savors of this harshness. God says he does so, therefore it is our business to believe it just.

The relations of reason and faith are also involved in this debate, and Dr. Landis charges that Dr. Hodge's extreme view concerning imputation has occasioned his falling into a dangerous inconsistency on this vital point. When dealing with Rationalists and Socinians, Dr. Hodge is usually firm and sound, repudiating their dogma, that comprehensibility by our reason is the test of revealed truth, and powerfully refuting it. But Dr. Landis complains that when he advances the great doctrine of our actual participation in Adam's sin—a truth he regards as being as essential to our anthropology as the Trinity is to our theology—Dr.

Hodge rejects it as "unthinkable" and "nonsensical." And he justifies himself by saying that since the rational intuitions of the mind are as truly God's handwork as revelation itself, no proposition of Scripture can contradict those intuitions. And this he claims for sound Protestant doctrine. But Dr. Landis replies that the human mind is now a fallen mind, belonging to persons who are "defiled in all the parts and faculties of the soul and body;" whence it is apparent they may err even in operations deemed intuitive. The history of opinion shows that such errors have often occurred, in fact. And when we concede, as Dr. Hodge seems to claim in this case, that the fallible man is to exercise the prerogative of deciding whether the pet opinion of his, which happens to clash with some proposition of the word, really is intuitive and necessary, we have nothing short of full fledged Rationalism.

So stands the debate. Dr. Hodge has obviously been incautious. The reader will note, however, that Dr. Landis claims a right of judging some dogmas rationally impossible, similar to Dr. Hodge's claim. For while the latter pronounces the proposition of our actual participation in Adam's sin to be "unthinkable," the former pronounces, though with a less imperious dogmatism, that the gratuitous antecedent imputation of one person's guilt to another person wholly innocent conflicts with man's moral intuitions. Dr. Hodge's friends have doubtless said that his critic does the very thing which he condemns.

In fact, right reason has its proper prerogative, even in the presence of revelation. Did we not grant this, we should not be Protestants, but should be bowing with an implicit faith to the impossible absurdities of popish transubstantiation. Were it infallibly certain that a given judgment of the human intellect was intuitive and rationally necessary, then we should have a right to hold it, yea, be obliged to hold it, against all witnesses. Even when the clashing witness professed to be revelation, we should be obliged to say no. It could not be the true meaning of revelation, because the judgment held was the immediate and necessary prompting of laws of thought just as really established by God as the Bible itself. But the critical question remains: is

this human judgment really the immediate and necessary result of man's constitutive laws of thought? Or is it merely a fallible opinion fondly cherished and unjustly elevated to the rank of an intuition by the pride and prejudice of the mind? The question of the rights of reason all turns on that hinge. And, as Dr. Landis urges, we cannot grant to the individual fallible mind the right of deciding that question. To whom then shall we reserve that right of decision? If we say, to the document claiming inspiration, we seem to require, for the initial acceptance of that document, the mere blind, implicit faith of the Papist. Shall we refer the question, with Vincentius of Lerins, to the general *consensus* of Christians, and hold such judgments to be necessary and valid truths, *quæ ubique, quæ semper, quæ ab omnibus credita*? This famous platform, which so long satisfied the mind of the Church, has in it an unquestionable element of truth. Could we define the *omnes* as the living elect, the real members of the invisible Church, "who shall be all taught of God," we should be ready to accept it as a practical rule. But the invisible Church is—well, *invisible*. It is not any *man's* prerogative to separate the "tares from the wheat," and to distinguish the minds really taught of the Holy Spirit from those who plausibly profess to be so taught. Tried by the rule of Vincentius, Dr. Landis is more nearly right than Dr. Hodge; for the former evidently has the *consensus* of the major part of the Reformers. There is no safer or better settlement of the rights of reason than that proposed by Turretin: that the reason has its prerogative, even concerning the things of faith, when it is not a carnal and inimical but a humbled and sanctified reason, and when its judgments are necessitated by the soul's constitutive laws of thought. Now, the individual believer may know, by the fruits of the Spirit and the witness of the Spirit, for himself whether he is truly humbled, sanctified, and truth-loving, and may thus know in himself that he is entitled to his conclusions as necessitated by the reason. But should he attempt to dictate his thought on only rational grounds to others, they would be entitled to reply: "Hast thou faith? Then *have it to thyself* before God."

Dr. Landis also proceeds to discuss the theory in its ethical



relations, and argues that Dr. Hodge furnishes the basis for the following inferences: that a portion of the race was created in order to be damned; that the theory of restorationism is justified; that we should be willing to be damned for the glory of God; that God has introduced sin into the universe as a means for accomplishing the greatest good; also that it obscures God's love towards his creatures and our true Christian conception of his worthiness of our worship; that it subverts our view of God's justice and of human accountability, and thus undermines the obligation to repentance for sin. These consequences the friends of Dr. Hodge would of course deny with heat. No one supposes that he deliberately intended or approved them. It will be the business of the reader to judge whether his positions are really responsible for them.

We have thus attempted to put the reader in possession of the main thread of Dr. Landis's work, rather than to advance our own judgment of his doctrine.

We only say, in this direction, that he has left an able, acute, and learned work. He has shown himself in all these respects fully equal to the contest with his great opponent. The book should be in the hand of every Presbyterian minister. It is a *succedaneum* for many of the works of the Reformers on this cardinal subject which are not generally attainable. Dr. Landis's learning and thoroughness were, in one respect, his snare. His discussion is in some degree repetitious, and consequently lacking in lucid order. All his reasonings, and even all his quotations, could have been compressed, by means of a closer method, into a smaller bulk.

In one particular he has, unintentionally no doubt, done scant justice to Dr. Hodge, in that he denies him any countenance for his extreme doctrine of imputation in the writings of the Church divines. This does not appear to us true. Dr. Hodge could have quoted a number of them who seem to countenance him in his assertion of an antecedent, immediate, and even gratuitous imputation of the guilt of Adam's sin, and in the dogma that the very first initial subjective depravity of the infant human soul comes upon it *as penalty* of that imputed guilt of the *pecca-*

*tum alienum*. So De Moor. Nearly all Dr. Hodge's positions may be found in the ninth chapter of Turretin's *Locus* on Original Sin. The true verdict on this history of opinion seems to us this: that a few of the more acute and forward of the Calvinistic divines were tempted, by their love of system and symmetry of statement and over-confidence in their own logic, to excogitate the ill-starred distinction of the antecedent and gratuitous imputation. Their error here was exactly like that of the supralapsarians, who thought they could throw light and symmetry on the doctrine of the decree by assigning what they thought was the logical order of sequence to its parts. But they became "wise above that which was written." They added no light to the mystery of the decree, but they misrepresented the moral attributes of God and provoked a crowd of natural cavils and objections. The distinction of supralapsarians and infralapsarians ought never to have been heard of. Enlightened Presbyterians now rejoice that it is practically obsolete. So say we this distinction of the antecedent imputation ought never to have been drawn. The eminent men who drew it, constrained by good sense, piety, and force of Scripture, usually contradicted it in substance by teaching along with the Church that the original corruption and the imputation were coeval and inseparable, and by agreeing that a just and good God would not gratuitously impute the guilt of a *peccatum alienum* upon an agent personally innocent. And such was doubtless the conclusion of the great body of the Reformed and of their Confessions. They usually concurred in the statement of Stapfer, refusing to distinguish the mediate from the immediate imputation. But the difference with Dr. Hodge seems to have been this: his love of systematising enticed him to adopt the extreme points of his great teacher, Turretin. But after they were adopted, the boldness and dogmatism of his temper and the confidence of his logic led him to follow them out hardily to their repulsive consequences. He scorns those amiable inconsistencies by which the others avoided the harsh consequences. The result was the extreme and exaggerated doctrine which has provoked several able protests, and last, this posthumous one of Dr. Landis.

With one more point this criticism will end, and this is a point by which it is humbly conceived the difficulty Dr. Hodge professed to find in the doctrine of our participation of Adam's sin may be relieved in some degree. Dr. Landis has asserted several times that not only do sinners of subsequent generations partake in Adam's sin, but partook in it *when he sinned*. He also claims that this is the teaching of the Reformers. If we understand him, his one authority for thus dating the epoch of our participation is the phrase in Rom. v. 12, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρτον. He urges that this is *aorist*, and must mark a finished act completed in one definite past time. Hence, all the race actually sinned *when* Adam sinned, although none of the race except him then had any personal existence. Now, does he not herein unnecessarily complicate and damage his doctrine? Does the apostle say that the common participation in sinning, which he here teaches, occurred as to the children of the nineteenth century, for instance, on the day Adam ate the forbidden fruit? No evidence appears of it. We surmise the apostle would be hugely surprised to hear that he had said so. The aorist does, indeed, describe definite past action. But when the agents are more than one, it does not describe the definite past actions as all occurring at one time. In the fifth chapter of Matthew, for instance, we have, again and again, an aorist to express *actions done at various past times by successive agents*. See verses 21st, 27th, 31st, 33d, ἐπρόβη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις. If we translated these places, "Your ancients were *went to say*," etc., it might be objected that we confounded with the aorist the more proper sense of the imperfect. But we must translate it virtually thus: "Your ancients" (succeeding each other in their generations) "said" (successively). So let us read in Rom. v. 12: "For that all successively sinned." When? *As soon as they began to exist and act*. Each human soul became an actual sinner when it began to exist. Then the apostle's reasoning will be: that the one man's sin (Adam's eating of the forbidden tree) brought death upon mankind, and so death passed upon all, not solely because the first man sinned, but, also because all subsequent men like him sinned too. How much more simple is this reasoning? How much more accordant

with fact and experience? We have no call to insist upon the "unthinkable" assertion that the soul born in the nineteenth century actually and literally shared the forbidden fruit by eating it while in Adam's loins sixty centuries before that soul had any personal existence at all. What the apostle says is: that the first man introduced death into the race by sinning in Paradise, and that this penalty judicially passed upon all men for this reason; among others: because all these men like Adam personally sinned also. Thus they adopted and endorsed their first father's rebellion. Thus their personal attitude exactly and invariably conformed itself to their federal attitude, and that freely. Thus it becomes just in God to associate them in the common associated guilt of their father. If the question be asked, How it came about that they all began existence with sinful wills and lives? the answer of the Scriptures and of the Reformed theology is: because it pleased a holy, wise, just, and benevolent God, in creating *a race* existing by the tie of generation, to so make its first head the natural and federal head of all the members of the race as to let his action under probation equally determine for them the same legal state and the same moral state as for himself, and both in inseparable conjunction and with coördinate originality. Adam sinned, was condemned, and died. His natural seed are born equally dead in sin and condemned with him. So God ordained. This is our fall in Adam—a fall both judicial and moral; both moral and judicial.

R. L. DABNEY.

## ARTICLE II.

## SUPERNATURAL REVELATION:

A MODERN FORM OF THE A PRIORI AND ANALOGICAL  
ARGUMENT.\*

The mind of our age is largely engaged in discussing the possibility and the reasonableness of a divine revelation. Much of this discussion is doubtful and sceptical in tone. Without describing or criticising in detail any of the rationalistic theories advanced in recent years, an attempt is made in the following article to present the classic argument from natural analogies and human needs in a modern form. The *a priori* argument, and the argument from analogy, will bear unscathed the test of scientific scrutiny in the nineteenth century. Nothing in modern thought or discovery has diminished the strength and cogency of the reasoning from antecedent probability, so skilfully employed by the early Apologists and Fathers, Clemens Romanus, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Minutius Felix, Tertullian, Origen, Arnobius, Cyprian, Lactantius, Augustine, etc., and in later times by Cudworth, Butler, and others. Let us consider briefly some of the principles underlying the doctrine of a divine revelation, and then apply them in support of the Bible's claim to be God's word.

## I. POSTULATES OF THE FAITH IN A DIVINE REVELATION.

The presuppositions underlying the Bible, the facts which it asserts and assumes concerning the being and character of God, the nature and destiny of man, are necessary to explain the Bible as a phenomenon in human history.

1. *God's existence a necessary postulate of true science in interpreting nature.*

The world needs God to become intelligible. Christian theism

---

\* The substance of this Article was delivered as an address before the International Sunday School Convention in Louisville, Ky., June 12th, on the assigned topic: *The Bible—The Word of God.*

is necessary to the scientific interpretation of the universe, from the atom to the star, from the molecule to the constellation. The universe is cast into thought-moulds. It fits into man's thought as into a socket, or as the teeth of wheels into cogs. Matter, as far down or up towards the atom as man can analyse it, has the appearance of a "manufactured article." In its form, its weight, its motion, its chemical properties and relationships, matter is impressed with geometrical laws. Its rules of proportion and its methods of procedure are mathematical. Now, nothing is so purely mental, in origin and character, as mathematics, whether manifested in the "rule of three," or in the law by which oxygen and hydrogen form water; in a table of logarithms, or in the law of motion along a cycloidal curve; in the equilibrium of the solar system, or in the structure of honeycomb. Mathematics in nature must have a mental origin, for mathematics without mind would be harp notes without a harp. All things on their under-surface correspond to mind, hence all things on their upper-surface must correspond to mind. Even lifeless matter is magnetic with thought; thought sparkles in its play, pulsates in its flow, sings the music to which it keeps time in its march. Nay, is both its music and its march.

The impressive thing about even dead matter is the light of mind that illumines it, the thought-purposes that rule it; we really see matter as the drapery of thought, the instrument of life. Except when men philosophise sceptically, the material universe is known merely as a screen, on which are thrown the thought figures from the magic light of mind behind it. Matter and force are mere anvil and hammer, brush and canvas, used by mind and will to embody ideals and purposes. The main fact which impresses the mind is not the brush or canvas, but the picture; so to the thinking mind, nay, to the instinct of the race, to the common sense of humanity matter is and ever has been a tool of mind, a canvas on which thought-forms are painted. Not to see God's thought pictured on creation's canvas is not to see creation; it is simply to exist, blind, like the eyeless fish in the Mammoth Cave.

God's thoughts are interwoven with the very texture of crea-

tion, like pictures cut deep into glass. His thoughts are wrought into the inmost structure of things, like the raised letters in books for the blind; the letters cannot be blotted out, because they make up the very material of the page. God's thoughts are stereotyped in nature. The atoms and their motions are his alphabet and punctuation. The forces of nature are his will, the laws of nature are the methods of his will in action. The rules of mechanical action and chemical combination are his grammar. The rules of proportion and harmony in form, color, and sound are his rhetoric. The various forms and orders of being are the subjects of his composition. Mountains are petrified odes of omnipotence. The sweep and the shine of galaxies are epics of infinite wisdom. The song and the plumage of birds, the odor and color of flowers, and the hum of insects are psalms of divine goodness. Waving forests, rainbow crowned, leaping cataracts, and shout of hand-clapping sun-lit seas, are lyrics of praise to "the eternal, immortal, invisible, only wise God."

Now all this music, this visual poetry and stereotyped thought, can no more escape the recognition of mind than mind can fail to perceive the thought written in books for the blind, or cut into metal stereotype plates, on which, and in which, the types have been wrought into words and sentences. Not to see the thought is to be blind. Again we say, the important thing in stereotype plates is not the metal *per se*, but what is inwrought in the metal. So with God's inwrought thoughts in nature. Matter and force are indestructible, because they are the forms of God's thought, the acting of his will. God has carved his thought into the universe as the artist carves his thought into stone, producing the image of a man. What the mind truly sees in a statue is not the material cause—the marble, nor the instrumental cause—the chisel, but the formal cause—a man's image, which preëxisted in the artist's mind; the final cause—the pleasure of others and the self-delight of the artist in creating; and the producing cause—the sculptor himself. So in this mighty cathedral of nature the mind beholds, not the mere stone, but the immaterial thought wrought into it and expressed by it. Its beauty fills the mind, because it manifests mind.

The universe without a personal God having mind and will as its source, is a stream without a fountain, music without a harp, a rainbow without a sun. What a rainbow is to the sun, creation is to God. The sun, by his beams, is present in the rainbow, yet distinct from and independent of it. So God, through the forces and laws of nature, his acting will, is present in, and yet distinct from nature. The forces and laws of nature are the potent beams emanating from God. Time and space are the mysterious cloud-canvas or background. This "mighty universal frame of things" is the bow thrown by the shining of that central sun. The bow spans the cloud *there*, because the sun shines *yonder*.

2. *The moral character of God a postulate from the nature of man.*

Even on any just hypothesis of evolution when man looks into himself he is forced to conclude that the author of his own being and the maker of the world is a personal spirit, endowed not only with mind and will, but with a moral nature. Evolution can allow nothing in the effect which was not in the cause. Whatever is evolved was first involved. What the method of nature brings out in the conclusion must have been in the premise. Therefore, as mind is the latest and highest result of the creative process, mind must have been in the creative cause. Hence man is both the interpreter and the interpretation of nature, because he is the highest revelation of the creative power.

The consciousness of freedom and responsibility, right and wrong in conduct, the sense of moral law, and of moral qualities in actions, is more clear and infallible than the testimony of consciousness to an external world. Consciousness also makes it sure that action caused by mechanical force has no moral complexion. Hence if man is free and responsible, his actions are not necessitated like the flow of tides or the roll of planets; his thoughts, his institutions, his conduct and religion are not "the transferred activities of his molecules." Man is a free, moral, and responsible being, and cannot be interpreted in "the terms of matter, motion, and force." Physical necessity can never be the equivalent of moral freedom. But if man cannot be so interpreted, neither can the power that made him.



### 3. *Man, the image of God.*

The Bible and Plato voice the truth written upon man and upon the very nature of things in asserting this fact. We know that God *is* from nature; we know *what* he is from man. The lake may shadow the mountain mantled in clouds, or the star flashing in the silent heavens, and the shadow reveals the reality, known to be real were it only by its image.

Man in interpreting the universe cannot escape from his own mind; he must begin with thought, and what thought supposes and implies. The interpretation of nature is the interpretation of thought by thought, the translation of ideas out of a mystic, unspoken, unwritten speech into the speech of men. The true and the beautiful thought underlying Berkeley's Idealism was this: "Nature is a visual language, its phenomena the visual words in which one mind speaks to another. It is the expression and vehicle of intelligence, an orderly, because a rational system. Science is a mirror held up to nature, and the reason which science exhibits merely reflects the reason which nature embodies. The intelligible implies intelligence. Mind is omnipresent. The universe is thought interpreted." God, then, is the architect of the atoms and the Father of our spirits. He is the complement and background of all true science, and the satisfaction of all true religion. If these views of God, man, and nature, were accepted by all, especially by those who pervert scientific truth by trying to use it against Christianity, religion and science would be universally recognised as a holy and ministrant sisterhood, and reproaches and misunderstandings would cease. "The heart and the intellect would live in peace under a heaven where the sun of knowledge shines in light, and where the moon of faith walks in beauty."

## II. A PRIORI GROUNDS FOR EXPECTING A DIVINE REVELATION.

Assuming as an established fact that creation reveals God's existence—"his eternal power and Godhead," and that man, the bloom and end of creation, reveals God's character, on the principle that the climax, the final end, and highest result of a work reveals the character of a workman, assuming in short that God

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—3.

is an infinite and eternal personal Spirit, and that man, having mind and will, is in the image of God, there are strong *a priori* grounds rendering it highly probably, if not morally certain, that God would make a clear, verbal, written revelation to man.

A. *The hints and prophecies in nature lead the mind, reasoning from analogy, to expect such a revelation from God as we find in the Bible.*

1. The universal law of dependence upon the invisible, the distant, and the higher.

(a) *Through all nature we find every order of being dependent upon invisible forces* for well-being, and for the realisation of the true ends of being. Nothing in nature reaches its highest and best without the aid of unseen powers. What microscope has yet revealed the forces of polarisation and crystallisation? Their effects are seen in the prisms of snow and in the geometrical crystals of quartz, garnet, and ruby, but the forces themselves are as hidden as the workings of thought. The forces of cohesion and gravitation acting through all worlds and in every particle of matter have never yet been seen, yet everywhere their clamp is felt like the grip of an omnipresent hand. They are the unseen, ever-acting nerves and muscles of the universe. Who has yet seen the life forces, the vital machinery of an acorn, a cedar, a bee, or an eagle? Yet nothing is better known as a fact, which we receive on faith, and about which we feel no uncertainty.

(b) Again: *Through all ranks and orders of being the law of dependence upon something distant and exterior reigns.*

The tides break on every shore of our sea-belted globe in response to the drawings of the distant moon. The sap of the oak is pumped through its pores from root fibre to limb tip by an engine at work in the sun. The leaf-umbrella of mighty forests held over moss and daisy is spread by a cosmic hand stretched down from the stars. The mountain is mantled in snow like a white-hooded monk by hands above the mountain top. The curtains of cloud which drape the setting sun, and which rise and fall over the shifting drama of the day, are woven by a loom whose wheels and pulleys work so far off that their hum is un-

heard. The grain of wheat depends for its budding and growth upon waves of heat-light which throb across a boundless sea of ether. The bird builds and broods, dependent upon other worlds for its food, its plumage, and its power of flight and song. "Whether plenty or dearth shall rule on earth for man depends upon what is going on among the stars. The wheels which grind for the children of men their corn, are all turning in silence outside the human sphere, not moved by water-power, or wind, or steam, by children's cries or dealers' hopes, but nevertheless in their inaccessible distances rolling round in manifest relation to the daily renewed hunger of this needy human family of ours."

(c) Again: Not only is there a universal law of dependence on invisible power, and exterior, distant agents, but the crowning feature is the *law of dependence of the lower upon the higher for the accomplishment of the higher ends of existence.*

The mineral kingdom, with its laws and forces of mechanics, chemistry, and crystallisation, does not find its end in itself. The finest examples of mechanic and chemic force and mathematical law are not found in the mineral kingdom, the world of mere lifeless matter. The most perfect geometry and the highest working of chemic force are found in the structure and life of plants and animals, not in dead matter. The phenomena of sound and color, abstractly considered, are purely mechanical, and their highest illustrations are met in the sphere of life. No song of the sea or voice of the wind is as perfect a music as the singing of birds. No play of color in rainbow, or sea-foam, or precious gem, is so perfect as the tints of plumage on bird or insect, or as the glowing light in beauty's eye. No geometry is so accurate as the curves, lines, and angles in the myriad forms of life. Mere matter and force cannot reach, unaided, the best that is potentially in themselves. They cannot realise what is highest and most perfect in the laws of mathematics, chemistry, polarisation, and the other physical forces. They depend on a higher. The reason of their being and the power by which it is realised are above them. They are means to higher end. They are a stage for a drama which they can neither write nor enact.

The life-forces of plants and animals take up and carry out

the ends, the predestined objects and uses, of the mineral kingdom. And it must be noted here that the higher kingdom of plants is not evolved by the spontaneous working of mechanical forces. Life has never yet been developed from matter and force. The experiments of Tyndall, Pasteur, and Bastian, have settled the question as to its possibility. It is a higher kingdom than matter.

No ship from the empire of matter and force has crossed over the gulf to the empire of life. No Great Eastern, built in the dockyard of matter, manned and piloted by molecular mariners, propelled by the steam of force, has ever yet sailed across the ocean between life and matter. But life has made the mineral kingdom its vassal, and by subjecting it to its higher laws, and working upon it with higher forces, has accomplished for it, and in it, the true ends of its existence. The car of matter and force has indeed hooks and couplings, but life's engine draws it along the track—which neither laid—to its destination. An *Æolian* harp can make no music until swept by the fingers of the wind. Untouched by a higher power there is nothing in its strings to evolve musical vibrations. So matter remains for ever an untuned, silent harp, until life's hand sweeps its chords and awakens the music which it can sing when taught, but which it could not compose.

Climbing higher the pyramid of nature we find the same story of the lower dependent upon the higher repeated in the relations between the plant and animal kingdoms. In the forests of sea-plants growing over the vales and mountains of the ocean's bed, in the meadows of sea-weed, in the floating gardens of the *Sargasso* Sea, wherever there are plants in the world of brine, they are largely dependent upon and are helped by the animal life around them.

All over the globe the plant kingdom feeds and grows by absorbing the carbonic acid gas breathed down upon it by the higher animal kingdom. Many plants are fertilised, spread, and thus sustained by the action of insects seeking honey in their cups and carrying away on wing, leg, or proboscis the fecundating pollen dust to another flower and leaving it there to produce

another seed and another plant. The more fully nature is known, the more do we see her work done by the machinery of living agents. The sea swarms with phosphorescent animalcula, the air is full of infusorial life. Solids have been poetically called "sponges or nets interpenetrated with vital force." Note again, that there is nothing in the plant kingdom which is evolved into animal intelligence. The gulf between mere life and mind is as broad and deep as that between matter and life. Yet the powers of mind play upon and help the world below it, and as before the coming is down from the higher to the lower.

When we come to the relationships between man and nature, we find the law of dependence still more clearly illustrated. If all orders of life are cultivating and cultivable beings, this is pre-eminently true of man. When he employs their forms and forces in the arts of sculpture and architecture, painting and music, in commerce and manufactures, we feel that the highest purpose yet realised by matter and force has been accomplished. We feel that matter and force are glorified, their meaning and destination reached, when they are rightly used by man. *Rightly* used, we say, that is, in accordance with the higher purposes, the spiritual ends of his own being.

Granite and marble, iron and gold, are glorified by being made to serve the will of man. They are capable of receiving the impress of his mind in the petrified music of architecture, and are ennobled when employed to voice what is pure and good in man's wisdom and might. When ocean's waves are made the bearers of man's products, when rivers are harnessed to the wheels of his factories and made to turn them, when steam and electricity are made his servants, we feel that they are ennobled thereby, that the higher ends of their being are realised when they are made to work for man.

(d) *Man's agency over plants and animals brings out what is highest in them.*

All plants, whether sought for ornament or fruit or manufacturing purposes, can be improved by the culture of man. The true ends of their being, their noblest and highest uses, and their most perfect forms are reached through the help of man. The

same law holds good in a still higher degree in the relationships between man and animals. The proof of these statements is found in the agriculture and horticulture of all lands, in the experience of men over all the world in the rearing and management of cattle, horses, fowls, and animals of every kind.

Note five things here: 1. The growth and progress, the realisation of the higher purpose in each order of being, the bringing out of the best by the action of a higher being, is accomplished only when the interaction of the higher and the lower is in accordance with the laws wrought into the constitution of each. 2. These laws are simply the plan or will of God which he has embodied in his own creation. 3. Lower and higher are mutually developed, the highest ends of their being are mutually attained, when their interaction is in accordance with the laws and forces which are above them both. 4. The mutual relations and dependence of all orders of being result in the uplifting, the improvement of all. Hence the aim of nature is toward the best. God aims at the highest within each sphere through all parts of his dominion. 5. The possible best of every order is reached through the help and working of a power not beneath, not within, but above itself.

2. *The phenomena of conscious communion between lower and higher, and of voluntary obedience to the will and authority of the higher on the part of the lower, point to a continuation of that law in man's communion with and obedience to a higher than himself.*

Without dwelling on the typical facts presented in the animal kingdom of one species making another subject to its will, as seen in one tribe of ants enslaving another, we pass at once to the phenomena of communion between men and "birds and beasts and creeping things and fishes of the sea." Nearly every order of living thing can be taught and controlled by the will of man. Birds are taught speech and music, animals are taught to work, to play, and to respond in various ways to the will of man.

Two significant things are noteworthy in this communion with and voluntary obedience to the mind and will of the higher on the part of the lower: 1st. Man impresses his mind and will on

birds and animals by means of language, either sign language—gestures, motions, tones, and changes in the face—or by the language of articulate speech; and the revelation of his mind is always in accord with the laws of his own being, and in harmony with the natures to which he speaks. 2d. The character and disposition of the lower animals are often completely changed by the influence of man's mind. Something of the human seems to be imbibed by the animal order. By communion with or revelation from the higher to the lower, latent capacities are awakened, and powers whose existence was unsuspected are either bestowed or called into action and developed.

The phenomena thus far considered bring out the following deeply significant and crowning facts, viz.:

1st. *"A being with a destiny unaffected by any higher being is unknown in nature."*

2d. Man is the head and king of nature, the microcosm embodying in himself an epitome of nature's forces and laws, and carrying to their highest development all the meanings and uses wrought into creation. Everything below man and before his coming prophesied his character and office. A breath of will blows upward from atom and force in the direction of man's mind and will. A breath of will blows through the universe seeking to utter itself in the facts of moral law, and finding voice at last in the moral nature of man. The mathematical accuracies of molecular structure and chemic force point to the higher perfection of moral law. The geometrical perfection of atomic form and stellar march is a prophecy of that antetypal harmony and beauty of holiness which is the true glory of a moral being. Everything works and points upward to man and hints his character. The shadow cast by the coming man is seen on the folds of nature's tabernacle, just as the image of the coming Christ was seen on and through the drapery of ceremonial worship.

3d. *Hence the final end of nature is a moral one. Her deepest meanings are spiritual.* Her highest uses find their consummation in a moral system, in a spiritual kingdom. The topside of every material fact is moral, bears the impress of a spiritual purpose.

4th. *In the ascending scale of nature no law is dropped out. Whatever is in the lower is repeated and carried to a further development in the higher.*

Now, apply these principles to the question under consideration. If all forms of being below man depend upon "invisible powers" for the realisation of the true ends of their being, much more must it be true of man, the apex and crown of creation. If all orders are dependent upon exterior distant agents for well-being, we would expect to find the same law holding good with man. If all orders of life depend upon a higher than themselves for the realisation of their noblest possibilities, so must it be of man. If the law of conscious communion with and voluntary obedience to a higher order of being obtain in the kingdoms below, we would expect to find the same law in force in the kingdom of man. If the noblest possible in birds and beasts is evolved or produced by a revelation of man's mind, through the medium of symbolic or spoken language, then we would expect to find man cultured in a similar way. If the God of nature is aiming at the best through all these methods in the kingdoms below man, then there is an antecedent probability that his purpose concerning man would be the same, and his methods similar. If an artist is careful with the details of his work, much more will he be so with the great central thought and figure, for which all his other work exists as means. Nature is the scaffolding, the pedestal which exists for man, the frame in which he is set. All the wisdom, power, and love displayed in the kingdoms below man will find a grander illustration in man himself.

Now, as William Arthur asks, in his recent profound work, "The Difference between Physical and Moral Law," "Does the institution of headship extend no higher than this little earth? Has the universe beyond it no common head? Does the ascending order of intelligent being set its loftiest crown on the brow of man? Man's nobler wants, whose very cry proclaims him a kinsman of beings above himself, have sources of supply still higher than the earth, and higher than the clouds. Terrestrial relations, whether physical or moral, go on ascending till they reach their *apex* in man. Man's bodily relations are not brought



to a stay either at the bounds of his own person or at those of the globe. They pass the bounds of both and continue their ascending movement. They go on whither he cannot follow. They pass over space, over time, over darkness, over distances incomprehensible, stretching into the heaven of heavens."

What art thou who biddest us believe that the spiritual relations of man, his relations with thought, feeling, and moral action, his relations with intelligent beings, halt short here at the line between earth and sky, and lag behind the relations of his body in such a manner that while his eye, and indeed every pore in his frame, are continually holding joyful relations with the king of the sky, the forces of his soul, which ever tend to climb the sky, have no outfield, but like those of an eagle which the enemy has winged, droop backward, downward towards things below him, till over the sun-bright thoughts of man the last word to be uttered must be "clay to clay"!

Now, a step farther. "As all terrestrial relations ascend upward to an *apex* in man, is it not probable that the relations of the whole universe ascend upward to one all-comprehending Chief and Head? And as no being with a destiny unaffected by a higher being is known to nature till we reach man, is it probable that he presents us with an example of a being whom no higher being can affect? Does not all nature seem rather to say that the relations of man's soul must pass on in the same direction as do those of his eye, the cosmic sense; onward beyond the bounds of earth, moving upward, forward, towards brighter worlds, towards countless lights, towards a career in which every step is both a goal and a starting point, towards conscious fellowship with a higher Power, an everlasting Father, in whose house are 'many mansions'; a house roomy enough to be the home of a soul whose thoughts outfly sunlight, and which sail round and round the most distant globes; a house roomy enough not for one soul only, but large enough to be the home of kindred souls, as many as the stars in the sky for multitude, and as the sand by the sea innumerable?"

III. THE NATURE, THE NEEDS, AND THE MORAL CONDITION OF MAN, RENDER IT HIGHLY PROBABLE THAT GOD WOULD MAKE SUCH A REVELATION AS WE FIND IN THE BIBLE.

The basis of the preceding argument is the postulate that God will act consistently and harmoniously; that he is a lover of symmetry of plan and unity of purpose through all his works and ways. Leaving the prophetic hints in the world below man, we find in man himself strong *a priori* grounds for expecting a divine revelation.

1. *In his capacity and longing for communion with a higher, an infinite Being, whom he can love, obey, and reverence, and in the natural expectation which he cherishes of a revelation from God.* It is an historic fact that these longings and expectations have always been cherished by the race. No longings are more universal or deeply seated. They are psychological facts. They have been voiced in the speculations of the profoundest philosophers. Plato, in his *Phædrus*, describes in splendid diction the primeval purity, beauty, and felicity of the soul, and then sadly says, "This happy life we forfeited by transgression." That is, we fell and lost our original beauty and excellence, and became "more disfigured than Glaucus by his long dwelling in the sea." In his *Meno*, Plato teaches that man cannot save himself nor regain this primitive form. "Virtue," says he, "comes by a divine influence, it is the gift of God. Man needs a divine education." In his *Republic*, he teaches that if man is saved, it must be "by the special favor of heaven." In many passages of his *Dialogues* this great philosopher expresses his desire for and his belief in a revealer and a revelation from God.

The emphasis with which the heathen have always believed in seers and prophets, and the confiding eagerness with which men in all ages and lands have resorted to astrology, oracles, and auguries, clearly show that there is in man an instinctive belief in, an appetency and a longing for, revelation. In the lower kingdoms, when aptitudes or arrangements exist in one order of beings suiting it to relationships with another order, the scientific conclusion is that some objective reality corresponds with this

prophetic preparation. The hint is the shadow of a complemental fact. Coupling-pins imply a joining of two things together. Coupling-hooks imply rings into which they fasten. Hinges and pivots imply something to turn and rest on them, just as the eye implies light, the lungs air. Man's nature and longing fit into a revelation as a flower into its calyx; hence if man's nature be not an exception by being prophetic of falsehood, there must be a revelation from God to man.

2. When we take into consideration the needs of man growing out of his present moral condition, as a fallen and a spiritually diseased and crippled being, the probabilities become still greater.

(a) Man's mental and moral disorder renders him unable to fulfil the divine ends of his being. Man's whole life and the history of the world constitute an unbroken series of utterances which reflect man's consciousness of moral disorder, and of an inability to reach unaided his true destiny.

(b) Man's consciousness of guilt before God, expressed in various forms of worship and expiatory sacrifice, shows that he feels the need of the working of other and higher powers than are in himself or in nature to bestow that righteousness and peace for which he longs. Man needs a restoration to peace with himself and harmony with God. He needs a readjustment to his whole environment (which includes God and eternity), physical, mental, and moral.

(c) All man's efforts to restore himself to righteousness and peace have failed. "The highest prophets of reason do not agree among themselves as to what the teaching of the asserted all-sufficient and universal religion of reason is." All the colossal systems of paganism fail to satisfy. They are man's searchings for God, cries in the dark, gropings into hollow vacancy.

(d) *There are hints of a remedial system in nature.* The medicinal and curative properties of minerals and plants which heal and restore the bodies of beasts and men when diseased or wounded suggest that if moral disease should injure man, God would provide a system of restoration for his spiritual nature as well as for his physical. Man's body falls, is ruined by hurts and disease, and by the remedial system which God has set in

nature he is saved, made whole. Will he not make a similar provision for his soul?

3. All the foregoing facts and analogies in nature and man are revelations of God's character. The implantation of capacity and desire in man to commune with God implies a desire on his part to make himself known to intelligent beings. His wisdom is sufficient to devise a way by which to reveal himself to man. His power is great enough to overcome all difficulties that might oppose. His love and goodness are such that a plan of revelation devised by his wisdom and executed by his power would work benevolently for man by restoring him from ruin, recovering him from degradation, and readjusting him to his physical and spiritual environment, so that the true moral ends of his being could be attained.

IV. THE BIBLE IS THE WORD OF GOD TO MAN BECAUSE IT MEETS ALL THE NEEDS AND LONGINGS OF MAN, IS IN HARMONY WITH NATURE'S ANALOGIES, IS IN EVERY WAY WORTHY OF GOD, AS SHOWN BY ITS EFFECTS IN RESTORING AND SAVING MAN, AND ENABLING HIM TO ACCOMPLISH THE HIGH SPIRITUAL DESTINY FOR WHICH GOD EVIDENTLY PURPOSED HIM.

1. The Bible, believed and practised, realises the lofty moral purposes and noble ideals prophesied in nature and demanded by the very constitution of man himself. The morality of the Bible is the morality of the "nature of things." It is the complement and bloom of all the laws and facts of nature. The moral system of the Bible is the unseen Neptune whose existence is demanded by the structure and behavior of the system of nature, and whose discovery explains phenomena which would otherwise remain inexplicable, unclassified mysteries. The penumbra of moral law shadowed forth in the harmonies and relationships of lower orders was cast by that radiant sun which shines with undimmed effulgence in the moral system of Scripture. The echoes and tremors of moral truths and spiritual realities which vibrate through all nature are but the reverberations of the moral music of the Bible.

2. The final cause or purpose of nature is man, her head and

crown. The distinguishing feature and crowning glory of man is his moral nature. He is essentially a moral being. Hence his final end and destiny must be moral. Therefore nature, in and through the various grades and orders of being culminating in man, exists for moral purposes. The moral aim of nature and the moral destiny of man are one. This proposition is a necessary corollary from any evolutionary theory which binds man and nature together into an organic or ideal unity. The final aim of nature is not only moral, but her purpose, as wrought out through the law of dependence upon invisible forces, exterior agents, and higher beings, results in the production of the highest and best within the limits of every species and order. It is highly probable that if the Bible system of truth produces the best and highest possible in human life and character, then it is at least consistent with all creation below and outside of man. Influences which work for the highest perfection and beauty of flower and fruit cannot be detrimental to the welfare of the whole tree. The true glory of the head and of the body are not discordant. The methods of the working of the Bible system of revelation and its results are analogous to those in creation. The fundamental feature of nature's working, viz., the production of the highest and best through the operation of invisible forces, the influence of exterior agents, and the aid of higher beings, is repeated in the Bible system of truth and redemption. The noblest and best that man has ever attained has been through the powers brought to bear upon him in the Bible. The natural tendency of the Bible upon the individual man is to create the noblest spiritual personality, and to mould society on the basis of the purest and most beneficent laws, into the most perfect types of family, social, and civil order. It establishes a universal spiritual kingdom which works pervasively in and upon every natural organisation, and tends to make each one "perfect after its kind." It operates dynamically upon the heart of the individual, and through every root and fibre of social organisms, giving the whole race a trend towards the highest possible best. It sets the tides of life pulsating toward the perfect.

3. The influence of the Bible in developing man's power to

know, subdue, and use nature aright, for the benefit of the race, and for the glory of God, is a proof of its divine origin. The knowledge and the right use of nature's laws and forces is both an end of man's existence and a means by which his noblest destiny is achieved. The moral ends and purposes of nature can be accomplished only through the agency of man. Man's use of nature glorifies her only when his moral character is in harmony with Scripture. There is a deep subtle influence which the Bible exerts by which the moral meanings and uses of nature are suggested to man. Without elaborating the proofs or reasons, the following facts lie on the surface of history and confirm the proposition under discussion:

1st. *The lines of civilisation and of the Bible in human history correspond.* A map of Christian lands and of civilised countries coincides. All true civilisation is Christian. It is a Bible product. The "revival of learning" was stimulated and largely caused by the study and spread of the Bible. Chaucer, "the morning star of English poetry," was the pupil of Wyckliffe, the "morning star of the English Reformation." Wyckliffe's translation of the Bible was the real fountain of English literature. Luther's Bible in Germany—and even the French Bible in papal France—was the hand that swept the chords of Teutonic and Celtic thought and awoke it to music, poetry, philosophy, and history.

2d. *The growth and the benefits of civilisation cease with the decay and moral degradation of man.* When the laws and institutions of the Bible pass into neglect, man grows corrupt, and while science and civilisation may apparently continue to flourish, yet decline soon sets in, and the real blessings of arts and inventions come to an end. A gas jet may burn for a time after the source of supply at the reservoir has been cut off. Water may flow from a pipe a short time after connexion with the main has ceased. So signs of civilisation and scientific progress may appear after the Bible has been abandoned, but "death comes sure and soon." The "Dark Ages" were the ages of a shut Bible. Dynamite bombs, French revolutions, the "coming slavery" of communism and centralisation, the Sand Lots and car-shed riots of San Fran-

cisco and Pittsburg, destroying life, property, scientific inventions, and paralysing hope and energy, and tying a mill-stone around the neck of progress, are the fruits of scepticism and rejection of the Bible. Without the moral character and spiritual life which the Bible produces, science and civilisation develop parasites which destroy them.

Without the Bible nations develop into rotten empires. Without the aid of the "higher powers" of Christianity, the evil which is in man develops irresistibly by its own natural working into moral cancers which destroy the vitals of all civilisation. An unchristian or non-Biblical civilisation, is a civilisation which at last turns and gnaws itself. A civilisation without the Bible develops into a suicide. Its natural end is its own death. A strange development which develops into rotten empires, decaying arts—into characters and customs which act like gangrene, poison, and consumption! A strange development which grows downward into savagery, anarchy, death! If the *natural* forces of evolution were the only ones at work upon man; if the invisible powers, the exterior agencies, and the higher beings of revelation, were not at work in history, then if man be a development from the monad, and if he has been developing as man "a thousand centuries or more," unless his evolution resulted in suicide, he would long since have developed, not into a God, but into one or many semi-infinite devils, each one with powers and attributes enabling him to control, not only whole planets, but solar systems and clusters of worlds throughout space. Yea, and their dominions would be hells, compared with which the Inferno of Dante, the Tartarus of the Greeks, the Gehenna of the Hebrews, and the Hell of Milton would be paradises of bliss.

Perhaps it would be difficult to explain why the influence of the Bible naturally tends to the production of true science and civilisation, but the philosophy of the fact includes the following propositions:

(a) The relationship of the Bible to man.

(1) Bible truth puts man in the centre of all truths. It is to all truth what the Copernican theory is to the solar system. The centre of all truth is the moral one given in the Bible, and this fact acts as a clue to a mysterious labyrinth.

(2) The spiritual and moral power of Christianity invigorates and enlarges man's capacity of knowledge and action. The facts and characters revealed, the duties and motives urged, and the ideals presented as models for imitation, expand the powers of man, mental and moral, like a telescope multiplying the faculty of vision.

(3) Man is a truth-seeker and finder only when he loves and lives according to the moral truth of Scripture. Man interprets nature successfully only when his character and life interpret and image God rightly. He is nature's interpreter only when he is her interpretation by being himself an embodiment and illustration of all the laws, physical, mental, and moral, of which he is the centre and epitome. He interprets the macrocosm when he himself is truly a microcosm, with all the laws and forces, of which he is the focus, at harmony with each other, that is, when he is at one with nature and Scripture by making moral aims the final and chief end of life. This moral harmony works outward into mental and physical harmony. A character in unison with spiritual forces and truth is an organ for the mastery of all truth. The moral adjustment of man is to the mastery of scientific truth what the tuning of the harp is to music. God's thought in the Bible operating upon the spiritual substance of man, like chemic force acting upon the molecular structure of matter, makes the mind a magnet for God's thought in creation. Nature is a mighty violin, man the bow by which its music is to be awaked, science the music of nature, and the Bible's influence is the stretching and resining of the bow.

(b) The relationship of the Bible to nature.

(1) The Bible throws light on nature by revealing clearly and enforcing authoritatively the moral purposes of the universe. The sun awoke Memnon's statue to music by shining on it. Bible light makes nature's Memnonian music audible to man's spiritual ear. Cathedral pillars and arches are put into a rhythmic tremor by certain organ strains; iron bridges are set into harmonic vibrations by violin notes. Ears, acute enough, can hear the melody of quivering cathedral columns and jarring iron bridges. Sympathetic notes struck on one instrument will



awaken the strings of another to music. The moral music of the Bible strikes the sympathetic notes which cause the columns and arches of nature to tremble in response. The Bible is the sympathetic note to nature, awaking the music of science.

(2) The Bible account of the origin of nature and of her relationship to God and man, acts like a hint in puzzle pictures which serves to disclose their meaning. A puzzle picture looks like a mere collection of animals, trees, rocks, and hills ; nothing else would ever be seen until the hint was given that the real picture in the apparent medley was a man. A careful look reveals him and shows all the parts of the picture harmoniously arranged with reference to the man for whom they exist. So the Bible, while not a book of science, is a hint from the Author of nature concerning the spiritual significance and moral uses and aims of all things enabling man to discover the intellectual system, which is the basis and framework of nature. The writing on paper done in invisible ink is made visible by immersing the paper in a certain chemically prepared liquid. Bible truth is the liquid which makes visible to man's inner sense the invisible thoughts of God written on nature's page.

To sum up the whole argument, the methods and the results of the Bible's influence are in harmony with those of nature, the meanings and uses of nature which man discovers and arranges into science and art are God's thoughts materialised ; and as the Bible makes man an interpreter of God's thoughts, it must be a revelation of his mind. The moral purposes of nature, which are the key-note of all her working and the spiritual ends of man's being, are but the determining trend, or the tidal pulsings, of God's will, to the accomplishment of which he makes all things bend. The Bible brings to bloom and fruitage the moral aims of nature and man's own being. Hence it must be the expression of God's will. It fulfils God's will in creation and in man. None but God can do this, hence the Bible is God's word, containing the key to the parable of his thought and the power enforcing his will.

Man's own testimony is to the effect that his greatest and best

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—4.

have been the result of elevating and organising influences which came from the Bible—the noblest lives and the highest civilisations acknowledge a Bible source. Now, man is an organ of truth. His testimony as to the origin of his own higher life is more accurate and trustworthy than on any other subject. It is a matter of consciousness as to what thought, deed, person, or book gives an upward mental or moral impulse. The time and source, human or divine, whence new and higher influences come down upon man are ever memorable and distinctly outlined in experience and ever after retained in history and character. Hence, when human testimony and experience point to the Bible as the source of moral redemption and spiritual life, asserting that this experience includes the consciousness of a divine authority, and the sense of a divine power and personality, that testimony must be accepted as true.

Last of all, the Bible is divine, because it satisfies man by its self-completeness and by bestowing that righteousness of character, that peace and comfort to the mind, the heart, and the conscience for which man longs. These wants and longings are divinely implanted, hence they can be satisfied by God alone. The Bible meets them fully, therefore it is from the same God who is the author of man's nature. Blessed word! Priceless truth! We can believe it, we can live it, we can teach it with a confidence that is a song of triumph, and a hope that is a doxology of praise. It reveals the glory of God; it brings redemption and bliss to man. It makes man the inheritor of the earth, the possessor of immortal hope, the heir of all things. It spans our clouds with rainbows, gems our nights with stars, and floods our days with radiance. It is the vital air, the fertilising dew, and transfiguring sunlight of God by which there is wrought in man that "fruit of the spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance, against which there is no law," *against such no law!* "Bold, yet invincible word! Against these lineaments of God's image there is no law of the family, the happiness of which they will insure; no law of society, the relations of which they will sweeten; no law of the nation, the strength of which they will build up; no law of the race, the

welfare of which they will enhance. Against them there is no law of the body, which they will cover from many homes; no law of the emotions, for the peace of God will make them throb with equal pulse; no law of the intellect, the working of which joy in the Holy Ghost will make smoother; no law of the conscience, which may call for more of them, but never for less; no law of space, for goodness is goodness everywhere; no law of the great white throne, for they will shine bright in its light; no law of the heaven of heavens, for there the image of God finds the Father's house." Change shall not disfigure it, nor shall decay ever wither it, for "the word of the Lord endureth for ever." It singeth a mighty music, and the theme and chorus of this divine anthem, like the refrain of creation's song, is "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen! Amen!"

J. WILLIAM FLINN.

## ARTICLE III.

## THE EVANGELIST AND DR. WILSON'S AMENDMENT.

DR. WILSON'S ARTICLE: "*Presbyterian Polity and Foreign Missions.*" SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Volume XXXV., No. 1., January, 1884.

From the hour of our first acquaintance with Dr. Wilson we have never ceased to love him. We sincerely pity any man who professes to love the Lord Jesus Christ, who does not, upon personal acquaintance, feel an instinctive yearning of brotherly love towards J. Leighton Wilson as a brother beloved in the Lord. We know no man concerning whom we more readily, and without any effort, make the distinction between him and his views, so as to differ with him without any breach in the unity of the spirit. It may well be imagined, therefore, with what reluctance, yea, and trembling also, we have couched our lance for a tilt on this occasion. But when duty calls consequences must be left with whom they belong.

It may be best to get before the mind a view of the field of controversy. 1. The Book of Church Order, Chapter IV., Section 2, paragraph 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 entrusted power to organise churches, and ordain ruling elders and deacons therein." 2. The Assembly's proposed amendment: See Minutes 1883, page 60, . . . . "After the word 'ordain' it shall read: 'To all the offices required to make them complete; and also with a view to the extension of the Church he has power in foreign fields to ordain other evangelists.'" 3. Dr. Wilson's proposed amendment: REVIEW, pages 77, and 64, 65, after the word "evangelist," in the Assembly's amendment, add: "It being understood that in all ordination of pastors and evangelists, the act should be done by the body of evangelists on the ground, and that the pastors and evangelists thus ordained shall have no other

powers than those which the Constitution gives to pastors and evangelists at home." To this Dr. Wilson adds, by way of comment, "more than this is unnecessary, less is insufficient." Farther on (same page) he adds: "It stops him from performing the act of ordination alone, except in extraordinary cases," etc., etc. Now, if you will look back to his amendment, you will notice that in it he has made no provision whatever for this "extraordinary" case, but "all," etc., is to be done by "the body," etc. Yet this power of the evangelist singly to ordain another evangelist "in extraordinary cases," is exactly what he has maintained (page 69, etc., etc.) throughout this article from first to last. On the last page he gathers it all up; states it in formal words as the amendment he desires; affirms that more is unnecessary, and immediately shows that more is necessary, or else after all his mending of the Constitution, this very thing of an evangelist ordaining an evangelist "in extraordinary cases" could only be done as an extra-constitutional act! Surely, it must be evident that Dr. Wilson will need to mend his amendment.

4. Brazilian Missionaries' Overture, Minutes of General Assembly, Lexington, Ky., 1883, page 10, urges the amendment of the Constitution so as to allow one evangelist to ordain another in the foreign field. This recommendation was adopted by the General Assembly, page 60. Dr. Wilson states (REVIEW, page 70) that his memorial was sent to the Staunton General Assembly, 1881, and that the Brazilian protest was sent to the Atlanta General Assembly, 1882. This must be a mistake, as we can find no reference to either in the Staunton General Assembly, but a reference to Dr. Wilson's in the Atlanta, and to the Brazilian in the Lexington, Ky., General Assembly. 5. The proposition of A. B. C. in the *Southern Presbyterian* (February 28, 1884), viz., to let Chapter IV., Section 2, Par. 6, remain as it is, and remove the whole difficulty by amending Chapter V., Section 7, Par. 2, adding these words: "Except in foreign countries, where, in the absence of a Presbytery, the body of evangelists on the ground may constitute a commission, having power to ordain a minister and to conduct the previous examinations." 6. The proposal of Mark, *Southern Pres-*

*byterian* (March 13, 1884), which, if we understand it, is this : (1) He endorses the General Assembly's overture ; (2) he would have the General Assembly's Executive Committee (Commission) of Foreign Missions, "for prudential reasons, require that every evangelist which it employed should use his extraordinary power of ordination in any field only by the consent and approval of 'the mission' ; (3) and when the Presbytery turned over its evangelist to the control of the Assembly in its foreign missionary work, it would be expressly to subject him, as an evangelist, to this restrictive rule." 7. The views of R. A. W., *Southern Presbyterian* (March 6, 1884): (1) the native evangelist on heathen soil should be ordained by the parochial presbytery—the Session of the native church ; (2) yet under the law of necessity (Dr. Wilson's "extraordinary case"), "when no parochial presbytery is within reach, the ordaining is to be done by the foreign evangelist in the exercise of the single powers of his office ;" (3) "we must return a negative answer to the last Assembly's overture, and regard our Book of Church Order as needing no amendment on this point." 8. The undersigned (1) agrees with R. A. W. that the ordaining should be done by the church Session, provided there be no higher court ; (2) differs with him inasmuch as we think that the Scriptures do not authorise the evangelist, under any circumstances, to ordain any but elders (in the plural), and that even necessity must be regulated by the law of God ; (3) agrees with him that we should return a negative answer to the last Assembly's overture ; (4) believes that the Scriptures require us to amend Chapter IV., Section 2, Par. 6, so as to strike out the words "and deacons."

These are all the modifications, so far as we know, that have been presented up to this time (March 18). It appears very clearly that there is a great diversity of opinion : the Book itself is inconsistent with the Scriptures—it is wise above that which is written ; Dr. Wilson differs with himself ; the two who endorse him do so only in part ; the Brazilian missionaries have the inside track so far as regards the Lexington General Assembly ; R. A. W. agrees with Dr. Wilson in one point, with us in two ; whilst in one point the undersigned, possibly (?), stands alone, so

far as appears ; but with the Bible at our back we can still hope that it will yet be seen that there are 7,000 who have not bowed the knee to Baal.

We think we see in this and other discussions which have been recently carried on in our Church the fruit of the sad neglect of bringing every particular point of the Book of Church Order to the searching test of the infallible standard. In 1879—five years ago—the present Book became a law unto our Church ; yet to this day it remains unsupplied with proof texts. The same is true of the old Book, so far as concerns the “Book of Discipline,” and the “Directory for Worship,” but the “Form of Government,” under which head this discussion falls, is supplied with proof-texts. We think when the Westminster divines discussed matters that came before them, it was their custom to postpone final decision until they had discussed and agreed upon the proof-texts. From this much-to-be honored custom of our fathers, and of the apostles before them, we would seem to have departed. The fifth year is about to expire since the adoption of the present Book. We hear and have heard during this period much about “amendments,” but little or nothing about “proof-texts.” And it might well be asked in this connexion, Are we now in a favorable condition for an unbiassed study of proof-texts ? Can that be an unprejudiced searching of the Scriptures when five years after we have published to the world our conclusions we go to the word of God for proof of that to which we are already publicly committed by a foregone conclusion ? Nor is this apparently to be the end of the matter ; for here we have in Dr. Wilson’s REVIEW article of nineteen pages an earnest effort to persuade the Church to amend the Constitution, and yet if there is one out of its many defects which stands head and shoulders above all others, it is the conspicuous absence of any appeal to Scripture. Of argument we have no lack, but of argument based upon Scripture there is a distressing dearth. The only direct appeal to Scripture we have been able to find is on page 64—reference to the great commission—with an argument based upon it, the fallacy of which is pointed out by Mark in his article. Now this article, coming as it does from Dr. Wilson, has pro-

foundly impressed our mind with the painful conviction that our Church has gone on in this direction until she has reached the danger point. Is it not high time to call a halt and take our bearings again from the Scripture?

As a fair specimen of Dr. Wilson's mode of argument (by which he seeks to convince the Church of her divine right to incorporate into the Constitution his amendment, which all of her officers must thereafter adopt or "approve," and which, according to the principles of reasoning practised by him in this article, are to serve as *data* for still further discoveries in the outlying field of ecclesiology), take the following from page 77: (1) "To deny the power of the evangelist or evangelists to ordain pastors over the churches they may gather would be nothing less or more than an estoppel of the foreign missionary work. (2) Surely the Church will place herself in no such position as this." [Now mark.] "But (3) if the evangelist or evangelists have power to ordain a minister to be the pastor of a church, (4) it is no stretch of that power to set him apart to the work of an evangelist, or to ordain him in the (5) first instance as an evangelist," etc., etc. Now when this argument is analysed it presents (1) a *dictum* of Dr. Wilson, no Scripture offered in proof of it; (2) another *dictum* from the same source; (3) a hypothesis deduced from the two preceding *dicta*, assuming, without Scripture, the power to ordain a pastor; (4) consequent of the hypothetical antecedent, concluding from pastor *ergo* evangelist, who was first made pastor; (5) corollary from preceding, concluding, from evangelist, first made pastor, to "ordain in the first instance as an evangelist." All this without any proof of his original *data*, without any reduction of his hypothetical to the categorical; yet his final conclusion (not expressed, but of course implied) is this categorical proposition: "Therefore the Church must engraft upon the Constitution my proposed amendment." Yet strange to say these same two *dicta* which he puts in the forefront of the battle are at once swallowed up in the pit which he dug (unwittingly) on the preceding page (76). "There might be circumstances, it is true, when a church Session could with propriety ordain a minister," etc., etc. This is his own admission (as to what he adds to take away the



force of this admission, we shall attend to that in due time, *D. v.*). Now, then, his first line of battle falls into this pit, for if the Session can, under any circumstances, ordain a native minister—pastor or evangelist—(*i. e.*, outside the bounds of the Church already constituted), the denial of this power to the foreign evangelist will not be fraught with the terrible consequences of putting a stop to foreign missions; and with the first goes the second line of battle into the same pit; for if the Session can ordain the native minister, then the Church will not be placed in any such dilemma as he fearfully portrays; foreign missions will go on smoothly after the due order of the sanctuary upon the shoulders of the Levites, and not upon the ox-cart. For the grand advantage which ordination of a minister by the Session has over ordination of a minister by an evangelist is simply this: One is scriptural, the other unscriptural (see my REVIEW article, "The Minister of Evangelisation," January, 1881, pages 127–130). Elders (plural) are (in the formation of a church on missionary soil) scripturally ordained by one or more evangelists, but the minister of the word is ordained by the Presbytery (not the presbyter), presbyters (plural) in court assembled. Now, with his first two lines in the pit dug by himself, where should the remainder (and with it his amendment) go? Certainly not into the Constitution. Surely, Dr. Wilson in preparing his article did not "labor in the word and doctrine." 1 Tim. v. 17.

Now attention may be called (in reply to some things said above) to the difference between the second and the third question on page 34, Book of Church Order: 2. "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of this Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?" 3. "Do you approve of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States?" It might be said that in reference to the "Confession and Catechisms," your ordination vows require you to "adopt as taught in the Scriptures;" but in reference to "government" (and ordination belongs to this head) "and discipline" you "approve," without even being required to say you approve them as being the system taught in Scripture. To this we would reply, 1st, that

this construction of the third question would be the discretionary power, and that to the utmost limit imaginable. 2d. What right has any officer to approve of any government and discipline in this kingdom, unless he first ascertain from the Constitution—*i. e.*, the Bible—that it is approved by the signature and seal of the only King in Zion? 3d. This construction would contradict the context which says (see page 5), “The scriptural form of government,” etc., (and page 52), . . . . . “together with the formulas of government, discipline, and worship, are accepted, etc., etc., as standard expositions of the teachings of Scripture, etc., etc. Nothing, therefore, . . . . . which cannot be proved to be such from Scripture as,” etc.

Yet Dr. Wilson asks the Church to adopt his amendment, put it in our organic law, lay it upon the consciences of all our officers as the law that is to bind our faith and control our practice in the name and by the authority of Jesus Christ, and hereafter to be quoted in controversy as final: all this without any *Thus saith the Lord!*

Now, let us return for a moment to page 76 of his article. Having mentioned the scheme of the Brazilian missionaries and his own, he proposes to notice (page 73) “some of the other schemes adopted by other bodies of the Presbyterian Church.” On page 76 he says: “A fourth, but purely theoretical, scheme is, that the local Session of the first church established on heathen ground ought to ordain pastors and evangelists when necessary.” His first difficulty is, “How is the pastor of this first church to be ordained if not by the evangelist who first called it into being?” Then, secondly, he makes that fatal admission, that “circumstances” might arise “when a church Session could with propriety ordain a minister.” • Then, thirdly, endeavors to rob this concession of all its value, to kill it in the hour of its birth, by saying, “but this would be contrary to established Presbyterian usage” [granted]. “Why set the native Church on the wrong [denied] track at the very beginning of things?” “What might be right and justifiable in extraordinary circumstances [*e. g.*, at the very beginning of things] would not be so under the regular working of an established Church.” Exactly so.

Dr. Wilson characterises this fourth scheme as "purely theoretical." We are at a loss what we are to infer from this. Surely, he does not mean to affirm that his plan is not a scheme, but this one is; that this is purely theoretical and his purely practical. Does he mean to deny that any theory underlies his practice, and to affirm that no practice can exemplify our theory? On the contrary, we assert that his is as purely theoretical as ours, and ours as purely practical as his: for surely Dr. Wilson will not consent to the charge that he practises in ecclesiastical matters without any theory; and surely he will not deny that to offer a prayer, and during that prayer to lay on hands, is as easily practised by a church Session as by an evangelist. The grave difference being simply this, that his theory and practice are both unscriptural, and ours purely scriptural. One is the ordination of a minister by the laying on of the hands of a presbyter, the other is the ordination of a minister by the laying on of the hands of a presbytery. 1 Tim. iv. 14.

As to his first difficulty, "How is the pastor of this first church to be ordained?" this will present no difficulty to the minds of many, we trust, who, with the Scriptures in their hands, will reply, "The pastor is to be ordained by the Session of course." For (1) whereas the Scriptures by precept and example give power to the evangelist as evangelist (not as preacher) to ordain presbyters "in every church and in every city" (Acts xiv. 19-23, though even this was done not by one, but by two at least, "Barnabas and Saul"; see also xiii. 1-3; Titus i. 5 clearly authorising the ordination of "elders" (plural) to be done by Titus singly, "thee"); they never give him any power to ordain singly, a single presbyter. (2) They do give everywhere the power of ordination to the body of elders as elders, *i. e.*, as a court of rulers, *i. e.*, as a presbytery, to ordain ministers of the word, and evangelists. Now, to deny this power to the Session because they are simply ruling elders, and to give it to the evangelist because over and above being a ruling elder he is a preacher, is evidently to give it to him not as ruler, but as preacher. This is to contravene the whole testimony of the Scriptures; for they make ordination a function of the ruler as such, whilst this clearly makes

ordination a function of the preacher as such. The Scriptures lodge the function of ordaining to the gospel ministry in the hands of the Presbytery, not in the hands of "the evangelist, or evangelists;" therefore the Session (in this instance) is the proper body to ordain this native minister (or this native evangelist), because the Session is the Presbytery.

Secondly. As to his fatal admission, we have sufficiently dwelt on that. So we proceed, thirdly, to his effort to neutralise its damaging effect. That the ordination of a minister of the word by a body of ruling elders simply would be contrary to established Presbyterian usage, we most cheerfully grant; but we do not intend to lose sight of the fact that the case we are now considering—a newly organised church on heathen soil—has yet no established Presbyterian usage, and cannot, therefore, be judged of by this principle; but must proceed, step by step, according to the first principles laid down in the word; being careful, however much it may violate established Presbyterian usage in other countries where the Church has been long established, to violate no fundamental principle of church government contained in the Scriptures. And remembering the unity of the Church under both Testaments, this newly organised congregation will be justified in learning a lesson from that period when the patriarchal was about to be merged into the Mosaical, and when therefore the latter was in its forming stage, without any established Mosaical usage, but holding fast doubtless to the first principles of patriarchal ecclesiology. From this what will she learn? (1) That Moses, the ruler, ordained priests and high-priests;<sup>1</sup> (2) That the people laid on hands in the ordination of the Levites;<sup>2</sup> the people, the first receptacles of church power, of church rule. Thus will they learn that the very first principle of ordination is that it is an act of government, and not an act of priestly charm, or of a preacher's sacred distillation. The wrong impression, therefore, that might have been made upon them by the scriptural ordination of their elders by the one evangelist who had preached to them would be at once and for ever dissipated by the

---

<sup>1</sup> Lev. viii. 1-30; Num. xx. 23-28.    <sup>2</sup> Num. viii. 10.

immediately succeeding scriptural ordination of their native preacher by the body of elders who are not preachers; and so they would at once learn that the function of ordination is one belonging exclusively to rulers as such in court assembled, and not at all to preachers as such; and that the only apparent exception, that of the ordination of their ruling elders by their foreign evangelist, is not an exception as to ordination being a function of rule (being an illustration of ordination by Moses, the ruler), but an exception to the otherwise universal rule of ordination by a court of rulers.

Fourthly. It must be manifest from the foregoing that thus to ordain the minister of the word (or an evangelist) by the Session, even though it should be composed exclusively of ruling elders, would not be to "set the native Church on the wrong track," but exactly to counteract a tendency to run on the wrong track, by setting it on the right track, and that, too, "at the very beginning of things." To teach them Presbyterianism and not Prelacy.

Fifthly. In the next sentence, Dr. Wilson speaks of ordination as "the highest ecclesiastical function known to the Church." From this he makes an argument against ordination of a minister by the Session, viz., that it is contrary to "common sense that a Church just emerging into the twilight of Christianity" should "be called upon to perform this highest ecclesiastical function." Then Dr. Wilson must think ordination (rule) is higher than preaching, yet the rulers must not ordain the preacher. He appeals to "common sense;" but as we prefer Scripture even to the "law of necessity," so we prefer Scripture even to "common sense." If common sense is not according to Scripture, then it must be a very bad common sense, and should be corrected until it conforms to the standard of propriety. But is it contrary to common sense? Let us analyse ordination: (1) As preceding it, really a literal preliminary (*præ et limen*), there comes the election or vocation by the people, the exercise of church power *in actu primo* (Acts vi. 5); (2) Next the ordination itself properly so called, which is a concluding of the preliminary act of power, therefore an act of rule, power *in actu secundo*; this act in its last analysis furnishes this, and this only, "the laying on of

hands" (1 Tim. iv. 14) on the head of him who is to be ordained, accompanied by prayer (Acts xiv. 23) for him. Laying on of hands and prayer, then, make up the whole of this act of rule (Acts vi. 6).<sup>1</sup> Hence it is scripturally done either by a court of rulers or by one extraordinary ruler. Wherever there is a candidate or candidates (elect) to be set apart to office, the simple laying on of hands is not scriptural ordination, the simple praying for him is not ordination, but the laying on of hands, accompanied with prayer, is scriptural ordination, if it be done by a presbytery, or a presbyter extraordinary. Now, these very elders of this native church have, along with the people, exercised themselves in the very delicate, responsible, and exalted use of church power in selecting from their membership one to fill the responsible position of minister of the word; but having so done, it would seem that they have so utterly exhausted their power, if not their wits also, that the Session has neither power nor wits enough left to "lay hands on" the preacher-elect and "offer a prayer" for him! *i. e.*, to ordain him. Which is the most difficult exercise of "ecclesiastical functions," to prepare and preach a sermon? to give an intelligent vote in the election of church officers? or to lay on hands and offer a prayer? We leave it to the "common sense" of our readers to suggest the reply.

We are thoroughly persuaded that the whole difficulty at the bottom of this question concerning the ordination of native evangelists in foreign fields, which has now troubled the Church for several years, lies right here, *viz.*, in failing to see that ordination is exclusively a function of rule, and in failing to see that in its performance it is nothing more nor less than laying on of the hands of the presbytery, accompanied with prayer. But God's province is to bring good out of evil. The ordination by Dr. Wilson of a pastor in Africa, and of two native evangelists in Mexico recently by two of our missionaries, and of one evangelist several years ago in China by another of our missionaries,

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noticed that even when deacons were to be ordained, and "apostles" to do the ordaining, in this case at least it was by not one, but more than one: "they prayed, they laid hands on them."

would, we think, have never occurred, nor would the present amendment have been sent down to us by the General Assembly, if these simple principles had been clearly apprehended and steadily kept in view. Then, too, we would never have had this discussion. But the occurrence of these irregular ordinations (permitted and to be overruled by God for wise purposes, his own glory, and the ultimate promotion of the truth and good of the Church) has served to show how far, whilst boasting of our pure Presbyterianism, we had swerved from the right track and were unconsciously acting upon prelatical principles, supposing them to be Presbyterian. It will be a great mercy if God shall cause these irregularities to awaken us to a sense of our danger and bring us in humble penitence back to a scriptural Presbyterianism.

It must be evident to any even cursory reader of Dr. Wilson's article that the great strain with him is to have this ordination of native evangelists kept in the hands of preachers, and kept out of the hands of the ruling elders as such, except indeed so far as they might be associated with preachers. He is not willing for a body of rulers as such, parochial presbytery (with or without the minister of the word, their technical pastor), to ordain a minister or evangelist, but he is willing, in extraordinary circumstances, for the evangelist alone to do it, though he would prefer other ministers or evangelists to be associated jointly in the act. Now, is it not patent that what he is in search of as the *sine qua non* for ordination is the preacher element (the very element for which the Scriptures care nothing in ordination) and not the ruler element (the very element which the Scriptures reveal as exclusively necessary), for if it was simply the ruling element he wanted, he has it ready made to his hand in the Session; but leaving this, he would go miles away (if necessary) for another evangelist. Why? Because that evangelist is a ruler? Certainly not; but because he is a preacher! (See pages 65, 66, 69, 73, 76, 77.) Then it must follow that when ministers engage in ordination they do so as preachers, not as rulers; then ordination must be an act of preaching, not of rule; then ruling elders as such are out of place participating in the act of ordination; then ordination is a function of the preachers as such; then since

preaching is not a joint but a several power, ordination is not a joint but a several power! What is this!!

We have just read, a day or two ago, that most admirable "Address Delivered before the Two Synods of Kentucky at their Joint Centennial, held at Harrodsburg, October 12, 1883, The Distinctive Doctrines and Polity of Presbyterianism," by T. D. Witherspoon, D. D. It would rejoice us to know that this pamphlet was in every household in our Southern Presbyterian Church. Did space permit, we would like to make several extended quotations, but the following must suffice: "The first fundamental principle of Presbyterianism is that church power is vested, not in officers of any grade or rank, but in the whole corporate body of believers. Our doctrine is, that Christ, who is the great Head of the Church, the alone fountain and source of all its power, has not vested this power primarily in a single officer who is the visible head of the Church and the vicar of Christ, as in the Roman Catholic Church, or in the body of bishops or superior clergy, as in the Episcopal Church, or in the whole body of the clergy, as in the Methodist and some other Churches, but in the people, the whole body of the people," etc. Page 4. Under the third fundamental principle, he goes on to say: "But whilst this ministry of the word entitles them to special honor, it confers no higher rank and invests with no superior authority. The minister in our church courts has no more authority than the ruling elder, so that we not only have in the Presbyterian Church the 'parity of the clergy,' of which we hear so much, but the parity of the eldership, of the ruling elder with the teaching elder, a principle not to be found under any other form of church government." Page 6. This we need scarcely say is the doctrine of Breckinridge, and Thornwell, and, what is most important, of the Bible. We cannot quote more, but refer to pages 7, 9, 10: "The priests themselves ruled not as priests, but as elders;" 13: "There is a complete 'church in his house;'" 14: "These elders [ministers and ruling elders], acting in their collective capacity, elected and ordained to the ministry."

Dr. Wilson's great anxiety is to prevent the evangelist from ordaining an evangelist by his single power; he therefore pro-



vides (page 77) an "ecclesiastical commission," composed of "all the evangelists [preachers] on the ground," that he may do it by joint power [of preachers]. "It estops him from performing the act of ordination alone, except in extraordinary cases." He triumphantly claims in his very closing words: "The act performed in this way is strictly Presbyterian, gives no countenance either to Prelacy or Independency (!), and places the native Church at the very beginning on a solid Presbyterian foundation." Rather, we would say, on the high road to Popery. What is the difference between this plan, "body of evangelists"—Dr. Wilson, and "body of bishops or superior clergy"—Episcopal, and "whole body of the clergy"—Methodist? (See Witherspoon's first principle above.) "The act should be done by the body of evangelists" (page 77). In a work entitled "A View, etc., of the Primitive Church," etc., by Rev. A. B. Chapin, M. A., New Haven, 1842, dedicated to "the Right Rev. Thomas Church Brownell, D. D., LL.D., Bishop of Connecticut," etc., we may surely expect to find Prelacy. Quoting from the Apostolical Canons, he says: "A bishop must be ordained by two or three bishops; a presbyter or deacon by one bishop" (page 198). Of course he uses bishop not as synonymous with presbyter-ruler, but as preacher of the third order of the ministry. Again, page 200, quoting from Jerome: "Indeed, *what can a bishop do that a presbyter may not do, except ORDINATION?*" (Italics, etc., his.) Some amongst us are ready to match this by saying, "What (except preaching) can a preacher do that a ruling elder cannot do, except ordination?" Again, page 286: "Doubts have been raised by some theologians [as we understand from the context, Episcopal theologians] whether ordinations by *one* [Italics his] bishop are valid; but, as seems to us, without sufficient reason. They would be *uncanonical*, and therefore *irregular*, but still valid." Again, pages 305-7, he gives a list of "the consecrators of the archbishops since the Reformation." Take "15, Matthew Parker, 101 from St. John (69), Archbishop of Canterbury, December 17, 1559, Park. Reg., 10. Consecrators: John Hereford, John Bedford, Miles Exeter, William Barlow" (page 307). On page 405, quoting from another, he says, speaking of the ordina-

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—5.

tion of Matthew Parker, archbishop-elect: "On September 8, the Queen sent her mandate to Tunstall, . . . Bourne, . . . Pool, . . . Kitchin, . . . Barlow, . . . and Scorey, to confirm and consecrate the archbishop-elect. Kitchin had conformed; and it was hoped that the other three, who had not been present in Parliament, might be induced to imitate his example. All three, however, refused to officiate; and in consequence, the oath of supremacy was tendered to them, and their refusal to take it was followed by deprivation. In these circumstances, no consecration took place; but three months later the Queen sent a second mandate, directed to Kitchin, Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, John, suffragan of Bedford, John, suffragan of Thetford, and Bale, ordering them, or any four of them, to confirm and consecrate the archbishop-elect. . . . Kitchin again appears to have declined the office; but Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, and Hodgskins confirmed the election on the 9th, and consecrated Parker on the 17th." On page 406, quoting from Rev. Dr. Lingard, he says: "3d. That four out of the seven bishops named in the commission undertook to execute the commission, etc., . . . and the commissioners were ready to perform it," etc. If Prelacy is the high road to Popery, we consider the above quotations as proof positive that Dr. Wilson's amendment providing an ecclesiastical commission to ordain, composed of preachers alone, is the high road to Popery. For it must be evident that it is no escape from Prelacy to ordain by a "commission" of four, or seven, or any number of preachers; but to ordain by rulers as rulers, and not as preachers, and that whilst to ordain by one preacher (or one ruling elder, or by the hands of all the people) as ruler is not Prelacy but Presbyterianism, to ordain by a commission of evangelists as preachers, whether the commission be composed of one or one thousand, is still Prelacy. Let the reader judge upon which track Dr. Wilson's amendment will set "the native Church from the very beginning." Parity of presbyters, not of ministers, is our first distinctive principle. Yet see Dr. Wilson's idea of Prelacy, page 70.

Whilst we have this good Prelatist (Chapin) on the stand, let us take his testimony on another point: "Consequently the bishops

and clergy of any one province, with the consent of the laity, have the right to make any regulations for the government of their own branch of the Church, not inconsistent with apostolical organisation and order," page 381. Apostolical in his use is equivalent to scriptural.

Now there are only three theories on this subject :

1. The Westminster : Whatsoever is not commanded is forbidden. See Confession of Faith, Chapter I., Par. VI. ; Chapter XX., Par. II. ; Deut. xii. 32, xvii. 3 ; Matt. xxviii. 20.

2. The Romish : "A right to regulate and enjoin to an unlimited extent."

3. The English—intermediate between the first and second : "Limits and restricts the power of ordaining ceremonies to those matters which are not forbidden in the word of God," or, as Chapin says, "not inconsistent with." Westminster limits it by what is not commanded : these (English) extend it to what is not forbidden. See Bannerman, Church of Christ, Vol. I., pages 336-8.

Now, let us hear Dr. Wilson on this point : "In the prosecution of the work, however, let it be observed, she is to adopt no measures inconsistent with the teachings of God's word," page 63. The reader can easily see that Dr. Wilson, in this respect, stands not upon the Westminster platform, but the Anglican. The same idea may be seen cropping out on pages 68 and 69, *i. e.*, on the supposition that the present Book is scriptural. Dr. Wilson thinks the Book is "defective"—the powers conferred on evangelists are not large enough. Why should they be enlarged ? because they fall short of the word ? not at all ; but because "the progress of the missionary work therefore renders it absolutely necessary that there be some modification or addition (!) to the Constitution." "Thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it." Deut. xii. 32. But then, according to Dr. Wilson, so long as we "adopt no measures inconsistent with it," all is well—*i. e.*, all is Anglican.

There is a frequently recurring phrase : delegated power cannot be delegated, "*potestas delegata non potest delegari*," is just as true in ecclesiastical as in civil matters." Page 71. The appli-

cation made by Dr. Wilson of this maxim is to restrain the native evangelist from ordaining another native evangelist. Dr. Wilson evidently thinks it is the Presbytery that delegates power to the evangelist. Now, if this be true, then the Presbytery's power is not *potestas delegata*, else his maxim would be false; moreover, the evangelist would then be to the heathen world the legate of the Presbytery, and not the ambassador of Christ. 2 Cor. v. 20. But since Christ is the sole source of power—"all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. xxvii. 18)—the Presbytery's power must be "delegated power;" therefore she cannot delegate her power to the evangelist or to anybody else. But the evangelist has power, it also must be delegated power; therefore he cannot delegate his power to any one else; so with all church power. Therefore no one has right, authority, or power to do anything save as power so to do is delegated to him by Christ; and any use of this power by any (singly or jointly) deacon, ruler, preacher, or court, beyond that which is expressly granted, is to disobey that which is commanded, and therefore to rebel against the King in Zion. John xv. 5; Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4-8; 1 Sam. xv. 28-9. All this discussion, therefore, as to how many degrees delegated power may be removed before the power further to delegate is exhausted, is simply irrelevant. The simple fact that all church power is delegated power stops it in the hands of the first recipient from the fountain Head. It is his to use, but not to delegate. Ordination, therefore, is not an act by which Presbytery or the evangelist delegates power, but simply an act of rule by which they designate the party to whom Christ has delegated power to exercise office in his kingdom. The maxim, therefore, to which Dr. Wilson has resorted for protection proves to be in possession of his opponents. Delegated power is given by Christ to his Church to be used according to the rules laid down in the word, not to be delegated. "Any number of illustrations might be adduced in proof of this." Whatsoever, therefore, is not commanded is forbidden.

The question might here be propounded, Why has the evangelist, then, any right singly to ordain at all? The reply is very

simple: 1 Tim. v. 22 authorises the evangelist to "lay on hands," but forbids him to do it "suddenly"—*i. e.*, without proper examination of the candidate. Titus i. 5 authorises the evangelist in the use of his single power to "ordain," but restrains the use of that power to the ordination of any but "elders." He is given the right, therefore, explicitly in the Scriptures to ordain (1) not an evangelist, or preacher, or deacon, or elder, (2) but elders. Thus the moment he exercises his divine right of ordaining and completes the act, he is in the presence of a court. The silence of Scripture, both by precept and example, as to the extent of the power of this one ruler to ordain in any other case save that of ordaining rulers (plural) (see also Acts xiv. 23) is its most emphatic limiting of this power to the ordination of ruling elders, and of ruling elders only.

On page 66 Dr. Wilson makes an argument for the continuance of a *quasi* presbyterial control by the foreign evangelist over the native church until a Presbytery can be formed, basing his argument upon this premise, viz., "an evangelist, or a body of evangelists, stands in the same relationship to a newly formed church in the heathen world that a Presbytery does to a newly formed church in the home field." Now, that this is a false assumption will be manifest at a glance; for, first, the evangelist cannot hold the same relationship to the foreign congregation that the home Presbytery holds to the home congregation, for this plain reason: every home congregation has a divine right to a seat in the Presbytery which governs it; but the elder from the Session of the foreign church cannot take his seat in the evangelist. Secondly, this would authorise the evangelist singly to use his power not only to ordain, but to sit in judgment as an appellate court over that Session. Thirdly, since that Session, under its existing circumstances, is both lowest and highest court, this assumption would make the evangelist higher than the highest, an œcumenical council, or something higher even than that if possible.

But to our assertion that the evangelist is, in the use of his power of ordination, to be strictly limited to the ordination of elders, it may be objected that whilst this inference would seem to follow from Acts xiv. 23, 1 Tim. v. 22, and Titus i. 5, yet

that inference must some way be false; for it is flatly contradicted by 2 Tim. i. 6, which asserts that Timothy the evangelist was ordained by Paul, "which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." To this objection it is sufficient to reply, that the inference of the objector amounts to nothing, unless he means to assert that on this occasion Paul, and no one but Paul, laid hands on Timothy. That this is a false inference is manifest from 1 Tim. iv. 14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." In the first passage the preposition is *δία*, in the second *διὰ προφητείας μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*. If these two passages refer to the same event, then Timothy was ordained by the laying on of Paul's hands in company with the hands of the presbytery; if they refer to different events, then Timothy was ordained once by the presbytery and again (?) by Paul, or else this latter does not refer to ordination at all. In Galatians i. 1, Paul speaks of himself as an "apostle not of (*ἀπό*) men, neither by (*δία*) man, but by (*δία*) Jesus Christ and God the Father," etc. But we have neither time nor space to follow out this line of argument. Suffice it to say, that even should we grant that Paul the apostle ordained Timothy the evangelist by the hand of Paul alone, it would be no ground for the inference that evangelists may ordain other evangelists. We have no doubt, however, that the two passages refer to the same event, and are intended to teach that Paul was present at the meeting of the presbytery at which Timothy was ordained. He may (or not) have been the moderator of the presbytery, and may (or not) have offered up the prayer; but he, along with the presbytery, did the ordaining, and so, in referring to the matter afterwards, he (or any other member of the presbytery associated with him in the act of ordination) could say to Timothy, "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by (*δία*) the putting on of my hands." 2 Tim. i. 6. Thus we see that Paul did not think that ordination was a matter belonging to preachers, but to rulers. He, apostle though he was, did not disdain to associate with him the humble ruling elder in the ordination of an evangelist. With him ordination was a ruling, not

a preaching, function. Paul was not a Prelatist, but a Presbyterian. So was Peter the "apostle," yet a "fellow-elder." 1 Pet. v. 1. So was John, though an "apostle," yet an "elder." 2 John i. 1; 3 John i. 1. Both Peter and John were Presbyterians. They believed themselves to be elders, and all elders as such their equals.

The most remarkable specimen of self-immolation which we think we have ever seen occurs on page 70, compared with page 71; unless, indeed, it be equalled by another specimen furnished by page 65, compared with pages 70, 73.

On page 70 the Doctor seeks to fasten the charge of "Prelacy" on "certain Brazilian missionaries." "It was maintained [by them] that ordination was joint power belonging to the individual missionary, and that he had a right to ordain in virtue thereof, whether other evangelists were present or not. The readers of the REVIEW need not be told that this is Prelacy and not Presbyterianism." Turn to the very next page (71). Dr. Wilson says: "The authority may be delegated to him [the foreign missionary] to organise churches, ordain elders and deacons, and in extraordinary cases native evangelists also." If Dr. Wilson's principle of testing for Prelacy, on page 70, is good when applied to the Brazilian missionaries, surely it must be equally good when applied to himself, with this exception: they do not admit this principle to be a test of Prelacy; he does! Then, according to Dr. Wilson, in "extraordinary" cases "Presbyterianism" must call in "Prelacy" to help it out of a difficulty—*i. e.*, in a pinch he will resort to Prelacy rather than, like Paul, call to his aid the humble ruling elders who compose the parochial presbytery. Give him (Dr. Wilson) the preacher every time when ordination is to be performed—this, whether you call it "scheme" or non-descript, practical or "theoretical," one thing we know, it is "purely" Prelatical and utterly unscriptural.

On page 65: "It is not done, in the first instance, by a Presbytery, for there is none on the ground [except the 'purely theoretical' one of the parochial presbytery]; it is not done by a court of evangelists, for there is no room for such a court in the Presbyterian system, but it is done by a regularly authorised

evangelical commission [like that, *e. g.*, which the Queen authorised, and by which the Prelatists ordained, Archbishop Matthew Parker]. This, then, is the ground upon which we stand in relation to the matter of ordination [which as we have just seen is Prelatical]. It not only accords with common (?) usage in the settled Church, but it is at the same time free from all taint of Prelacy." Rather, we would say, free from all taint of Presbyterianism.

But that to which we wish to call more particular attention is the assertion in the above extract, "not presbytery," "not court of evangelists," but "evangelical commission." Now, we would ask, where, either in the Scriptures or in the Constitution, do you find authority for a commission made up entirely of preachers? for a body of preachers, confessedly "not a court, not a presbytery," to ordain, to perform an act of government, of rule? And that, too, from which the ruling elder is excluded, and the evangelist included, not because he is a ruler, but because he is a preacher? If commission is the same as court, what is the difference between "evangelical commission" and "court of evangelists"? If commission is not the same in essence as court, then what have you gained by adding two or any number of preachers to the first preacher? If ordination is an act of government or rule, how, by multiplying and aggregating preachers and calling them "commission," "not presbytery, not court," will you ever generate the function of rule?

Now take the very next paragraph: this "arrangement for ordination by ecclesiastical courts ["commission," you see, is, after all, equal to "courts"] is only temporary." Why temporary? Because "as soon as a native [classical] Presbytery is formed, the whole matter of ordination falls into its hands." In the previous paragraph, commission is "not court, not Presbytery"; but in this paragraph commission is "ecclesiastical court," and "Presbytery" is not court! because this arrangement of "ordination by ecclesiastical courts is only temporary," for it soon gives way to "ordination by a Presbytery"! *i. e.*, ordination by ecclesiastical courts is not ordination by a Presbytery, *et vice versa*, therefore a "Presbytery" is not an "ecclesiastical court"!



Now turn to page 70: "The right view of the matter is that all the evangelists are to take part in the ordination of every minister, not as a Presbytery, not as a court of evangelists, but simply as an ecclesiastical commission of the General Assembly," etc. It seems, therefore, that, after all, the "right view" is that this "ecclesiastical commission" of preachers is "not a Presbytery, not a court," yet they are "to perform this [ordination] as well as all other ecclesiastical functions [of rule of government] necessary to bring the native church into the exercise of its full powers," etc. That is, this thing that is not a court, not a Presbytery, is still to perform all the necessary functions of government; without being a body of rulers as such, but a body of preachers as such, they are to perform all the necessary functions of rule. See Thornwell's *Collected Writings*, Vol. IV., pages 38-9, which, although not referring to this identical case, yet in its germinal idea shows that this "arrangement" of Dr. Wilson contains the essence of Prelacy as distinguished from the essence of Presbyterianism, *i. e.*, rule-government by a body of rulers-presbyters as contrasted with preachers; the people being the prime receptacle of church power, because without their vote or approbation no man can be ordained. On page 44 Dr. Thornwell says: "As ministers properly ordained are presbyters, and as a presbytery is essentially a college of presbyters, it hardly admits of argument that a presbytery may be composed exclusively of ministers. . . . It is equally obvious that a true presbytery may be composed exclusively of ruling elders." This is no relief to Dr. Wilson, for he denies that his college of evangelists is a presbytery; which is proof that he is considering them not as generically presbyters (*πρεσβύτεροι*), but as specifically teachers (*διδάσκαλοι*) or heralds (*κήρυκες*). But Dr. Thornwell's argument is based upon the conception of ministers under the general concept of presbyters. A college of presbyters is a presbytery; but a college of teachers or a college of heralds is not a presbytery; in this Dr. Wilson saith truly—college of "evangelists," but "not court, not presbytery." But to ordain by a college of preachers as preachers and not as presbyters is not Presbyterianism, but Prelacy.

Turn now to page 73: "The ecclesiastical commission embraces

all those, but only those, who are qualified to exercise the functions of government." Yet this ecclesiastical commission is "not a presbytery, not a court" (page 65). A college of ministers, therefore, composed of ministers as ministers, and not having a single member (considered from Dr. Wilson's point of view) as presbyter, and having no ruling elder solely as such, is yet not a presbytery [true], but is "qualified to exercise the functions of government." That is, the government, so far as this "arrangement" of Dr. Wilson's is concerned, is lodged exclusively in the hands of the ministers. If this is not Prelacy, pray tell us what is. Thus we see that Dr. Wilson's views, as expressed on pages 65, 70, and 73, are not only confusion worse confounded, a mass of inextricable confusion and contradiction, but a clear (but unwitting, we most cordially grant) selling out to the Prelatists. To constitute for ordination a body of preachers as preachers, which shall be at the same time not a court, not a presbytery, is not Presbyterianism. What it is, let the reader judge.

It may certainly (so far as our Southern Presbyterian Zion is concerned) be assumed that Dr. Thornwell knew what Presbyterianism is. Hear him on "the principles which really distinguish us from other evangelical Churches: Second element: . . . *only as rulers*, chosen rulers, or representatives of the people, can they appear in these courts. . . . Presbyterians, therefore, hold to the *parity of the eldership*, not only, as Dr. Hodge seems to think, to the parity of the 'clergy' (that is, of the teaching elders or ministers), but also to the *parity of all presbyters* or rulers of the Lord's house. I take my brother, the ruling elder, when I meet him in any church court, by the hand as my brother and my *peer*. As presbyters, as members of any Presbytery, from the lowest to the highest, we are all perfectly equal in authority, although some of us have another function or office, being ordained to labor also in the word and doctrine." (All the italics are his.) Vol. IV., pages 234-5.

Now let us hear Dr. Wilson, and see whether he sides with Dr. Thornwell or with Dr. Hodge: "If, for example, the pastor of that church [in the foreign field] became guilty of heresy or flagrant immorality, by whom could he be tried and disciplined

except by the ruling elders of that church, who are not his peers, etc. . . . This church might be rent and distracted by its internal dissensions, just as was the case with the church at Corinth. Nobody can tell what would have been the fate of that church if the apostolic authority had not been at hand to heal its dissensions" (page 66). (To this let us reply, in passing, that since Paul was a Presbyterian and not a Prelatist, we may rest assured he "healed those dissensions," not by calling upon Prelacy to help him out of the difficulty, "which would be a most unfortunate precedent to set before a church just struggling into existence," but by a rigid adherence to and application of the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism—the parity of presbyters—which would be a most fortunate example, to which we would all do well to take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.) Take, again, page 73: "At the same time, a native church, with a foreign evangelist as its pastor, would be a much more suitable and competent body to ordain native ministers or evangelists than a church Session made up wholly of natives." Again, page 75: "There is a further difficulty connected with this arrangement [mixed Presbyteries]. Very few missionaries would be willing to regard native ministers, just emerged from the darkness of heathenism and without the practical wisdom of experienced church officers, as their equals and peers," etc. It would seem that Dr. Wilson does not believe in the parity of the eldership; and in the matter of foreign and native evangelists, he does not even believe with Dr. Hodge in the parity of the "clergy." Now as to this latter it is no matter; for no one ever yet did believe in the parity of ministers as such, that is, as preachers, especially in the matter of "practical wisdom and experience as church officers;" but remember that Dr. Wilson is now all the while speaking of these under the category of members of church courts, in which capacity he denies not only the parity of the eldership, but of the ministry.

To return to page 66. It would seem that if the pastor of the native church should be guilty of heresy or immorality, Dr. Wilson would have him tried not by the ruling elders, because they are not his peers, but by the foreign evangelist, or evangel-

ists, because they, and not the ruling elders, are his peers. Trial, mind you, is to be by a court-presbytery, according to Presbyterian usage. Yet this Presbytery, which is also not a Presbytery, is to have no ruling elders in it, according to Dr. Wilson's amendment. But when the tables are turned, and the foreign missionary is to be tried by the native preachers, although they have native ruling elders associated with them, and so constitute a *bona fide* Presbytery according to Presbyterian usage, then the foreign missionary is to rebel, because these native preachers, even in Presbytery assembled along with other native ruling elders, are not his peers. Truly, if Dr. Thornwell is any judge of what is one of the distinctive doctrines of Presbyterianism, then Dr. Wilson's article will not stand the test: one affirms *in totidem verbis* the parity of all presbyters; the other, with equal emphasis, denies it thrice. Thus, when we have tested this article for Prelacy by Chapin the Prelatist, we have found it to be Prelatical; and when we have tested it for Presbyterianism by Thornwell the Presbyterian, we have found it to be not Presbyterianism; and when we have tested it by the word of God, the only infallible rule, we have found it to be altogether wanting. What shall we more say? for the time would fail us to tell of its other inconsistencies with the Scriptures, and self-contradictions; of its applications of principles without continually subjecting results to the touchstone; of its arguments from necessity, but not from the word of God; of its appeal to common sense, but not to the sacred oracles; of its human dialectics without testing them by the hind-sights of inspiration; of its overlooking the fact that it was the Presbytery, and not the Synod or the General Assembly, that sent out the foreign missionaries, Barnabas and Saul, and, by parity of reasoning, Philip and Timothy and Titus; of its argument from the individual church in the home field instead of in the Bible; of its discoursing on foreign missions, and yet ignoring, yea rather violating, the fundamental principle of the great commission—whatsoever is not commanded is forbidden; of its appealing to his own example in Africa and that of others in Mexico, instead of to inspired and infallible examples; of its appealing to the *vox populi ecclesiæ*, instead of

the *vox Dei*; of its appealing to the consequences of human actions, instead of to the statutes of the Lord; of its appealing to the inherent powers of the General Assembly, and to the general clauses of the Constitution, instead of to the law and to the testimony.

But with all the faults of his article, we love its author still; and we love him none the less because we love God's truth and God's Church more. Dr. Wilson's article is clearly and unredeemably Prelatical; but Dr. Wilson himself is no Prelatist. He would be the last man to swerve wittingly, even a hair's breadth, from the faith once delivered to our fathers and the pattern showed to Moses in the mount; but his article is the high road to Prelacy, and thence to Popery. To engraft his amendment upon the Constitution would indeed be to open the floodgates of error and to write Ichabod over the portals of our Southern Zion. 2 Tim. iii. 16-17: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

JAS. L. MARTIN.

## ARTICLE IV.

## SCOTLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: 1707.

I. Scottish society at the Union was marked by one peculiarity which demands our particular notice: it had no middle class. This is the key to the general situation. "There are only two ranks of men among us," says Hume of his own time, "gentlemen who have some fortune and education, and the meanest slaving poor." There was neither wealth nor trade of any consequence in the country, as we have seen, and the usual result of these in free countries, a true middle class. The gentry, the clergy, and the peasantry—this latter including the farmers and traders—were the three classes into which the nation was divided. The feudal division of society, therefore, still existed, and, as we shall see, much of the feudal spirit.

The gentry were mostly old families, and as such kept their hold on the hearts of the dwellers on their lands and in their neighborhood—unless when they had dyed their hands in the blood of their countrymen—and found that "the claims of long descent" were instinctively honored by them. It came naturally, and as an habit of blood, to the Lowland peasant to acknowledge these as his social superiors. The stubborn self-assertion which he had shown was as yet strictly confined to questions of dogma and church discipline—and would be until a greater shaking of crowns and kingdoms than he had been a witness of had taken place, and had irresistibly turned his attention to questions of personal and political rights; and if these were neither assailed nor derided, he was not more deferential than loyal.

The "gentlemen" spoken of by Hume, and of whom he was himself one, had at this time a scorn of mercantile and industrial pursuits equal to that of the gentlemen of France, and the wearers of the black cock's feather, the proud Duinbewassels. Handicrafts they despised, and handicraftsmen they treated with contempt. At that period, the gentleman merchant, manufacturer, or money-dealer, the civil engineer, architect, editor, or artist, were nearly unknown in Scotland; and the only form in which a

man poor and well-born could retain the rank of gentleman, if he did not follow one of the learned professions, was by obtaining a commission in the army, or a government civil appointment. "Our manufactures or trades," says a contemporary, "were carried on by the meanest of the people, who had small stocks and were of no reputation. Our weavers were few in number, and held in the greatest contempt. As manufacture was in no esteem," he continues, "men of fortune thought it beneath them to breed their children to any business of that sort, and therefore the professions of law, physic, etc., have been reckoned the only suitable employments for persons of birth and fortune."

But as only a few of these "persons of birth" could find a good settlement in their own country, by following out any of the professions, numbers of them went abroad to swell the list, already large, of the scholars and soldiers of fortune who had passed across the seas during the two previous centuries to lands where they hoped—the scholar, to find an honored, undisturbed home; the soldier, some favors, perhaps fame. More, however, preferred the ease and indigence and coarse semi-barbarous pleasures of the capital, where, without a single worthy object to engage their energies, they lounged about, haughty and fierce, divided by faction, and addicted to liquor, keeping it in continual brawls and scandals, and freely using their swords, which were still worn by gentlemen, to settle all their differences.

These were unworthy sons of unworthy fathers. The one portion of our history which all Scotsmen shrink from is the history of the Convention of Estates. It needs, but it has never found, an apologist. Its leading and most active-minded members have been sketched by our great historical colorist, and, unfortunately for human nature, the unlovely portraits are too well witnessed to by the memoirs and correspondence and legal decisions of the period; and these we cannot even casually consider without being forced to admit that the chief men in the Convention were as dishonest and unblushing seekers of office as either Scotland or England had ever seen. Virtue of the higher order, Roman or Christian, was an extremely rare thing among them. Simplicity and honor, its fairest twin blossoms, had not yet made fragrant

and beautiful the unwholesome and forbidding gloom of their castles. No imperishable scene revealing and embalming precious traits of personal and national character has been recorded of the Convention and floated down to our time, to be in turn proudly handed on to after generations. Sycophancy, self-seeking, dissimulation, and treachery, it must be admitted, were the leading characteristics of its members; and their evident motives in every crisis were mean and paltry. The Dalrymples, the ablest of them, were the just astonishment of their age. Their names are now synonymous with suppleness and sinuosity of political conscience. Never perhaps had Scotland two more capable ministers; but never had Scotland two such perfect disciples of Machiavelli. They set the example of saving their house by having no traditional policy or principle, and of adopting the artifice which subsequently became common among the politicians of Scotland, "of hedging," of dividing their allegiance between the rival governments, the father taking the one side, the son the other. Earl Crawford, a pharisee of the pharisees, was one of the most craven of souls. Lockhart, Montgomery, Hume, and Fletcher, poisoned by chagrin, were the willing tools and mouthpieces of treason and slander. Seldom has so large a group of really able men offered itself so unblushingly to the shafts of the satirists, the judgment of the historian, the jibe of the peasant. They live in history only because of the bitterness of their political creed and their maddened selfishness. Only do we touch upon the heroic and the memorable in the last passages of the lives of Argyll and Montrose and Baillie of Jerviswoode; and we feel when we do so an instant sense of relief and an exhilaration of spirit.

These were the men who, as fathers or sons, either countenanced Charles the Second and James the Second in their wicked misgovernment of Scotland, or were utterly indifferent to its wrongfulness and cruelty. These were the men who, on a change of masters, threw consistency to the winds and offered their allegiance to William of Orange, and begged for place from Carstairs; and who had hardly sworn allegiance, when, yielding to their vicious constitutional turn, they at once took to plotting on behalf of the exiled family, and to treasonable correspondence



with its drunken, unkingly head. Their religion and their politics were the creatures of whim and worldly interest. This, no doubt, was their special temptation; for hardly any of them had one penny to rub upon another, so deep and incurable was their poverty. Whatever, therefore, ministered, or was likely to minister, to their advantage in wealth or lands, was eagerly clutched at and fearlessly gambled for. Every one had his price, it was believed, and could be bought. Hunger is a sure deadener of conscience and weakener of moral eyesight. The poverty of the Scottish gentry was their one overmastering care for centuries. Hence they took sides and showed a compliancy and sacrificed consistency with an ease and frequency which astonish us as showing no less than a real divorce between morality and theology. For long their circumstances bore a close resemblance to the circumstances of the Bedouin and the Borderer—in which most things, human and divine, are always and easily sacrificed to personal ends.

Now, it would be against all experience to find men of this sort the fathers and fosterers of Parliamentary and popular liberty. Nor in this case does history belie our experience, but on the contrary, makes it perfectly plain that the morals and politics of these men had many points of contact and mutual influence. They were not our sires in our love of political liberty. No, assuredly no. Whatever political purity and freedom existed in Scotland, existed, it is only too clear, in spite of them; and those sparks of the divine flame which burned in the souls of the Scottish people, did so unfed and untended by them. A brief glance at Scottish Parliamentary history will put this beyond doubt.

II. During the reigns of the first Stuart kings we often hear of the Parliament; but if we were to conclude from this that it was like our present Parliament, a truly representative assembly, we should make a very great mistake. It never was this, and it never was meant to be this. It never was a power to which the Scottish people looked for redress of grievances or for the defence of their rights. No scenes in its annals illuminate the political history of the Middle Ages: it has no names famous in constitu-

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—6.

tional debate which haunt and inspire us. From the first there was a fatal flaw in its constitution which was never mended, nor sought to be mended, and which was taken advantage of again and again by the crown, until in the seventeenth century it became a mockery and a sham. The first defect was that the three estates sat in one chamber, with the Lord Chancellor as President. This had an obviously unfavorable effect on the freedom of debate and voting. The second and more serious defect was that all the legislative power was vested in a committee. As far back, says Robertson, as our records enable us to trace the constitution of our Parliaments, we find a committee distinguished by the name of *Lords of Articles*. It was their business to prepare and to digest all matters which were to be laid before the Parliament. There was rarely any business introduced into Parliament but what had passed through this committee; every motion for a new law was first made there, and approved or rejected by it; what they approved was passed into a bill and presented to Parliament; and it seems probable that what they rejected could not be introduced into the house. They not only, therefore, directed all the proceedings of Parliament, but possessed a negative before debate. These were extraordinary powers to be vested in a committee; but equally extraordinary in the seventeenth century was the mode of its election. It was composed of an equal number out of each of the three estates—of eight peers, eight churchmen, and eight burgesses, to which were added latterly the eight great officers of the crown. But never was there a more impudent pretence of representation. The bishops chose the peers, the peers the bishops; and these chose other sixteen representatives of the shires and burghs! The whole power was therefore in the hands of the bishops, who were the slaves and sycophants of the crown; and as their choice fell on those who were attached to the court, the Lords of the Articles were the tools and creatures of the king. Hence from the time of David II. till the Great Rebellion in England had roused some parliamentary feeling in Scotland, the Parliament cannot be said to have met at all. It met only on two days. On the first, it met to adjourn; on the second, it met to receive

and adopt the reports of its committee. During all these centuries, from the fourteenth to the middle of the seventeenth, not an article, or, as we should say, a bill, was brought in and discussed, opposed, supported, voted upon in open Parliament. And there was no Speaker to guard the liberties of the Commons—who were of small account in that assembly—though in no legislative assembly was a Speaker ever more needed.

The Scottish Parliament, in fact, was as to form the purest piece of feudalism in the world; more so than the States-General, and more so even than the Aragonese Cortes; and as to practice, was simply a court for the registering of the king's decrees, for giving legal form to every prejudice and purpose of the court. We read of it in 1621 passing one hundred and fourteen acts on the last day of the session! We are at a loss to comprehend how it could do this, until we turn to the Minutes of Estates, where we see with some astonishment how the thing was not only possible, but very easy. The whole proceedings, for example, before the house in one of the most memorable enactments in Scottish history, the Act against Conventicles, are thus indicated in the minutes: "Brought in from the Articles, twice read, approven, and touched with the sceptre." No objection is raised, no indignant anger is heard, no pitying entreaty to stay the tyrant's hand thrills the hearers and momentarily paralyses the brutal minions of Charles.

The same servility and meanness of spirit was shown in burghal affairs. The burghs, whether royal burghs or burghs of barony, must always have been nests and nurseries of obsequiousness. Generally the creation of some neighboring noble, who was himself by right the chief magistrate or provost, but who usually either deputed his office to a nominee, or his powers to a substitute called his bailie; and being bound to render him, as feudal superior, various kinds of service, it was impossible there could be independence of opinion, and it was inevitable that there should be a general subjection of mind to the patron. Nothing could prevent this. Our county histories abound with illustrations of this menial stage of our history; of its petty tyrannies; its trivial social aims. The villagers in the neighborhood of the

castle or hall could not be summoned as their forefathers, by a whistle or bugle call; but they were not less influenced, for the practical purposes of their time, by the immediate interests of their position; and so strongly did these affect all that, like Caleb Balderstone, in "*The Bride of Lammermoor*," the pleasing of their feudal lord was apparently the chief end of their existence; the thought of opposing or thwarting him was shrunk from as blasphemy.

The apotheosis of this spirit was the burgh elections. These were not elections at all, but nominations, in which the first principles of popular representation were openly subverted. Complete self-government had been conferred at the outset upon the burghs. The municipal franchise was the right of every holder of a rood of land; and by the ancient burgh laws the aldermen and bailies were to be elected by the whole community—that is, the whole body of regular burgesses. But the very manner in which most of the burghs came into existence and were fostered, checked the play and growth of municipal freedom; although it would appear to have been frequently asserted amid much popular excitement against feudal domination. Unhappily, an act was passed in 1469 which nipped this promise of liberty. It enacted that the Town Councils in future should be self-elected, that "the auld consail of the town sall chuse the new consail," etc. This act, worthy of the Lords of the Articles, concurring with the general circumstances of the nation, made every Town Council a set of oligarchs, instead of a body of representatives, responsible to and openly checked by the community whose interests they were pledged to see to. It could have no other issue. Never were such sleepy hollows of vanity and stupid self-satisfaction. Self-elected and beyond public opinion, they did as they pleased for generations with the lands, revenues, and offices of the burghs, until, at the close of the eighteenth century, they became, one and all, "sinks of political and municipal iniquity, steeped in the baseness which they propagated, and types and causes of the corruption that surrounded them."

III. Not less, but much more unrighteous and corrupt than the Parliament and the burghs were the courts of law. The

highest court in the realm, the Court of Session, had been for generations "an established perversion of justice;" and continued to be open to suspicion long after the Union. It was foul with favoritism; and, what was worse, justice was bought and sold in it. Open bribery was the recognised custom, the clients' gifts the most important item in each case. Each judge had a depute member of the bar, called a "peat" or "pet," whose special business was to conduct and see to this bribery or "solicitation" as it was called. "Pieces of plate and bags of money were sent to the king's counsel, to influence their conduct, and poured forth," says a contemporary writer, "like billets of wood upon their floors, without even the decency of concealment." No one seemed to think this practice a monstrous wrong; and the man who did not avail himself of it was sure to lose in law, and get himself laughed at for his scrupulosity. It was also usual for parties who had a case in court to deliver their information direct into the hands of the judges who were to try it, in their own houses; and the decisions of the bench were frequently given *after* the court had risen in private, and as could be arranged. Wickedness was in the place of judgment, and iniquity in the place of righteousness. Never was there in any country, not even excepting France before the Revolution, a set of judges more accustomed to prostitute their sacred office than the fifteen lords of session; and the phrase, "Show me the man and I shall show you the law," which has come down from that period, exactly expresses their principles and their motives. It was not without cause, therefore, that the celebrated Forbes of Culloden, their first President of spotless name, used to drink to such of the judges *as did not deserve the gallows*.

But worse still were the inferior courts. Courts of law they were not, as they did not exist for the interpretation of common law or jurisprudence by responsible qualified men. They were the courts of the barons, as the Parliament was the court of the king; in reality part of the machinery which belonged to the heritable jurisdictions, as the sheriffdoms, baileries, and royalties, which belonged by inheritance to the great families of each county, were called. The office of hereditary sheriff was usually vested in

one of the largest land owners in the county, one whose connexions happened to be among the most influential in it, and who was therefore supposed to have most interest in and was most likely to contribute to its welfare. His executive power was generally limited only by the gallows, and these he even sometimes set up and used. He was subject, of course, to the crown, and his judgments could be appealed against; but which of his tenantry, who among the peasantry or villagers, nay, who but his peers, would not always feel it to be at least safest to acquiesce in his judgments, and though burning with indignation, be dumb in his presence? In the sheriff's as in the Supreme Court, money answered all things. The sheriff reaped large profits from the fines imposed by him or his deputies, and his deputies, not being, strange to say, salaried officials, paid themselves out of the same convenient fund. Hence the door was opened to endless vexations and iniquities. Hence fines were almost always imposed. Hence crimes and offences were condoned by arrangement with the private or public prosecutor. Nor was this all. The Star Chamber mode of pressing accused parties to purge themselves on oath was common in cases where guilt was assumed and where evidence was not likely to be forthcoming. Righteousness and pity, in short, had no place in these courts.

Besides the sheriffdom there were the regalities. A regality, like a palatinate, was a separate little kingdom carved out of the realm, whose chief was allowed the free use of legal powers; that is to say, he was absolute in all matters belonging to his estate and people; the dispenser of justice, the fountain of mercy, the maker of law and custom. Sir Walter Scott has described one of these in "The Legend of Montrose;" and Inverary Castle as there described, with its twin emblems and twin terrors of regality, the pit and gallows, was quite according to the fashion of feudal times. As an institution belonging to a barbarous age, when the chief was overlord and responsible only to the king, the lord of regality was practically above law, and could punish with death or starvation, without fear of consequences, whoever drew his frown upon them, or were in the way of the gratification of his passions. In the shadow of the capital a show of deference was

paid to the Supreme Court, and something more than deference to the crown; but in their own lands the lords of regality cared little or nothing for either court or crown, and ruled as despotically as any Turkish pasha or any French seigneur under Louis XV. And as if this power was not enough for any one man to possess, the principal nobles held a plurality of offices, and were sheriff, lord of regality, and, in two or three instances, justice general, at one and the same time. Who will ever know the horrors of these tyrannies? Only when the dungeon and the grave give up their dead, and the silence and darkness of oppression find a voice and are lit up so as to make all things plain. It is not needful to have detailed proofs of the uses which the pit and gallows were put to to form a just opinion of the spirit and manner of administering law in the days preceding their abolition; it is enough to know that the power of life and death belonged as an hereditary, immemorial right to the leading chieftains of the land, and that they always possessed the means of instantly exercising it. Who might impugn or oppose their will in their own burgh or burgh court? Whoever did so was certain to find that it was a ridiculously vain thing to do; as the saying of the Campbells expressed it, "It is a far cry to Lochow."

IV. We are willing to believe that there was another side to this picture; nor have we any doubt that in practice the powers we have referred to had by this time generally fallen into disuse. It was natural they should. To what extent, however, this was so in the great northern jurisdictions we cannot even guess; and we have an instance in the case of Simon Lovat, chief of the Frasers, which should make us cautious in coming to a conclusion on the subject. As to the southern shires we are in no doubt. The Reformation brought about a state of things which struck directly at all exhibitions of feudal power, and therefore at the jurisdiction it conferred; and this was intensified, although by a different means, in the next century during the Covenanting struggle. Then the presence of a common enemy knit lord and peasant together; superior and vassal were each bound to the other by ties of reciprocal good-will; and so it happened that where the mere creatures of the government would have hunted

and shot down the suspected and the offending, the feudal magistrates, the resident owners of the soil, generally exerted their influence to shield and save them from the storm of persecution. It would be untrue, therefore, to speak of the regalities as engines of oppression—the dread of the people; the spirit of feudalism in its noblest form had made this impossible. Like other parts of the legal machinery of the day, they were the creation of, and had been made to suit, a ruder time, when might took the place of right, and force the place of law and precedent. But they were still the law of the land—still the private right of certain families. The pit and gallows might still be used as they once had been used. Nay more, they were regarded with the other heritable jurisdictions as essential to the dignity and safety of Scotland; for they were specially reserved at the Union as rights of property. There was no fault seen in them, no complaints made about them. Not better could be put in their place; and it was not till the statesmen both of England and Scotland were frightened and incensed by the mischievous use they were put to that they were swept away in 1746 in a moment of victorious power and indignation.

What, with all these facts before us regarding the political life of the nation, and the modes of administering law and justice in it, what is the meaning of the boast that Scotland has always been a land of liberty? Whatever it may mean, this it cannot, that Scotland was a land like the one described by Tennyson:

“A land of settled government,  
A land of just and old renown,  
Where Freedom broadens slowly down  
From precedent to precedent.”

For at the time of the Union there was, properly speaking, neither freedom of opinion nor freedom of election in civil and municipal affairs; there was no constitutional freedom; no generally respected common law; no even-handed justice in the land. And yet in a real, although limited sense, the boast is perfectly true.

If the body of the people had neither political nor municipal freedom, they had what they esteemed, and rightly esteemed, as



the source and foundation of all freedom, namely, a sufficient religious freedom. This they prized as the one chief good of life, and felt as yet no need of other forms of freedom. They have accordingly been pointed out by Macaulay as a remarkable example of a people well-conducted under bad laws. But their example was a very peculiar one. The theocratic idea had early possessed the national mind, and at this time was still an influence and a spell to rouse a portion of the people to the wildest intolerance. What their fathers bled and died to secure had in the main been secured, and laird and peasant alike felt, that in the possession of one faith and one baptism everything which had been desired or was desirable had been obtained. Free from all forebodings, and enjoying serene satisfaction in these his be'oved themes, which completed to him the essentials of religion and theology, the Scottish peasant gave cheerful honor both at kirk and market to lord and lady, whatever were their feudal relations to him, and taught his children to do the same as one of the first duties of life. It was more than he could imagine that dissent as to dogma and discipline should naturally arise in his altered, more leisurely times, as it was soon to do; it was more than could have occurred to him that one of the first fruits of the Union should be the discovery that there was a court in the realm superior to the General Assembly. Political life as it existed and for long had existed in England, and the whole range of those practical interests which are common and give such variety to our day, were then unknown: in their place and answering the same intellectual ends were the vaster if vaguer series of theoretical interests set forth and suggested by Calvinism and the Covenants. Taught for generations that their country was a theocracy, and kings and rulers God's vassals, the Scottish people had become the most theological people in the world. Every interest and relation was subordinated to their theology; all that makes up the round of human life was controlled, or was tried to be controlled, by it. Intensely realistic in their conceptions of the unknown, serious and earnest as became strong natures overawed by those conceptions, there was in nearly every cottage in the land an habitual and absorbing exercise

of the intellect on the baffling problems of man's nature and man's destiny. The manner in which they did this we see in Boston's "Fourfold State," a book which is the true reflection of the religious beliefs of the Scottish peasantry in the eighteenth century; a book which, although almost unknown now, was never absent from the window-sill or the wall press of the cottage, and with the "Scots Worthies" and "Cloud of Witnesses" fed the minds and filled the imaginations of the Scotsmen and Scotswomen of that century.

If their creed thus engaged their minds to the exclusion of all general secular interests, their form of church government no less certainly bred in them a love of representative assemblies and freedom of debate. What was denied them in the political arena they were freely and frequently allowed in the ecclesiastical one. The Presbyterian form of church government is based on the two principles, that all men are equal in the sight of God, and that all men are responsible creatures, and as such have certain inalienable rights of conscience. The turn which events took after the Reformation, the deadly contention between the crown and the people, favored the growth and diffusion of these ideas. Preachers like Craig and Black, tribunes in Geneva cassock and gown, exhibited them to the nation in the fullest sweep of their application; and from that April day three hundred years ago, when Presbyterianism was adopted in the Magdalene Chapel as the national form of worship, they have been native to the air of every Lowland parish, and been carried out with republican simplicity; the peasant as a member of the Church being on an equal footing with the peer, sitting side by side at the communion table without distinction of person, and in the Synod and General Assembly equally free to speak and equally influential in vote. From that time the pulpit was the most powerful means of forming public opinion, and the only organ by which it was or could be expressed; and the ecclesiastical courts the only assemblies in the nation which possessed any sort of liberty of speech and popular feeling. It was the clergy who first taught the people to express an opinion on public affairs, and they taught them thoroughly well. They gave the Church a spirit which no

fear could tame and no persecution break; an unconquerable hatred of illegal interference; a courage which never quailed in defence of its prescriptive rights. As Mr. Buckle has eloquently said:—

They kept alive the spirit of national liberty. When the light grew dim and flickered on the altar, their hands trimmed the lamp and fed the sacred flame. By their sermons, by their conduct, both public and private, by the proceedings of their assemblies, by their bold and frequent attacks upon the persons, without regard to their rank, nay, even by the very insolence with which they treated their superiors, they stirred up the minds of men, woke them from their lethargy, formed them to habits of discussion, and excited that inquisitive and democratic spirit which is the only effectual guarantee the people can ever possess against the tyranny of those who are set over them.

Thus although the Scottish Parliament failed to foster the first forms of a free commonwealth, and never represented the nation in any of its popular crises, the people found a constitutional mode of making their wishes both known and felt. The mode was ecclesiastical. But that was an accident. Beneath this peculiarity, and the form and phrase natural to it, lay the great principle of individual freedom, the prime Protestant doctrine of liberty of conscience. A parliament elected by the nation Scotland had not, but, thanks to her clergy, every pulpit was a tribune, and the General Assembly a House of Representatives. Unlike the Romish and English clergy the Scottish clergy were not priests separated from the mass of the commons, and the assemblies were not assemblies of an ecclesiastical order. They and only they represented the life, the genius, the best interests of the Scottish people; every hope of national life, every longing after freedom, truth, rest; every upward tendency of human nature.

This is the peculiarity, the leading feature, of Scottish history from the Reformation down almost to our own time. Whereas in England the leaders of public opinion and the originators of new movements have commonly belonged to the laity, in Scotland they have commonly belonged to the clergy. In Knox, Melville, Henderson, Carstares, before the Union; in the Erskines, Boston, Robertson, Chalmers, since, we have a list of

churchmen who represent the movements which have taken place in Scotland since the Scottish people had a political existence and a political influence. These are the names deepest cut in the national remembrance. The feudal leaders from the first had only their own interests in view, and therefore ceased, from the first show of democratic feeling, to be the real leaders of the nation. They are the figures on the page which indicate the direction of the feeling or opinion of the country, but are rarely or never the forces which create it. Whatever might be their policy they had to count on the clergy and the Church as the determining elements as to its success; and it fared well or ill with it in proportion as it had their favor or their frown. There was no powerful middle class as in the wealthier south; no rich tradesmen and many-acred yeomen of lineage older than the Conquest, to represent the people, to plead for, and if need be fight for, them against the oppressions of the crown. This, in Scotland, had to be done by the clergy. It was the Church under Knox which overthrew Mary Stuart and her cause, and saved the Reformation. It was the Church under Melville which crossed and thwarted James VI. in his first attempts on popular privilege. It was the Church under Henderson which enabled Hampden and the Parliamentary party in England to make head against Charles I. and the bishops, and whose stubborn patience under persecution hastened the Revolution. It was the Church in its collective form which induced the statesmen of 1688 to give an historical continuity to the faith of the people by setting up a Presbyterian establishment. The policy which was found best in each of these crises was the policy preached and insisted upon by the Church; and which would not have been adopted if her spirit had not been resolved and her voice constant and true.

In this sphere and in this form the Scottish people enjoyed liberty and latterly triumph. And it was in winning this, the single stroke on which all else hung, the one right which included every other individual right, that minor interests were unnoticed and unheeded. Enough that the Church was securely placed in its privileges by the Revolution settlement. Enough that men like Middleton and Lauderdale, Claverhouse and Dalziel, were

no longer possible. Enough, finally, that the Act for securing the Protestant religion and Presbyterian church government, and ordaining that the said Presbyterian government should be the only government of the Church in Scotland, was inscribed in the treaty of the Union and formed an essential part of it. The nation was profoundly satisfied. Every man could now worship in peace under his own vine and fig-tree, none daring to make him afraid. The saint might now, as before, entertain angels unawares and see the heavens open. The peasant, freed from the fear of the sleuth-hound and the spy, might now meditate, like the patriarch, in the evening stillness and shadows. The boot, the thumbscrew, the gibbet, the dungeon, were gone for ever; the lonesome cave and damp and dismal mos-hag were no longer welcomed as places of shelter and as temples of devotion.

V. In these two distinct and separate spheres all the mental activity of the Scottish people moved: on the one hand, the gentry mostly taken up with coarse personal pleasures and selfish factious politics; on the other, the clergy and the Commons passionately anxious for the adoption of their religious and ecclesiastical principles. But although the two classes were widely separate in their sympathies and beliefs, they were not socially antagonistic. There was never at any time the slightest approach to a war of classes. And after the Revolution this was really impossible. The means of tyranny, as we have seen, lay ready to hand, and the circumstances are easily conceivable in which they could have been used to grind the peasantry into slavery, as they were ground in France. But these happily never occurred. The country was thinly peopled; the soil could not do more than furnish grass for a few cattle, and grains for home consumption; there was neither mineral nor mercantile wealth. The gentry were, therefore, like their tenants and servants, very dependent on kindly skies and favoring seasons for bare sustenance; and as we see in the family papers of the period, were simple in their tastes and gentle and familiar in their ways. The consequence was that in the beginning of the eighteenth century the bulk of the nation, certainly all the rural part, was under the spell of the feudal spirit, and subject in much to feudal use and wont. On

one point, and one only, had it completely broken away from this bondage, but so gradually had this been done that no one was sensible of any awkward or serious difference of opinion. As yet all things seemed to be unchanged: as was said at the outset, the time had not come when secular interests for their own sake, and when political and personal rights were counted all-important and claimed as part of a man's inalienable heritage.

Two curious and striking illustrations of this may be given—the existence of slavery or serfdom in collieries and salt-works, and the existence of an extensive kidnapping traffic between the northern counties and America—illustrations of the dwarfed, one-sided sympathy, and of the moral obliviousness, which are possible and too common to all men who narrow their observations to a single aspect, and their interests to a single set, of human affairs.

1. At a time when the nation was anxious above all things to secure one of the higher forms of liberty, namely, freedom of religious opinion, it takes us by surprise to find that there were two considerable classes of men and women, hundreds of whom were within sight of Edinburgh, living under the doom of slavery. These were the colliers and salters. "They were literally slaves," says Lord Cockburn, the first writer who describes them. "They could not be killed nor directly tortured, but they belonged, like the serfs of an older time, to their respective works, with which they were sold as a part of the gearing." They were true *ascriptitii glebæ*. We know nothing of their personal condition at this time; we have not a single reference to them in any of the writers of the day. But we know enough from late observers, when their condition was better, to assure us that the social and mental condition of these persons, of whom "there must have been thousands," was an offence to humanity and a disgrace to their country. They were simply beasts of burden. Like other animals they had some rights, but these were lightly esteemed by their masters, even by the best of them. They formed a separate and avoided tribe; their habits were low and brutish; they wore the look of creatures outcast and despised. If not quite forgotten, at least no man cared for them. So complete was their

degradation, so blunted, in other words, were the feelings, so blinded were the moral perceptions of their countrymen, that in a statute passed in 1701, which has been extolled as the Scottish Habeas Corpus Act, they were expressly *excluded from its protection: being slaves, they had no personal liberty to protect, and no rights to preserve.*

And the manner in which this form of bondage grew up into established and recognised use, gives it additional point as a proof of the characteristics just mentioned. There is no reason to regard it as a vestige of an old feudal custom, nor as a relic of ancient villenage. It probably originated in the practice of condemning offenders to perpetual servitude; it was certainly directly encouraged by several Acts passed by the Stuarts, which legalised forcible possession of the person of the vagrant and poor, and their compulsory perpetual employment. One of these Acts says: "It shall be lawful to all persons or societies, who have or shall set up any manufacture within this kingdom, to seize upon and apprehend the persons of any vagabonds who shall be found begging, and who, being found masterless and out of service, have not wherewith to maintain themselves by their own means and work, and to employ them for service as they shall see fit, etc." This legislation defined all servants as either "necessary" or voluntary. "Necessary" servants were those belonging to the classes named above, whom the law compelled to work in places which it was found difficult or impossible to carry on otherwise and who, like their unhappy brethren who were "apprenticed" to Virginian planters, thereby became chattels. The hardship, the wickedness of this legislation was not in its compelling the vagrant and houseless to work for their living; it was in punishing a misfortune as a crime, and, in addition, in depriving men and women of their natural rights. In Scotland there was always the sorest of temptations, namely hunger, to force persons into such employment; and latterly, the most of the persons engaged in these works preferred being so employed to being starved. All who did so were enslaved for life! And hence wives, daughters, and sons went on from generation to generation under this family doom.

2. The other illustration of the light regard shown by the authorities for the rights of the individual was the practice of compromising with thieves, vagabonds, and other offenders, by banishing them to the American and West Indian plantations. Hundreds of unhappy and unfortunate creatures had been so shipped off, from time to time, to the other side of the Atlantic; sufferers for conscience' sake, persons obnoxious and suspected, but not tried and found guilty, and proved offenders. The extremely iniquitous thing about this form of criminal procedure was that the persons in question, except those summarily dealt with by the Privy Council or lords of session, appeared to consent to their disposal in this way—to their banishment into slavery. This was a trick of law; for in reality they chose this fate simply because there was no other open to them; it was their one and only alternative. The juggle was characteristic of the jurisprudence of the day. The offenders were not treated openly, their crime first proved and then their punishment proclaimed. They were dealt with. They were not driven out of the country as pests, and forbidden to return; or kept at home and marked as public criminals. They were hustled out of sight, and beyond redress: as the record bore, they elected to be given over to whoever would receive or purchase them, with the certain fate of being sold as slaves in the Barbadoes, Jamaica, or Virginia. Where the forms of law could be altogether dispensed with, as in the western jurisdictions, some lonely islet was used as a penal settlement. The island of Saint Kilda, it may not be generally known, was used as such by the Macleods of Skye and other chiefs for all who grumbled under their yoke.

What a ready and convenient form of punishment was this for a lord of regality, an hereditary sheriff, and the Privy Council! Burt saw this system in operation long after the Union. What he saw was no doubt that which had been use and wont for many generations. He thus describes it in one of his letters:

“When any ship in these parts is bound for the West Indies, to be sure, a neighboring chief, of whom none dares openly to complain, has several thieves to send prisoners to town.

“It has been whispered their crimes were only asking their dues, and



such like offences: and I have been well assured they have been threatened with hanging, or at least perpetual imprisonment, to intimidate and force them to sign a contract for their banishment, which they seldom refused to do, as knowing there could be no want of witnesses against them, however innocent they were; and then they were put on board the ship, the master paying so much a head for them. Thus two purposes were secured at once, namely, the getting rid of troublesome fellows and making money of them at the same time."

It was an old practice, perfectly true to the feudal style. Public opinion was blind and deaf and dumb to its inhumanity and unrighteousness. And so long was it before justice in Scotland took any qualm about this mode of dealing with accused persons, that even in 1732 two men of humble rank who were suspected of being accessory to a murder, having petitioned for banishment before trial, were sent forthwith to Glasgow, there to wait a vessel for the plantations.

Another form of this same iniquity was the practice of kidnapping young people for the American colonies, which was extensively pursued for several years when the Scottish trade with the plantations began to open up soon after the Union.

"Small as then was the commercial enterprise of Scotland," says Burton, "it was deeply stained by this criminal traffic for some years before the Rebellion, and a foul combination had sometimes been made between the feudal landlord judges and the corporate authorities in the seaport towns for the kidnapping of healthy strong young peasants to be sent as slaves to the plantations! And like many another evil which has been done under the sun, we only know of it by chance. There would have remained no traces of its existence, save a few fugitive notices in letters and memoirs that might have been explained away, had not one of the victims returned to the country, in the days of a stricter administration of justice, and told his story."

His name was Peter Williamson. He had been kidnapped in the streets of Aberdeen when a boy about ten years of age, and sold to an American planter three or four years before the Rebellion. Returning twenty years after to England, he printed an account of his very chequered and romantic career, and this being so far an exposure of unknown and incredible malpractices in Aberdeen, very much alarmed and angered the Aberdeen magistrates. The result was a case of prosecution. The history

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—7.

of this case is highly curious, and strikingly illustrates the state of things we have described: namely, the impotence of the law; the indifference to individual rights; the tyranny exercised in many ways by the upper towards the humbler classes, and the general deadness of public feeling to all questions not immediately concerned with the salvation of the soul.

Probably every one will feel surprised at the existence of these things. And certainly that such a system, as Burton observes of it, should have been tolerated into the middle of the eighteenth century after Somers, Hardwicke, and President Forbes had occupied the bench may seem incredible: but then few countries, as has been naively remarked by Lord Cockburn, can supply better materials than Scotland, for a history of things incredible, yet true and provable. Probably, too, every one will feel that it is after contemplating such a condition of society that we are likely to learn that public virtue is a plant of slow growth and the product of settled times; and that the chief value of history is the power which it confers of making just comparisons between one condition of human life and another.

VI. We turn now to the intellectual and religious condition of the country. As the political aspect of Scottish society, as we have seen, was profoundly affected by the feudal spirit, which gave it a mode all its own, so this other aspect of it, as we shall presently see, was even more profoundly affected by the spirit born of the prolonged and bitter struggle of the nation in the seventeenth century against the aggression and the oppression of her Stuart kings. The key to a true comprehension of the first, as we said, was the absence of wealth and a great middle class; the key to the latter is the almost constant presence of conflict and controversy.

"It is a memorable fact," says the biographer of Ruddiman, "that there was not a newspaper printed in Scotland at the Revolution. The few had doubtless instructed themselves during several years from the *London Gazette*; and the many," he continues in his biting way, "had been too busy during the late times with the affairs of the other world to be very anxious about the events of this." Intelligence or news beyond the bounds of

the parish or market town there was literally none, and this was easily carried by the cadger or strolling beggar. Broadsheets hawked about or put up at the market cross were used in the capital on extraordinary occasions, and one or two towns issued now and then a print called "A Diurnal;" but it was not till we reach the first and second decades of the eighteenth century that the great engine of modern intelligence, the newspaper—whose ambassadors, as Pendennis truly says, are in every quarter of the world, whose couriers are upon every road, whose daily existence is a perpetual blessing, and whose influence is that of a minister of peace and justice—became an established fact, and there was any chance of the town knowing the country, and the country knowing the town, and both knowing something of other countries and people. It was in 1705 that the first newspaper deserving of the name was published, the *Edinburgh Courant*, "a small folio in double columns," containing about as much literary matter as a single column of a modern newspaper of moderate size. It did not live long. Then followed in 1718 the *Edinburgh Evening Courant*, which still survives, and two years later the *Caledonian Mercury*. These two sheets supplied the wants of the nation for many years. How few these were, the dingy, meaningless prints remain to tell, and to tell in a very convincing way. The larger and greatly more varied news-sheet of the remotest Canadian settlement or New Zealand township shows us, when compared with these, what a mighty change has taken place since then, what a new world has come into existence.

It is an equally "memorable fact" that at this time there was only one general printer in Scotland. Printing as a trade did not exist. "Printing of books," says Gibson, "was first begun in Glasgow about the year 1638; but," he adds, "there was no good printing until the year 1735: an interval of a hundred years." Yet Glasgow was the seat of a university. It was much the same in Edinburgh. *There was no native, no vernacular literature.* Till the close of the seventeenth century, and indeed later, Latin was the literary language of the Scottish theologian and scholar, the one medium of intellectual intercourse amongst educated persons.

For many generations Holland, dear alike to the Pilgrim Fathers, the English Nonconformists, and the Scottish Presbyterians, was the one sacred retreat of freedom whose printing presses gave voice age after age to the mind of Europe. Rotterdam, Utrecht—"the cradle of liberty"—Leyden, and other Dutch towns, always had their distinguished group of exiles for conscience' sake; and the books which bear the imprint of these towns on their earlier editions, testify to their literary activity. In Edinburgh there was only coercion. Andrew Anderson, the king's printer, received his patent from Charles the Second, in 1671, and held it for forty years. He had an exclusive right to print all kinds of lawful books in Edinburgh; and no printer in the kingdom could print anything, from a Bible to a ballad, without Anderson's license or supervision. The "lawful books" referred to were those which made no remark "to the scandal or detriment of the Church or kingdom as now established;" or expressed "disaffection to his Majesty's authority by contravening acts of Parliament or Council in relation to church affairs." As we might expect, Anderson had small need for either license or supervision. Censorship of the press, and monopoly in trade, concurring with the unhappy circumstances of the time, made the literary history of the next fifty years a melancholy blank.

But what cared Charles or James, or their creatures, the traitorous Sharpe, and the bad and brutal Lauderdale? It mattered nothing to them how deadly the hurt, how irreparable the blighting effects of their oppression might be; it mattered nothing to them that no freedom and nimbleness of spirit and gladness of nature could grow and thrive and bear goodly, perhaps immortal, fruit in the prison house of their tyranny. The ends of the High Commission were attained, or seemed to be: the people were silenced, the press was still: and they, blind and deaf to the signs of the time, were satisfied. Two illustrations of this condition of things will come home to us. The one book read and in demand by the people was the Bible, yet most of the Bibles used far into the eighteenth century were printed either in Holland or England; and such were the Bibles which came from the press of the king's printer, that he and his heirs have earned

the poor fame of having issued the most illegible and incorrect copies of the Holy Scriptures ever printed; miserable beyond all example as to type, printing, and paper. Next to the Bible in interest to that generation was "The Cloud of Witnesses." It was published in 1714, yet although assured of success from its supreme attractiveness on personal and patriotic grounds, it bore on its title page the name neither of printer, publisher, nor of compilers. And if its typography was as rude as anything in Anderson's Bibles, its woodcuts were certainly not less rude than the rudest of Saxon times.

Where books were so few, libraries of course were almost unknown. We happen to know of two or three—Leighton's and Carstares's—and as we run along the shelves of the one in Dunblane Cathedral, and scan the catalogue of the other, we feel how miserably placed, how scant and stale was the literary fare of the student and the scholar. It is, however, when we see the pastor of Ettrick, Thomas Boston, the foremost figure in the theological literature of the eighteenth century, in raptures over his three or four authors, "Zanchy's works, and Luther on the Galatians, and Beza's 'Confession of Faith,'" that we realise with painful vividness the extreme literary poverty of the period.

The truth is, Scotland made no progress in civilisation during the seventeenth century. It was a century lost to culture and the arts and comforts of life. It was the misfortune of Scotland at the Reformation to enter on a sea of troubles, and to be so driven about by winds and waves, as to be often in peril of shipwreck. That calamity did not happen, and the Revolution found the sorely battered little bark safe with her colors still flying, and her crew stout-hearted and fearless. Life, dear life, and its sweetest charm, liberty, had been saved from the heartless grasp of the Stuarts. But, meanwhile, the hand on the dial had stood still. The eighteenth century succeeded to the state of things which the sixteenth had left. Art was unborn. Song was silent. Imagination, haunted and harassed and conscious of no slumbering strength in her pinions, or of golden sunshine on her head, was fain to fold her wings and lie still. Excepting Burnet, there is not one writer who sheds the least lustre on the literature of

the century. And science was a tiny babe, with no pretty promises of coming greatness dawning in its face. One name, indeed, the name of Gregory, had been distinguished during three generations for varied intellectual accomplishments; but the first Scotsman of purely scientific genius, Colin MacLaurin, was yet in his cradle, and the tongue which was to unfold in the Edinburgh University to astonished hearers the sublime discoveries of Newton, and give a general impulse to the cultivation of science, was prattling its infant prattle in an Argyllshire hut. A few minds among the younger clergy had felt the influence of Descartes, and had dared to lift questioning eyes to the far-off uncertain heights of the city of God, but only to shrink back appalled at their impiety.

And it could hardly be other, since we are to a great extent the children of circumstances. The Presbyterian forgets this when he compares the masters in theology, whose works are still among the glories of English literature, with his countrymen, their contemporaries, and is silent, perhaps sad, at the uncouthness of style, the narrowness of view, the fierce and fiery dogmatism, which mark every tract and treatise of the time. He forgets what were the chief causes of the difference. He forgets, too, that it is not to be expected that men, no matter how gifted, sharing in the troubles of one of the fiercest persecutions which church history records, shut out from all the seats of learning, finding it hard sometimes to get their daily bread, and absorbed night and day in the pressing anxieties of the moment, should be digging into patristic tomes even had they possessed them, or writing books not likely to be printed, or, if printed, without a public to welcome and read them. Between these and those who dwelt in the bounteous fulness and leisure of the bishoprics and deaneries of the English Church no comparison is for a moment possible.

Episcopalians, and Englishmen generally, forget this when they complain of the hard and barren character of Scottish theology, and of the general poverty of Scottish literature in the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries. Proud of their own greatness—the full flower of many centuries' con-

tinuous care—they slide into easy sarcasm towards their neighbors, and are inclined to Charles the Second's opinion that Presbyterianism is not a religion fit for a gentleman. Indeed, can any good thing come out of Presbyterianism? The spirit which dictated that bitterest of party pasquils, "Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed," and is so alien to a true historical sense, is still in the air, and was a disturbing influence even on the wide sympathies and delicate mental poise of the late Dean Stanley. Instead of complaint, there should rather be regret and candid acknowledgment of wrong and injury done, and a frank delight shown that in spite of all the misery inflicted—one tithe of which England never at any time endured—the spirit of Presbyterianism was not broken. It was made fierce and suspicious. Who was to blame? Who had taunted and tormented the people from the beginning of the century? Was not Archbishop Spottiswoode at the birth of the High Commission, and did not Archbishop Sharpe, and even the saintly Leighton, know of and sanction the horrible cruelties committed by it? As well expect the weather-beaten bleak hillside to yield the gorgeous flora of the sunny highly cultivated plain—as well expect that during the Wars of the Roses Jeremy Taylor or George Herbert should have flourished in England—as expect to find the fair and full-grown fruits of social strength and safety in Scotland in the seventeenth century. It was a century lost alike to charity and culture.

The historical critic forgets this when, like the late Mr. Buckle in his "History of Civilisation," he commits the grave error of making the literature of this period—the sermons and theological works just referred to which were passed by the censor as "lawful"—the measure of the intellectual and moral life of the clergy and the commons. What an absence of a fine historical sense—of insight into human affairs, of justness of spirit—was here! What an absence, as we might expect, of proportion, of light and shade, of naturalness, in his crowded and often eloquent pages! Mr. Buckle fell into the snare which lies in wait for all historical critics, the snare of generalisation; and despite his twenty years' labors on his history, he is now known, not as a brilliant soldier in the war of liberation of humanity, like Froude and

others, but as a closet knight, a very learned Don Quixote, whose extravagances fill us with wonder and pity.

Literature is not life—and the quality of the one, in the past history of mankind, is usually a poor measure of the character of the other. It is no more than a fair measure in our own day, with its free and cheap press, its telegraphs, its freedom of discussion. It is certain, therefore, that we should form an opinion of the general character of the Scottish clergy of this period nearly the reverse of the truth if we formed it only from their writings. Their circumstances most unfavorably affected their literary tastes—indeed, made literary culture almost impossible. Yet as a class, man for man, they were better scholars, better read in the classics and in the Fathers, than the minor clergy of the English Church. But if there was no room for the growth of what would have added the charm of elegance to the duties of their sacred office, there was room enough for, as there was a constant demand on, their intelligence and integrity, and the exhibition of the severer virtues. And it is to the credit of the Scottish clergy that they were never wanting in these. Whatever fault may be found with their literary tastes, no fault can be found with their lives. A rare tribute, surely! They lived as few great bodies of Christian ecclesiastics have lived. The Church laid on them, in Wordsworth's happy phrase,

“The strong hand of her purity;”

and from the days of Knox downwards, in the simple, severe, and saintly lives which they led as pastors of their people, they have never been surpassed. They were the types of all excellence—the patterns of devotion and unworldliness to their flocks; and in their pastoral, more than in their doctrinal, relation showed and persuaded men to seek the highest ideal. Accordingly, their names and memories have become a national heritage, and are still cherished and influential. This was no mean thing to do. Literature could not do this. England has a fair list of parish priests, but during the reigns of Anne and the first two Georges she had crowds of creatures in cassock and gown, creatures like Fielding's Parson Trulliber and Puzzletext, which were a disgrace to her and were impossible in Scotland. They were little,



if anything, better than the clergy of the Restoration; indeed, were members of the same unapostolic succession, the chief end of whose existence was the enjoyment of meats and drinks and coarse sensual pleasures. These were the men who, as chaplains, curates, and even bishops, were the living epistles of Christianity known and read of all Englishmen, during the first half of the eighteenth century—the men who made Wesley and Whitefield and the movement they originated an imperious moral necessity of the times. The age had many eminent divines, and its literary associations give it an undying charm; but what availed the literature of the period—the eloquence of Atterbury and Sprat, the arguments of Warburton and Butler, the wit and wisdom of Addison and Steele—to the mass of the nation against the daily life of men who indeed read the prayers of the congregation and of my lord's household, but who had long openly parted with consistency, and in whom reverence and honor were either lost or laughed at—who were the idlest and the most lifeless clergy in the world? This has never been charged against the Scottish clergy. They erred the other way, in being over-earnest and over-righteous. No one can candidly consider their lives as recorded, and their influence as preserved in fondly remembered traditions, without being satisfied that till the Union at least they were singularly true to their vows and the duties of their vocation, and had hitherto maintained, age after age, with a noble, steady consistency, the highest piety and morality in the realm.

Nor did they fall from this position, at least as individuals, after the Union. They had been the leaders of opinion, and had formed a united front against the common foe. But that foe gone, it was their doom to war and wrangle amongst themselves about points of doctrine and discipline, and to split into sects and sub-sects, whose points of difference for metaphysical fineness have been the astonishment of the world. Not a little of this trouble, it is to be said with sorrow, was made for them. Hardly had the Revolution Settlement become an accomplished fact than it was found that a legacy of controversies of the thorniest kind had come down from the pre-Revolution Church, and that Jacobite intrigue and English legislation were moving to

make dispeace and dissension. If only it had been otherwise—if only the Abjuration Oath and the Patronage Act had never seen the light, there would have been some chance that charity and culture would have kept pace in their development with commerce, now, after long hindrance, about to start on a brilliant career. But this, unhappily, was not to be—neither at the beginning nor at the end of this century—the good fortune of Presbyterian Scotland. Through direct intentional disturbance, and through perverse legislation, ecclesiastical controversy became the inevitable doom of every serious-minded Scot. In the previous century it had been conflict in the field; now it was conflict in the senate house and church courts. The conscience, the hopes, the traditions of the nation were once and again wounded, if not insulted, by ill-timed and mischievous measures of English statesmen who could not, who probably did not care to, comprehend the peculiar nature and necessities of the situation. The older men, the sixty who had not bowed the knee to any Baal, and their adherents, could not but grieve over, and indeed resent, these things; they could not but mourn over the evil days on which they had fallen, and at the dimmed lustre of their beloved Church; nor could they fail to regard it as their solemn duty to lift up their “testimony” against the defections of their brethren. Unfortunately there was no leader, no magnetic, moulding mind in the Church. A new era had dawned upon Scotland, yet which of the clergy saw this? They were at the parting of the ways, yet which of them was aware of it? Hence the din of contention and debate resounded in every Presbytery and General Assembly through the first half of the century. The Covenant was still the saving shibboleth to many; its renewal still the one thing needed to restore whatever was out of joint in Church and State. To hillmen, protesters, non-jurors, compromise or conciliation was a strong delusion, and toleration the unpardonable sin. And with the Patronage Act mocking the distinguishing feature of their religious system, and making havoc in all the churches, it seemed to not a few of the very best men in the land as if the blood of their fathers had been shed entirely in vain. If only it had never passed, it is a matter of history that

the course of Scottish ecclesiastical life would have run much smoother and very much sweeter; for from the days of Carstares to the days of Chalmers, the long period of a hundred and thirty years, it was the unfailing cause of discord, dissent, and disruption.

From such causes the clergy as a body failed at this crisis to see the signs of the times. Their faces were not set towards the future; on many of them indeed had fallen the shadow of disappointment. Meanwhile new forces were silently rising in society, forces which had the practical and secular for their basis and their bourne, and were destined to change the face of Scotland soon. It was not an accepted principle then that

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,  
And God fulfils himself in many ways."

These forces the clergy took heed to only to flout and frown upon. Not unnaturally, perhaps. Commerce and industry, as mirth and music, as indeed love and laughter, with their fathers were viewed with some suspicion, as developing the lust of the eye, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life. Hence arose a new condition of things in Scotland. Diverse interests produced diverse feelings and opinions, and in the next twenty-five years we have the first indications of a real disintegration of public opinion, and of a departure by the laity from the old paths. Men had begun to observe and find out which was matter of opinion and which was matter of fact; to look at reality and lay the ghosts of their own mind. On the one hand, the clergy clung to the mediæval spirit, and slowly came to have a defined position as the professional teachers of religion: on the other, the laity began to think and act apart on secular affairs. Leisure, reflection, and intercourse with other minds were beginning to tell upon thinking men. In other words, from about this time and coeval with the rise of the industrial spirit, the clergy fell from the lofty position they had held for a hundred and fifty years as the most intelligent, the most practical, the most patriotic men in the nation. They no longer guided its intellectual tendencies. They no longer could. A turn in the road, to use a common metaphor, had been made, and lo! an unexpected change in the

familiar scene. Instead of the sombre, narrow glen, with its one solitary, winding way along which many earnest souls had travelled, the broad plain stretched smiling far onward, and various pathways invited the lighter-hearted wayfarer. The day of exclusive theocratic ideas was nearly over: the donatism of the Covenant was being quietly ignored. And while commerce and industry slowly but steadily filled the villages and burghs with a stir they had never known (but should have known generations before, had fate been kinder), and silently gave men's thoughts a wholesomer tone, and drew all into a nearer bond of brotherliness—the clergy, divided into two parties, fascinated and frost-bound by the mediæval spirit, were mainly interested in entrenching themselves against the new influences.

The race of great ecclesiastics, of reformers, scholars, and statesmen, had died out. Their successors were plain commonplace men, who were untouched by "the tender grace" of a chequered pathetic past, and were unable to comprehend fully the pressing need of a wise, broad, and practical policy if the Church they loved was to be restored to its former place as a national Church. One man, and one only, of that number was equal to the times. But he was unique; single in kind and excellence. Four times in eleven years he was Moderator of the General Assembly—a certain proof of his acknowledged worth. A clergyman, a citizen of the world, a royal counsellor, above all, a Christian of the rarest type, the type of apostolic charity, William Carstares, was the one man who saw clearly before and after, and has been justly named "the second founder of the Church of Scotland." He died in 1715. His most remarkable contemporary was Thomas Boston, who may be taken as the representative of the old Calvinistic party. Never were two men more unlike, nor two lives which were ruled by the same motive and spent in the same cause. Weakly and melancholic, yet resolute and keenly intellectual, Boston spent his life in rural seclusion, evolving that system of theology already referred to, which made him in the eighteenth century an influence second to none. To many "The Fourfold State" solved the riddle of existence and made plain the mystery of death. Next to the Bible it was

the one book which the Scottish peasant made his companion, and from which he drew his strength for this life and his hope for the life to come. His "Memoirs" is his own self-portraiture, in which he describes his moods, his self-examinations, his fastings, his vain efforts to reach his own impossible ideal. There is nothing more morbid and painful in all our religious biography. Duty to him was certainly the one thing laid on him to do, and we are bound to believe that nothing was so precious as the comfort which came from doing it—that flowers laughed before him in their beds, and fragrance filled the air he daily breathed; but if we may judge from his own words, it was not so. Life, indeed, was not worth living. "The world"—these are his last words—"hath all along been a stepdame to me; and wheresoever I would have attempted to nestle in it, there was a thorn of uneasiness laid for me. Man is born crying, lives complaining, and dies disappointed from that quarter."

VII. Between the poles of thought represented by these two names lay all that was properly Scottish in religious opinion and feeling; and these were true to the severest Calvinistic rule. No other was known. No other was possible. Cradled in and brought up under Calvinism as it was drawn out day by day from the Bible in reverent household reading, and from the Shorter Catechism in school and in church, it was the one influence during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries constantly at work moulding and disciplining every young mind. It was the first and the last lesson of the day, the one chief end of education. In the dame-school as they stood at the mistress's knee, in the parish school (where they were fortunate in having one), and in the burgh school, the rudiments of Calvinism, the national faith, were the prime subjects taught every boy and girl. They were taught to read—if taught nothing more—that they might at any rate be able to read the Bible, the word of God. This was the proud pre-eminence of every Scotsman of those days: he could read his Bible and knew its meaning word for word, equally with the most learned in the land. Alone of all the peasantry in Europe the Scottish peasantry as a body could do this, and often by fire-side and wayside

Reasoned high  
Of Providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate.  
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute.

And this they owed not, as has been often and most mistakenly said, to their parish schools as schools, but to their Presbyterianism. The parish school system properly belongs to the eighteenth century; Presbyterianism was the one educating power in the country from the Reformation to the Revolution. At the Revolution parish schools became a fixed part of the State machinery, and added much to the previously existing means of education, but it was Presbyterianism which gave them their distinctive character as schools, which gave them a republican and a religious spirit. They spread its leaven by the constant use of the Bible and the Shorter Catechism. What that leaven was we have seen. Knox at the Reformation awoke the Scottish "commonalty" from the lethargy of a long vassalage; kindled in them the first stirrings of intellectual liberty and desire, and taught them the full sweep of the fundamental principle of Presbyterianism. How they answered his call we know; and it is one of the finest things in history. How the spirit of these men continued into the next century we also know; and the wrestlings and wreckage which fill it are among the saddest things in history. Parish schools were few enough in the first half of the seventeenth century, yet the intelligence of the people astonished their Episcopal well-wishers, Bishops Burnet and Leighton, who were amazed, as the former of them tells us, to see how the very meanest of them, even their cottagers and their servants, could argue on points of government and the power of princes in matters of religion. Upon all these topics they had texts of Scripture at hand, and were ready with their answers to anything which was said to them. This was in 1670. It was not the parish schools, therefore, which equipped these "cottagers" and "servants;" it was Presbyterianism with its ideals, its problems, its aims, its assured faith, above all, its constant appeals to the individual mind, and to the sense of individual responsibility. And, rightly considered, it is Presbyterianism which has made Scotland what she is, and given her a people which for intellectual

fire and sustained strength of purpose and endurance, has had no equal. Long distracted and spent in conflict and self-defence, these high qualities shone out in brilliant individual forms when peace and quiet prevailed; and in Hume, Burns, Scott, Livingstone, and Carlyle, has given us types of human nature of universal interest, and the most commanding influence.

The scoffing spirit is offended at these men. Be it so. Yet the great soul of the world is just. They were pilgrims and strangers on the earth. They did not try to make the best of both worlds. The ideal of their daily conduct was the one so magnificently set forth by the apostle to the Philippians: all things they counted loss that they might win Christ and be found in him. Light-hearted they were not; gay and frivolous they could not be: they took their pleasure not sadly but soberly. As men who were soured and unkindly? As men whose hearts could not leap up when they beheld a rainbow in the sky, or on whom the beauty of childhood or the glory of the landscape did not often bring thoughts too deep for tears? No: but as men who were overawed by the Infinite, as seeing Him who is invisible; as men who had a profound reverence for the divine powers, and a strong realising sense of their nearness and exceeding awfulness. And with the vision of the New Jerusalem, that glorious fan'asy of the early Church, ever in their eye, what were the passing shows and vanities of time to them? One thing they had to do, and that was to hate sin, to renounce the devil and all his ways. Who will say they did not, with the intensity of intense, "strongly realising" natures, strive to do this?

And the scoffing spirit fancies that these men did not enjoy life. Be it so. Still as it was, and seriously regarded as a trust given them by the Most High, life to them was precious. The description which we have of their life—of their common pleasures and their common cares—in the poems of the century, in "The Gentle Shepherd," "The Farmer's Ingle," and "The Cottar's Saturday Night," prove this. If to these we add some songs and ballads "crooned" over by the cradle and the spinning-wheel and the quern, or sung as the brewster's "two-penny" went off in successive hornfuls, we shall have scenes not less human than

historically true. Their "humor," so unlike English wit and banter, is biting and grim; is quicker to smite than to smile. They give and take it, however, with most infectious laughter. And in their old-fashioned games of golf and bowls, in their cock-fights and penny weddings, in their annual fairs and curling matches, and in the ever-varying play of human love and sorrow, the common lot of all, we may be perfectly sure there was no lack of sound natural feeling, of mirth and merriment, if also of sadness, too, sometimes. "Looked at broadly," says one who sees clearer on these points and is sounder in his judgment than most—"looked at broadly, one would say they (the Scotch) had been an eminently pious people. It is part of the complaint of modern philosophers about them that religion or superstition, or whatever they please to call it, had too much to do with their daily lives. So far as one can look into that commonplace round of things which historians never tell us about, there have rarely been seen in this world a set of people who have thought more about right and wrong, and the judgment about them of the upper powers," etc.

Such is the estimate, such is the notion, we have formed of the character and of the condition of the people of Scotland at the time of the Union. Do the old times live again? Do they seem "the good old times"? Do our forefathers seem to have been better or wiser or more happily placed than we? It is not, as we said at the outset, a picture which would charm; now that it is drawn, it is surely a confused, inharmonious, unfinished picture—a picture of partial imperfect civilisation, of arrested national development.

It is pleasant to know that now nearly all the wrongs which bred confusion in those bygone days have been righted, and what was bad changed for the better. But it was slowly done. This was mainly the work of the eighteenth century. To all who love to mark the dawning of better days to the oppressed—the growth of a nation's free development—the rise of original forms of literature and philosophy—the history of the eighteenth century in Scotland is indeed a moving and never-to-be-forgotten chapter in the story of human progress.



## ARTICLE V.

**"THE NEW TESTAMENT PLAN OF EDUCATING CANDIDATES FOR THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY" RE-EXAMINED.**

An article in the October number of this REVIEW, under the above title, forcibly reminds one of a remark of Macaulay to the effect, "That of all the literature of any given subject, the poorest is generally found in prize essays upon it." If it were not understood that a prize had been awarded to this essay, one might be tempted to regard it as a covert attempt to burlesque the whole subject or to disprove the one ostensibly advocated by a *reductio ad absurdum*.

The thing that strikes one as most conspicuous, throughout the whole article, is the absence of scriptural authority for its confident and sweeping assertions. The author starts out with the declaration that all candidates for the gospel ministry "must be prepared, trained, and educated, not according to merely human methods and principles, but according to methods and principles either expressly set forth or deduced by good and necessary inference from the teaching of the inspired word of God" (p. 65). In treating of those qualifications that all admit to be indispensable, he follows the Scripture; but in reference to those that are disputed and that involve the very gist of the whole question in controversy, he deduces his scriptural arguments almost entirely out of "the imagination of his own heart."

Purporting to be an original investigation of the teachings of the New Testament, as the terms required upon which the prize was offered, it is in fact a strained and systematic effort throughout to make the New Testament sustain the preconceived theory of our Church standards. Following closely the requirements of our Form of Government, the author concludes that fifteen different things, among others, the knowledge of Greek and Latin and Hebrew, and mathematical and natural science, are *indispensable*, and asserts in the conclusion that "*no consideration of supposed wisdom or expediency, or immediate efficiency, can justify the*

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—8.

*Church of Christ in the slightest lowering of the standard of training and education,"* etc. Page 682. Or again: when these requirements shall be disregarded by the Church, "then on her brow shall be written, *Ichabod*," etc.

It is not proposed to follow the author in his reasonings, but briefly to point out some of the peculiarities of his article, and then examine the question at issue in the light of New Testament teaching.

To some of the fifteen things specified as qualifications in the candidate for the gospel ministry, no exception can be taken. Nor would any objection be made to any of them, as *important*, in preparing for the most important of all work. But dismissing all others, when our author claims that the knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Mathematical and Natural Science, are indispensable qualifications in the candidate, and that they are made indispensable by the teachings of the New Testament, we join issue with him just there.

First. He says, page 668: "It is obviously impossible that a man unacquainted with the original tongues in which the inspired Scriptures were given shall know that he is preaching the word." And again: "The word (*διδάσκω*) teach *necessarily implies* a competent knowledge of the original languages of Holy Scripture." And so throughout, the most sweeping assertions are made. Everything claimed by the author is not only important, but *indispensable*. If this be true, the conclusion is inevitable that nine-tenths of the preachers of the first ages of the Church, and ninety-nine-hundredths of all who have preached the gospel since, were impostors, not knowing whereof they affirmed, "blind leaders of the blind." The immortal dreamer Bunyan, and many like him, could not know that they were preaching the word. Now, here is a marvellous thing, that these men, who, according to our author, were not called of God to preach, because they had not the qualifications indispensable according to Scripture teaching, yet had the witness of God's Spirit to their ministry in the fact that multitudes were converted under it. Which witness shall we believe? the Spirit of God testifying for them, or our author in his interpretation of the word of God?

But in reply to this claim that a knowledge of the original languages of Scripture is indispensable, two things are to be observed: First, the author evidently shrinks back from his own conclusions when he says, page 667: "He (the candidate) is not required so perfectly to master these languages as to be able to read them, speak them, and write them as well as he can his own vernacular; neither is he required to study them so as to become a professed philologist." A smattering is sufficient, or such a superficial knowledge as would leave him as much dependent on the critical knowledge of others as is the intelligent English student who avails himself of the critical apparatus furnished him. Second, if a knowledge of the original languages is indispensable to know that one preaches the word, so also, and much more, must he be able to determine for himself which of the various readings of the original are the true ones. He must not only be able to read the Greek and Hebrew, but settle for himself the true text, and determine what is the word of God, and what the interpolation of man. But who is sufficient for these things? The principle so broadly and confidently asserted would leave the world to perish while we were wrangling over the disputed passages and their meanings. It would brand as impostors who had stolen into the ministry under false pretences an overwhelming majority of the best, the most devoted, and the most successful preachers of the gospel, of every age and nation.

In regard to the necessity of Latin, it is wonderful how the author finds an argument from the Scripture for it: Pilate, forsooth, wrote the inscription on the cross in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; *ergo*, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew are indispensable to preaching the gospel. Could the author of Hudibras have done better? Paul quoted from one of the Greek poets, *ergo*, the study of Greek poetry is necessary. The good and necessary inference is wonderfully remote, in fact beyond the reach of common minds. He might just as truthfully and forcibly argue that because Christ said, "Are not *ten* sparrows sold for two farthings?" or because the Apocalypse deals largely in *numbers*, therefore the study of mathematics is indispensable. If the author draws back from this claim for divine authority for the knowledge of

Latin in one place, he just as surely claims it in the sweeping conclusions reached at the close of his article.

The confidence and boldness of these assertions is simply amazing in one who professes to be guided by the word of God in this investigation. And the coolness with which he takes up *seriatim* the things required of the candidate in our standards would almost induce the belief that he was interpreting the word of God by the standards, instead of testing the standards by the word.

But we leave the author, to examine the subject from the standpoint of Scripture example and teaching. It may be well, however, to clear the subject of some of the embarrassments surrounding it, arising from a misconception of the purpose of those who deny the divine authority for the standard of scholarship required by our Church.

It is not denied that a competency of human learning should be required of every candidate for the ministry of the gospel. Nor is it denied that the most thorough and extensive acquaintance with all kinds of knowledge is desirable and to be sought, so far as it can be consistently with the great and paramount duty of preaching the gospel to all nations. The question is, What amount of educational training is necessary to this work? And how shall we train men so as not to educate them away from the people, or cultivate such habits as will unfit them for reaching and sympathising with the masses of men?

Admitting all that can be said in favor of the most thorough training of our candidates, what is *the least* that the Scriptures require, and the Church ought to accept, in a candidate for the gospel ministry?

In determining this, it ought to be kept in mind that three-fourths of the work of evangelising the world, that was committed to the Church, is yet undone. And that the great end of those whom Christ calls into the ministry is to save sinners, and bring all men to a knowledge of the truth. If the truth is to be defended, it is not as a mere speculative system that its defence is necessary, but because it alone "is able to make men wise unto salvation through the faith that is in Christ Jesus." If gainsayers are to

be convinced, it is because they lead men astray from that truth by which they are to be sanctified. The most important of all qualifications for preaching the gospel is a deep and personal experience of the preciousness and power of the gospel in the heart of the preacher himself. Therefore the gospel is to be committed to *faithful* men who will be able to teach others also; and the preacher is admonished, first of all, "Take heed to thyself," lest, having preached to others, he himself should be found a castaway. His preaching is not to be in words of man's wisdom, but "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power," that the faith of his hearers may not stand "in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God." These and many other Scriptures show that the qualification of first necessity in the preacher is the spirit of Christ. It is true, perhaps, that God uses sometimes the ministry of ungodly men to work salvation for others, but the general history of the Church proves that it is the presence of the Spirit in the heart of the minister that, more than anything else, insures the success of his message. Then when the sinner who has himself experienced the saving power of the gospel, tells the story of the cross, however simply, it is made the power of God. "The weak things of the world are used to confound the mighty," and "out of the mouths of babes and sucklings God perfects praise," and ordains strength that all the wisdom and learning of the world is not able to gainsay. It is possible, therefore, to attach too much importance to human learning and culture as a qualification for preaching the gospel.

In determining this question there are just two things to be considered: 1st. The example of Christ and the apostles; and 2d. The direct teaching of the New Testament on the subject.

What, then, are we taught by the examples given us? That there were many of his countrymen, in the days of our Lord, who were thoroughly cultivated in the learning of that day, and who had been thoroughly trained in the Scripture, there can be no doubt. The schools of Gamaliel and others are known to have existed. And schools in different cities, where philosophy was taught, leave no doubt about the education of many both in sacred and profane learning. But from none of the learned did

Christ choose either the twelve apostles, or the seventy whom he sent out as his forerunners to preach the kingdom of heaven. This seems a necessary inference from what we know of their occupations—fishermen and publicans—and from the declaration of the rulers, Acts iii. 13, concerning Peter and John, that they were "unlearned and ignorant men."

Still less is it possible to believe that they were chosen in preference to others *because* of their superior culture or learning. The absence of any hint of such a ground of choice, and the information given us of their subsequent blindness to the truth, preclude the thought that they were chosen by Christ because of their educational advantages. Why, then, if such thorough education as is now required be indispensable, did Christ choose these from the common walks of life, rather than Gamaliel, or some of his pupils, or the scribes, who were instructed in the law?

We would not press this beyond what it will legitimately bear; but think it a good and necessary inference from it that Christ did not intend to make any special grade of human learning indispensable to the preaching of the gospel. When we look farther, we find the apostles themselves ignorant of the very nature of the kingdom of heaven they were sent to preach, and their conceptions of the nature of Christ's mission remained very imperfect and inaccurate up to the day when the Spirit was poured out upon them. Peter rebuked Christ for saying that he must be delivered into the hands of men to be crucified and slain. They wondered in their hearts what he meant by rising from the dead on the third day. They disputed which should be greatest in his kingdom. Jesus, after his resurrection, reproached some of them, "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." The whole history of the twelve, up to the day of Pentecost, reveals a state of ignorance concerning the fundamental principles of the gospel that any child of ten years of age may learn accurately from our English Bible, and without aid.

We do not claim this as proof that learning is unimportant, but we do claim it as unmistakable evidence that Christ did not

make extensive human learning a condition of call unto the ministry *in his own day*; and yet it is true that these twelve certainly, and in all probability the seventy, were candidates for the gospel ministry, if there were ever any candidates, and were commissioned by Christ as the first preachers of the gospel, and endued with power from on high for the work of preaching.

What was true of Christ in calling these men to be co-workers with himself was true also of the apostles in ordaining elders in every city. There is not a hint given in the Acts, or in any part of the New Testament, that any question of education or of human learning was taken into the account in their ordination. That men of intelligence and ability would be elected by the Church in preference to ignorant and unlearned men, other things being equal, is natural to be supposed. That some of those ordained in the cities were Jews of the dispersion, and learned in the Scriptures, is altogether probable; but that any such education, as is contended for now and required by our Church, was required in the candidate for ordination can no more be inferred than that acquaintance with the art of fishing was essential to those who were to be fishers of men. The difference between the record that we as a Church make and that made by the apostles in ordaining men is a testimony against our method being scriptural. Titus was left in Crete "to set in order the things that were wanting and ordain elders in every church." Is there any kind of previous literary preparation of the "parts of trial" or the testimonials required? Yet this record was set down as the guide for the Church, and it is inconceivable that a matter so important as we make this education to be should have been passed in absolute silence if it had been required.

But it will be said that Christ trained his ministers for three years, by his personal instruction, both in public and in private. This is much insisted on, and rightly, because there is nothing else to justify the course of study now demanded. No one can doubt the value of the instruction given by Him "who spake as never man spake." That in his private instruction he was much more full and explicit than in his public teaching we may justly infer from his saying, "Unto you it is given to know the myste-

ries of the kingdom of heaven," but to others he spake in parables. But the question now is, not how he taught or what its value, but what? Did he teach them Greek, or Latin, or mathematics, or science of any kind? It will scarcely be questioned that all their training under him was in the mysteries of the kingdom, the great fundamental truths and facts of the gospel. But what is very remarkable, they still remained ignorant, in great part, of the essential truths and facts of the gospel even up to the day of his ascension.

When this is taken in connexion with other facts, it furnishes very little encouragement for the demand for the great and varied learning now required. Christ said to his disciples: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come; but if I go away, I will send you another Comforter, who shall abide with you for ever." "He shall guide you into all truth." "He shall testify of me." When, however, they had received the promise of the Father in the outpouring of the Spirit, "then understood they" those things that had been mysteries before. What, then, is the necessary inference from these things? Not certainly that their preparation for preaching depended on their human learning; not that any theological course of three years can fit one for preaching; not that they were being trained in languages or history or science by Christ; but that all instruction will be of no avail without the Spirit of God to open the eyes and heart to receive the truth.

When the first persecution arose against the Church, which was at Jerusalem, "they were all scattered abroad except the apostles, and they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." It is claimed that only the preachers were scattered—the one hundred and twenty. But were *they* all learned men? able to read and interpret the Scriptures in the original language? This will scarcely be claimed of all. Yet all preached the word, which our author says they could not preach without such knowledge. Nor will the gift of tongues at all help the matter, for tongues were not given to facilitate the study of Scripture or the preaching of the gospel, but were like other miracles, "for signs to them that believe not." See 1 Cor. xiv. 22.



Now, all this is only negative; it gives no hint that special learning was necessary in the preacher of the gospel; but the important thing was then, as it is now, that he be filled with the Spirit of God.

But we think that, in connexion with these things, a good and necessary inference may be drawn from the very nature of the commission to "preach the gospel to every creature" against the necessity of the varied learning now demanded. The extent of the field, the magnitude and importance of the work to be done, the impossibility of doing it except by the employment of a multitude of preachers, forbid the thought that a course of training that would require years of close application must be passed before even the churches planted by the apostles could have preachers. Not only is there nothing in the references to the ordination of elders to justify this, but all the facts forbid it. And if men could preach the word then without it, who shall lay this burden on the Church now? Our own aggressive work in the foreign field furnishes a fair illustration of the method of ordaining then, and what is found necessary in similar circumstances now was just what the apostles did. We do not, and could not without great hindrance to the work of missions, require the varied learning in the native preachers ordained in the foreign fields. If they have a passable education, and have studied the Scripture, even in the comparatively imperfect translations that are made into their own languages, and are "apt to teach," and men "full of the Holy Ghost," they are ordained without hesitation, just as Paul ordained elders in every church. But does the word of God justify the application of one rule to one and another to another class of preachers? Can a Chinaman or Japanese, with not one-tenth of the apparatus for studying the Scriptures, preach the word without a knowledge of the original languages, and an American, who has every facility for their study, not? Or will we adopt the other horn of the dilemma and confess that we ordain men in foreign fields without the qualifications that are *indispensable*? "The legs of the lame are not equal," and this halting and breaking down whenever our supposed divine standard comes into conflict with the real diffi-

culty proves that the commission to preach the gospel to every creature will not be bound by the swaddling-clothes of modern culture.

But do our circumstances in the midst of Christian culture require higher intellectual training for our home work? Some would claim this, and with some plausibility; but the answer is threefold:<sup>1</sup> First. This is fixing the standard, not according to the teaching of God's word, but according to our own views of expediency, and the question is not what we think, but what saith the Lord. Second. It is not true that all the classes to be reached in our land are cultivated or learned; the fact is, that as a Church we are not reaching the ignorant. Third. It is not true in our case, more than in that of an Indian, that a knowledge of the original languages is necessary to know what is the word of God, or to defend that word against heresy and infidelity more than to defend it against any heathen philosophy or religion.

There are, in addition to the general examples, some special cases of ordination that deserve notice. Paul was a learned man, and when, after his conversion, he went into Arabia for three years, it was (so our author) to study theology—*ergo*, we ought to be like Paul well educated before we study theology, and then, like him, study three years in Arabia or somewhere else. It may be somewhat difficult for plain people to see the force of this, or even to determine what Paul was doing in Arabia; but it is not difficult to understand what is meant by Acts ix. 19, 20, when, immediately after Paul's baptism, "he was certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus, and straightway preached Christ in the synagogue that he is the Son of God." His preparation for preaching was "certain days (not years) of association with the disciples (not theological professors) at Damascus." So Apollos was mighty in the Scriptures, an eloquent man, a Jew of Alexandria. His knowledge

---

<sup>1</sup> It is to be regretted that the writer had not enlarged more fully upon this "threefold answer"; for many will object to his reasoning all through his article from the necessities of missionary work in apostolic days, or in our own, to what is requisite for the settled Church state in a cultured age and country.—Eds. S. P. R.

of the Scriptures was beyond a doubt obtained from the Septuagint translation, which was made and used at Alexandria, but "he was instructed in the way of the Lord and taught diligently the way of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John." This remarkable man received his *Christian* training from Aquila and Priscilla, private disciples, who "expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly." And then, with recommendations from the brethren to the disciples in Achaia, he began to preach, and "helped them much which had believed through grace. For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ." His Christian training was a very short one, and conducted by private persons. Whether he knew Hebrew, or Latin, or mathematics, or philosophy, or science, the record does not testify. The case of Timothy is also in point. He received his theological training principally from his mother and grandmother. 2 Tim. i. 5 and iii. 14-15. And we have no indication of any special previous training in his case, or in the case of Barnabas, Titus, Silas, or any other of all the preachers ordained by Paul, or who were co-workers with him in planting the Church. It seems unaccountable that such an omission should occur in the very narrative from which we are required to learn the character of the Church and its officers, if any such varied learning was required as our Church now requires.

This brings us to the question, What does the New Testament teach directly on this subject? No one can study the New Testament carefully, and especially the pastoral Epistles, without being impressed by the minuteness and specific character of its teachings as to the dignity and importance of the office, the divine authority and call to it, the personal and official qualifications required, the sacredness and solemnity of the charge committed to them, the matter and manner and end of their preaching, and the warnings against false methods and false motives. It would require more space than would be allowed to such a discussion as this even to enumerate the passages that refer to these subjects. We are compelled, therefore, to confine ourselves to a few of the more important things bearing directly on the

point at issue. The ambassador of Christ, then, must be sound in the faith, "holding fast the faithful word that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince gainsayers." Tit. i. 9; 2 Tim. i. 13. He must be "apt to teach." 1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24. He must not be a *novice* (a newly converted man). 1 Tim. iii. 6. "He must take heed unto the doctrine," and meditate upon the things taught him, "that his profiting may appear to all." 1 Tim. iv. 13-16. He is warned against giving heed to fables and endless genealogies, that minister questions, rather than godly edifying, which is in faith. 1 Tim. i. 4. To "avoid foolish and unlearned questions." 2 Tim. ii. 23. He must "study to show himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." 2 Tim. ii. 15. He is to "preach the word," to be "instant in season and out of season." 2 Tim. iv. 2. The kind of preaching required is distinctly laid down, 1 Cor. i. 17: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel, not with wisdom of words (speech), lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect," etc. "The Jews require a sign and the Greeks seek after wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified." We draw from these the good and necessary inferences: 1st. That the preacher must have a familiar acquaintance with the word of God, and be sound in the faith. 2d. That he must have whatever educational training is necessary to enable him to teach others, communicating his knowledge with facility, accuracy, and propriety. 3d. That he must give himself to the study of the things to be taught and "magnify his office." But that he is to be thoroughly educated, according to the standard fixed by our Church, and argued for by our author, is by no means involved in anything that is written in the law. True, this is altogether of a negative kind, but it is just that kind of evidence that we would expect to find in a case of this kind. It is not to be supposed that the inspired writers would go out of their way to tell us that "much learning" was *not* required, and it is equally true that if much learning was required, it would be taught either by example or precept in the Book which is the very law of the Church.

But this argument, as we think, rises to the strength of a demonstration when taken in connexion with the minuteness with which every other essential qualification for the gospel ministry is set forth. Let any one examine the passages 1 Tim. iii. 1-7 and Titus i. 6-9, and compare them with the various detached teachings of the whole of the New Testament Scriptures, and it will scarcely fail to produce the conviction that no high standard of intellectual training was fixed for those to be inducted into the ministry of the gospel. A very brief analysis will be sufficient for our purpose. A "bishop must be blameless, not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre, a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate." Titus i. 6-8. To this, 1 Tim. iii. 1-7 adds these: vigilant, of good behavior, patient, one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity, not a novice, must have a good report of them which are without. In other places he is required to act not as lord over God's heritage, but as an ensample to the flock (1 Pet. v. 3), not contentious or crafty, not a man pleaser, not easily discouraged, not entangled with the cares of this world. He is required to feed the flock, to watch for souls as one who must give an account, to warn, exhort, rebuke, comfort, endure hardness; what he is to preach and how he is to preach—*i. e.*, with plainness, simplicity, faithfulness, zeal, constancy, and consistency; he must give attention to reading, study, continue in the things he has heard, etc., etc. Without enumerating all, we have pointed out thirty-five different things distinctly required. Now, how is it possible to believe that in this very minute specification of the qualifications for and duties of the ministry,<sup>1</sup> some of which will be conceded to be of minor importance, this one thing which is made a "*sine qua non*" in our Book, and by our author repeatedly declared to be *indispensable*, should have been entirely overlooked and left out? Moral and religious and prudential qualifications are all clearly taught, but not one word is said, or one hint dropped, or one example given, in which the most remote

---

<sup>1</sup> Here many will object that the apostle is describing in all this the ruling rather than the preaching elder.—Eds. S. P. R.

reference can be traced to this varied learning as a necessary qualification in the candidate for the ministry of the gospel.

An argument might be founded on the use made of the Septuagint by Christ and the apostles against the necessity of a knowledge of the original languages. If they used a translation that is conceded to be very imperfect, why may not a good translation be used as the *word of God* now? Or a similar argument might be founded on the fact generally believed, that the Gospel according to Matthew was written originally in Hebrew, and that our version is a translation. But we pass these by as useless for our purpose.

There is, however, one other question worthy of notice in this connexion. What is the method of training candidates suggested by the New Testament? Nothing definite can be learned from the actions of the apostles as to any preparation of the candidate. If we are at liberty to put the natural construction on the record, it would lead to this: that when churches were gathered, and elders must be elected to teach and to rule, they selected the best qualified from among themselves and laid hands upon them, setting them apart to this work. And that by giving attention to reading and studying to show themselves approved, and with the help and instruction given them by the apostles and evangelists, they grew up in this study and work combined to be "able ministers of the New Testament." We, of course, do not affirm this to have been the plan so certainly as to give it the authority of a divinely established plan, but such as would be naturally inferred from the record given us.

The example of Christ in training the twelve, and probably others also, furnishes the only case from which we can infer anything with certainty. His call, "Follow me and I will make you fishers of men," was a call to the ministry, but they were not immediately inducted into office, but continued with Christ "from the baptism of John until the day that he was taken up from them." This personal attendance was necessary, not only that they might, as his apostles, be witnesses, but also that they might be trained under his personal tuition for the great work of preaching the gospel and "catching men." This was their theological semi-

nary, and in some things marvellously like the "Brush College" of our Methodist brethren. For it will be observed, 1st. That they were not fully prepared for or inducted into office until after waiting at Jerusalem they had received "the promise of the Father." Then, when their minds and hearts were opened to receive the truth, they went forth as ministers of the New Testament, commissioned to disciple all nations and to commit the gospel "to faithful men who would be able also to teach others." 2d. The period between their call and the baptism of the Spirit was the time of their training. But it was not a time of seclusion from the world and study of books and parchments, but it was a time of work. The twelve were sent out singly to preach, saying, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." The seventy were sent out "two and two into every city and village whither he himself would come," and to preach the same truth. All were commissioned to heal the sick, to cast out devils, and commanded, "Freely ye have received, freely give." They were co-workers with him while they were being trained for the "full work" of the gospel ministry. And their studies under him were made practical by the work given them to do, and such now would, it is believed by many, be a better plan for training candidates for the ministry of the gospel. Some might fail to enter, as Judas did, but those who are worthy would be better able to appreciate the value and importance of the things they are required to study by putting them to use in practical work.

To conclude, then, we have tried to examine this subject with fairness and impartiality, and to consider fairly the question, What does the New Testament require? We have found nothing, and intentionally have written nothing, to disparage the most thorough cultivation of all branches of human learning. As in this, so in every work, we can conceive of no branch of knowledge that may not be made in some way available to help on that work. But in the midst of a world, only one-third of which is nominally Christian and not one-tenth of which has been even professedly converted to Christ, with a population increasing in a ratio more rapid than the Church increases, and with an undeniable failure in our branch of the Church to reach the masses of

the people, or to keep pace with other Churches that have, if not less, yet not greater, facilities for work than ours, it becomes us to inquire, What can we do to secure greater efficiency in the work laid upon us? We have made much of our learning and thorough literary and theological training. Perhaps there is too much pride in this to permit an unprejudiced view of its influence upon our work as a Church. And it will require patient investigation before we can bring ourselves to realise that what has been our boast is, in part at least, the cause of our comparative failure. No one will doubt that the subject needs a more thorough discussion than it has yet had. We offer this, with the consciousness that it lacks the thoroughness that the subject demands, but as the result of an honest effort to understand what the Scriptures teach on the subject. And with our present light we conclude that there is no warrant in the word of God for exacting from any candidate for the gospel ministry the extensive and varied learning required by our Church, but that by adopting a standard not warranted we have unwisely excluded many from preaching the gospel, whom Christ and the apostles would not have excluded. We have cultivated by our method habits of thought and study and tastes that tend to separate us from the sympathies of the masses, and practically we are making our Church one only for the more intelligent and cultivated classes. The poor we have *not* always with us.

D. C. IRWIN.



## ARTICLE VI.

## SOME RECENT APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

The rank growth of apocryphal literature in the early Church is a puzzle to many, and the inference has even been drawn that it must have arisen before the canonical books had acquired the high authority that is now accorded to them. No doubt a truly reverent mind would abhor the thought of forging a divine book. But, after all, the human soul is very hospitable and will readily entertain together the most contradictory notions. While it is logically inconceivable that true reverence can coexist with a desire, or even willingness, to strengthen God, or correct God, in the records he has seen fit to give us, historically even pious men have been guilty of pious frauds. Heretics and misbelievers were naturally much more untrammelled in seeking to lay at the base of their systems a better foundation than their mere assertions furnished. As a matter of fact, almost all of the very early false Gospels, Acts, or Apocalypses, sprang up among the Ebionitish and Gnostic sects; represent, in fact, in various degrees of purity of descent that esoteric literature in the possession of which they gloried, and which they called in their pride "apocryphal" or "hidden" books—books too sacred and good for the common eye to look upon; though the irony of time and truth has sadly altered the connotation of the boastful term. So far from their origin arguing the non-existence or low estimation of our canonical books, it was the existence of the canonical books which incited their composition; it was the teaching of the canonical books which necessitated their invention for its correction and explanation; and it was the supreme authority of the canonical books which determined their form and nature. Because the doctrines of the Church did not profess to rest on an argumentative basis, but on the authority of apostolic writings, therefore every heresy which would gain for itself any credit must exhibit for itself a like foundation. A Marcion might use the shears and assert that his system was the teaching of the restored canon of truth; a Valentinus might press allegory to

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—9.

the extremest limit in the effort to found himself on the unmutilated canon; a Simonian might boldly oppose his "Great Announcement" to the Christians' "Glad Tidings"; but the great majority of the sects from the beginning, and all of them in the end, were driven to meet the true apostles with false apostles, the true Gospel with false Gospels, the true Revelation with false Revelations. It was late when "orthodox" Apocrypha began to appear, and when they did appear they proved but adaptations or imitations of the heretical books, and alike with them the vehicles of falsehood.

We have the less excuse in deeming the rise of such a literature unnatural in the presence of an inspired canon, that no age of the Church has been free from such fungus growth. Most certainly the nineteenth century is familiar with it. Did the early Church produce an apocryphum which could outdo the "Book of Mormon"? Nay, every form of false teaching that arises among us sooner or later exudes in the lighter and more innocent forms of apocryphal productions. We feel certain that the truly apocryphal literature of the past decade has been tenfold richer than that of any one decade at any previous age of the Church's life. One autumn gave us two rather startling apocryphal Apocalypses. Quite a crop of apocryphal Gospels spring up nearly every year. In form and character these Gospels offer a very curious parallel with the similar productions of the second and third centuries. Some of them class with those early pseudepigraphs which, whether as forgeries or as a matter of mere form, represented themselves as the compositions of companions of our Lord or his apostles; while others, with similar purpose, are put forth more frankly as histories rather than as autoptic narratives. All alike, however, exhibit both the genus and the differentia of the class *apocryphum*, and can be arranged under no other category; all are heretical writings, teaching falsehood and striving to commend it by substituting for the canonical Gospels a more correct account of the life and teachings of our Lord.

Among these recent apocryphal Gospels there are a few which have obtained, by reason of their literary character, or the repu-

tation of their author, or some extraneous cause, a considerable circulation among our churches, and are not failing of some influence on our people. The purpose of the present paper is to call the attention of pastors to them as dangerous books, to point out their character, and to warn the Church at large against their circulation. Some of them have already appeared in more than one edition; they are found in the most unexpected hands; and they are doing what they can wherever they go to undermine faith in the divine nature and saving work of our blessed Lord. Our purpose is not, therefore, critical, but expository; not scientific, but practical. We shall content ourselves with pointing out what these books are, without stopping to refute them; and if what we shall write has any scientific value, it will be only as one fragment of the history of the religious vagaries of an age peculiarly, perhaps unprecedentedly, rich in religious vagaries.

"RABBI JESHUA."<sup>1</sup>

To begin at the bottom, the book called "Rabbi Jeshua" is the most frankly rationalistic of these before us. The very name, which is intended to suggest that Jesus was merely a Jewish teacher, foreshadows the tone of the book. It is significant also in another direction, as a sample of one of the methods which these apocryphal Gospels adopt to give themselves a flavor of scholarship and so practise on the credulity of their readers. Our present writer speaks with contempt of "one of our popular writers" who "has confessed that even when undertaking so

---

<sup>1</sup>"Rabbi Jeshua, an Eastern Story." New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1881. We have used the American reprint; but the paging of the English edition (London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1881) is the same. This essay was already ready for the press when "Bible Folk Lore, by the author of 'Rabbi Jeshua'" (London: C. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1884), appeared; a work written with the same purpose of reducing the Bible to the most rationalistic level, and with the same insufficient knowledge, and in the same partisan spirit. At the end of it are given extracts from the reviews of "Rabbi Jeshua" and of General Forlong's "Rivers of Life." If the prefixed "by the same author" is meant to apply to both of these, we now for the first time learn the author of "Rabbi Jeshua."

serious a task as the compilation of a 'Life of Christ,' he did not consider it necessary to master the three stout folios which comprise the Mishna or text of the Talmud;" whence it may be not unfairly inferred that he professes to have himself begun by mastering them. As there are, however, few other signs of his Shemitic studies visible, it would never have done to fail to exhibit them in strange, and therefore learned, forms of familiar proper names. Both his learning and that of Dr. Clarke in "The Legend of Thomas Didymus"—of which more anon—takes at all events this chief outlet, sometimes not without curious results. The "Rabbi Jeshua" of our present writer is in the mouth of Dr. Clarke "Joshua-bar-Yosheph," which, as a transliteration of the Shemitic original, strikes upon our un-Rabbinically trained ear as a little peculiar. The Baptist is to one author "Hanan"; to the other he is "Johann," the "son of old Zabdi." "Rabbi Jeshua" permits us to rest our weary eyes on the familiar "Nazareth," and even "Jehovah"; but Dr. Clarke's cruelty insists on "Nazirah" and "Yahveh." Indeed, we must admit that Dr. Clarke beats "Rabbi Jeshua" on his own ground: he gives many more of these curious forms than he; those he gives are more curious; and he treats them all with a lordly inconsistency, perhaps to show his complete mastery over them. He alone can give us such monsters as the constant "El-jah" (but "Elijah," p. 47), "Solyma" (but "Solomon," p. 60), "Daweid" (but "David," p. 21). With all his boasted Talmudic learning, then (perhaps because of it), the author of "Rabbi Jeshua" must be content to stand second here.

He is second to no one, however, in the boldness of his dealing with the evangelical documents. Taking his start from the theory of the origin of the Synoptics, which makes Mark the original, and both the others only free re-workings of his material, he assumes at once such an extreme position as to rid himself of everything but Mark at a single blow. That Matthew and Luke are but fanciful elaborations of Mark, we are told, follows from the two facts, that "in no case do they agree in any statement which contradicts one made by" it (which is true enough, but does not

prove the matter in hand), and that "no two of the later versions<sup>1</sup> are in accord concerning facts not noticed by<sup>2</sup> it (which is so laughably false<sup>3</sup> as to suggest the suspicion that our author has neglected to make himself acquainted with the three thin volumes that constitute the synoptic Gospels, while studying the "three stout folios which comprise the Mishna"). The complete untrustworthiness of the additional matter they furnish is apparent from (1) the free use they make of miracle and supernatural machinery,<sup>4</sup> and (2) the utterly contradictory character of the legends themselves. Thus to our author as to Baur and such moderns as Loman, the presence of the supernatural element is confessedly the first and chief criterion of untrustworthiness. The amount of the supernatural—both the number of the legends and the circumstantiality of their details—grows with each new Gospel,<sup>5</sup> but the oldest reworking of them all—our Matthew—is already entirely untrustworthy, and bears its origin in a controversial purpose on its face.<sup>6</sup> It thus only remains to characterise these untrustworthy documents before they may be left totally to one side. Matthew was plainly written to show "how Rabbi Jeshua fulfilled in every respect the Pharisaic expectations of a Messiah," and "breathes the spirit of the narrow Pharisaic sect of Shammai."<sup>6</sup> Luke "breathes the liberal spirit of the opposite party of Hillel and Gamaliel, and introduces many latitudinarian

<sup>1</sup> It is part of the author's plan to speak throughout as if he were dealing with an immense mass of evangelical records of about equal value. See p. vi. and p. 20. When he comes to name them he is reduced to the canonical Gospels.

<sup>2</sup> P. ix.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. "Gospels" (of which more anon) on this point—p. 712b., ed. Stoddard; and p. 709a: "Hitherto the Triple Tradition—as well as the double tradition of Matthew and Mark and of Luke and Mark) has consisted mostly of short 'words of the Lord,' set in a framework of short narratives, and very seldom agreeing exactly for more than seven or eight consecutive words. But we now come upon 'words of the Lord' in Matthew and Luke, some of which agree exactly for several sentences." Thus the agreement of Matthew and Luke in "facts not noticed by Mark" is far closer than either or both with Mark.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 17, 160. Cf. p. x. <sup>5</sup> P. 160, sq. <sup>6</sup> P. vii., sq.

views."<sup>1</sup> As for John, it is a "cabalistic writing" beneath whose "repulsive mysticisms" some poetical beauties may be hidden, but to which we can certainly go for no facts, but in which rather the true facts of Rabbi Jeshua's life are "finally altogether lost beneath the overgrowth of a semi-pagan mysticism which culminated in his deification."<sup>2</sup>

Mark, then, is our sole credible authority, and it is refreshing to turn away from such characterisation as we have heard of the other Gospels, to learn that Mark was veritably written, as the Church has always believed, by a companion of the Apostle Peter's—or, as our author prefers to call him, "Simeon-bar-Sad-dik"—and embodies "the recollections of this aged puritan;" that it is "honest," "trustworthy," "simple" in the best sense, "artless," and contains information which, though scanty and imperfect, is yet genuine; that it apparently follows with care "the historical sequence of events," and preserves "many of the maxims of Rabbi Jeshua" "interspersed among descriptions of the minor events of his short career."<sup>3</sup> But though thus genuine and authentic and honestly written, even Mark's Gospel needs critical reconstruction. For it, too, has a marvellous element, though the "number of its miracles is smaller" than those of the other versions. "The peasant chronicler was influenced by the superstitions of the day,"<sup>4</sup> and his "ignorance" and "credulity" could not fail to stamp themselves on his pages. He believed in desert demons and demoniacal possession and his memory "prone to exaggeration and to love of wonder, must have magnified many occurrences, which, had they been described by an educated and impartial eye-witness, would have seemed natural enough."<sup>5</sup> The very late period of his life when Rabbi Simeon's recollections were written down—after the fall of Jerusalem—only increased this tendency. "It is clear that an original account written by a European (had such an account been possible) would have been entirely free from the supernatural element." "As, however, no such document exists, we must make the best use of the genuine material available, discounting as far as possible the idiosyncrasies of the writer, and striving to form some kind of idea

<sup>1</sup> P. viii. <sup>2</sup> Pp. viii., 159, 157, etc. <sup>3</sup> P. ix., sq. <sup>4</sup> P. 159. <sup>5</sup> P. 162.

of the actual facts which he relates."<sup>1</sup> The author promises us, thus, a life of Christ founded on Mark's Gospel when sifted from its miraculous element.

It cannot be denied that our author comes to this sifting process with alacrity and proceeds in it with bold touch. Nor can it be denied that to approach the matter with the open avowal that nothing supernatural will be admitted to be possibly true, gives a writer a great advantage over those who try to disprove the existence of the supernatural in the history. He can deal with all miracle *en masse*, and, concerning himself little with details, content himself with now and then pointing out a ground for miraculous stories in the constitution of human nature in general and of peasant Oriental nature in particular. "The miraculous event cannot be true; now, what may be true instead?" is a far easier riddle to unloose than the hopeless task the faint-hearts set themselves, which requires them to exhibit a *per se* easier and more plausible explanation than the miraculous one, for each miracle in turn, and so prove that nothing supernatural does exist in the history. Occupying the former position, our author has small difficulty in disposing of miracle. He feels justified in stating that Jesus did no miracle, at the beginning, instead of at the end of his argument: "There is nothing in the life which we are about to study which would appear extraordinary or impossible, if the events were supposed to have happened in our own times, and so long as the scene was laid not in Europe but in Asia."<sup>2</sup>

This does not imply a denial that Jesus was thought by his contemporaries to have wrought miracles. He was a great physician, trained by the best practitioners of his day (the Essenes), and the superstitious East attributes all cures to a supernatural agent.<sup>3</sup> Thus the suddenness with which he acquired fame (which cannot be denied) explains itself readily: an ignorant and superstitious peasantry could not do otherwise than attribute "his simplest cures to a supernatural cunning, or to the aid of mighty spirits who obeyed him."<sup>3</sup> As a matter of fact, however, nothing is recorded of him which "has not been performed by men who

---

<sup>1</sup> Pp. ix. and xi. <sup>2</sup> P. xi. <sup>3</sup> P. 79.

have laid no claim to peculiar sanctity or to supernatural power," "and which may not be witnessed in our own times and in our own country, not less than it was in the East, nineteen centuries ago."<sup>1</sup>

Nor does it necessarily imply that Rabbi Jeshua partook in the superstitious understanding of his own deeds; it would have been impossible for him to withstand the popular belief and it was useless for him to protest. He did protest. In the only case of raising the dead that is attributed to him, he asserted clearly that the child was not dead but only asleep.<sup>2</sup> And over and over again, in the case of nervous diseases which formed the mass of those he healed, he asserted that the cure was due to the mental state of the recipient.<sup>3</sup>

Prophecy is dealt with in the same broad way. It is clear, on the one hand, that Rabbi Jeshua's clear vision could not have escaped forebodings as to his end, and these must have influenced his conceptions of the character and career of the Messiah; and "there is nothing in the reputed prediction" of the destruction of Jerusalem "which differs from the ordinary language of apocalyptic literature of a period earlier than that of Rabbi Jeshua's career."<sup>4</sup> On the other, "it is extremely difficult to estimate the effect—conscious or otherwise"—after so long an interval of time as elapsed before Mark was written—"on the writer of the actual course of events. It is possible that the predictions attributed to the Rabbi may have been materially enlarged or modified in accordance with the subsequent facts; that with the ordinary license of Oriental literature, so called prophecies, never actually uttered, may have been inserted into the narrative; and that minute details may have obtained an unnatural importance through the supposed connexion which they may have had with the fulfilment of scriptural prophecies."<sup>5</sup> It is part of the advantage of the attitude our author has taken up towards the supernatural that these loose and somewhat contradictory remarks appear to him to justify his neglect of the problem of our Lord's prophecies.

From the standpoint of reason, all this is very satisfactory,

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 82. <sup>2</sup> P. 80. <sup>3</sup> P. 81. <sup>4</sup> P. 136. <sup>5</sup> P. 116.



provided it is useless; but unless one begins by denying that there is anything supernatural to explain, it does not explain anything. Our author exhibits wisdom, however, in refraining from an examination of the miraculous details. When he does allow himself to be betrayed into them, he cuts much the same helpless figure that others do in this kind of work. We have seen that he can only explain the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem by supposing that the "honest" chronicle has been "dishonest" here, and, "though not intending to deceive," has put into the mouth of Rabbi Jeshua words which he never spoke. Of the paralytic who was let down through the roof, he can only say that "so great was the patient's faith in the power of the Master that he was able to obey the imperative command of the Rabbi, who adjured him to rise and walk."<sup>1</sup> The possessed are only "maniacs and nervous patients" whom the Physician soothed and healed.<sup>2</sup> The healing of the Gadarene is reduced to such an outputting of nervous power, while the swine are frightened by the frightened crowds who flee from the maniac's violence<sup>3</sup>—an explanation apparently borrowed from Dr. Farrar, who supposes it to have been "the shrieks and gesticulations of the powerful lunatic" that "struck uncontrollable terror into the herd of swine"—but, whether in Farrar or "Rabbi Jeshua," inconsistent with the plain matters of fact recorded in Mark, fanciful in its details, and but one more specimen of the kind of naturalistic explanations on which Strauss executed justice in the person of Paulus.

About the greatest of all miracles, the resurrection of Jesus, our author has very little to say. It would be a supernatural occurrence, and the "original text of the chronicle of Rabbi Simeon" does not record it. Consequently he feels justified in dismissing it with a vague remark about the Semitic mind being "characterised by a tenacity which prevents the eradication of an idea once firmly grasped," and the consequent inability of "the Rabbi's disciples to grasp the fact that their hopes were at an end and their hero departed," so that, "remaining expectant" after their Master's death, "legends sprang up" among these •

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 75. <sup>2</sup> Pp. 72, 160. • <sup>3</sup> Pp. 75, 76.

“simple-minded, devoted, and grief-stricken” people.<sup>1</sup> In such a case as this, however, the simple statement, “There is no evidence in the chronicle of Simeon that any of the immediate followers of the Rabbi ever again beheld him in life or death,” amounts to a *suppressio veri*. To say nothing of the evidence of Paul and John—the chief Epistles of one of whom and the Apocalypse of the other our author will scarcely deny to be genuine—evidence earlier than even Rabbi Simeon’s veracious chronicle, and on weighing the true bearing and full implication of which some of the time wasted in wading through the dreary wastes of the Talmud might have been profitably expended, it cannot be unknown to our author that this chronicle itself bears witness to Jesus’s resurrection. That broken edge in which it ends is prophetic of something to come. Moreover, Simeon does tell us of the empty tomb, and it will not do to dismiss it with a word about “frightened and marvel-loving Oriental women.” Krim has, indeed, asked somewhat satirically if it is on an empty tomb that Christianity cares to base its claims. But if our author has the leisure to consider it fully, he may discover that much needs to be said concerning that simple and in itself non-miraculous fact—a fact, therefore, of a sort which even an ignorant peasant might be able to be a credible witness of.

It is thus, at all events, that our author obtains to his own satisfaction a non-miraculous Mark on which to found his exposition of the life and teaching of Rabbi Jeshua. We fear, however, that we cannot consider him, from his own point of view, a careful or exact historian. He not rarely puts forward as facts circumstances uncritically drawn from untrustworthy sources—even from the revolting cabalistic composition which men now call the Gospel of John. At the head of the very first chapter, for instance, stand the words, “Hanan of Bethania.” We learn at page 13 that it was “whilst Hanan was still preaching and prophesying at Bethania that Rabbi Jeshua first appeared prominently in public,” and we are afterwards told that John was a Galilean (p. 71). The Gospel of John is our sole authority for any connexion of John with Bethania, while we have not even

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 164, *sq.*

it for the assertion that he was a Galilean. The new-built synagogue at Capernaum (p. 69) is filched from Luke, while the attribution of a dome to it (p. 73) is probably a slip in the interests of Oriental coloring. These are all small matters—or would be small in another; but in our present writer they are significant, and if John and Luke can be trusted for these facts, why not for others too? Nor does the artful interpreter of the artless narrative of Simeon-bar-Saddik make as full use of his materials as he might. For instance, he is observed at times to know exceedingly little about his subject: where he was born, or when, or from what parentage, or even tribe—of all this he is strangely uncertain. He may have been born at Nazareth (p. 22), or perhaps at Capernaum—probably the latter (p. 70); his father was probably a mechanic (p. 22); as to his tribe, it is only certain that he was not of the house of David (p. 22)—seeing that it was probably long since extinct, and “his only recorded utterance on this subject was clearly directed against such a theory: ‘How say the Scribes that Messiah shall be the son of David? for David calls him Lord; how then can he be his son?’” Now, this excessive doubt may lead us perhaps to a very high estimation of the caution of our author; but it is scarcely justified if the highly praised and “honest” narrative of Simeon is at all worthy of confidence. That Jesus was understood to be, and to claim to be, the son of David, Mark x. 47, 48 (cf. xi. 10) apparently evinces; what rank in life his parents held follows inevitably from Mark vi. 1, *sq.*; from the same passage it follows as inevitably that Capernaum was not the place where he was brought up, while such as Mark i. 24; x. 47; xiv. 67; xvi. 6, sufficiently point out what was his own country. Nor does this excessive doubt about such plain matters of fact, about which the “artless Simeon” could scarcely have a prejudice, even late in life, contrast prettily with the exact and detailed knowledge which our author claims as to the personal appearance of the child Jesus, the education he received, and the influences which formed his character, of none of which does the honest narrative of Simeon drop a single hint, and in his vivid description of which our author ranges himself alongside of the Matthews and

Lukes, Farrars and Geikies, whom he calls very hard names for introducing imaginative touches, and especially supplying from fancy the traits of the childhood of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> That Jesus did receive the usual education of a village child, we agree with our author, however, in thinking probable, though that he was a learned Rabbi (p. 71) neither the artless Simeon nor any other record will permit us to believe; nor indeed could the village school have given him the requisite training for such a function. Nor are we concerned to deny that such a man as he makes Jesus out to be might have been formed by the influences which he enumerates as having formed Rabbi Jeshua; but, again, that these influences formed Jesus, we have absolutely no historical warrant for believing.

The man that he actually portrays as "Rabbi Jeshua" cannot be said to be an unnatural kind of man. For it is not to be denied that the frank Rationalism which reduces Jesus at once to a man of his time and race, and which can praise the "rude chronicle" of Simeon-bar-Saddik, because in it "he is presented in his true character as a Hebrew fatalist and an Oriental prophet;" does, by its very thorough neglect of all miracle, succeed in putting before us a life that might have been lived—a purely natural life for the time and scene. To ignore or pare away all that is above nature, and then refuse to trouble one's self about the marvellous consequents, of course succeeds in leaving a residuum that is, in a sense, natural. The life of Jesus here presented to us, accordingly, does not fit into the place in the history of the world, which the life of Jesus ought to fill, any more than a rush-light can take the place of the sun in our system; it leaves the subsequent course of history utterly unaccountable, and throws the student, as he traces back the varied lines of development to their source in this new creation, lost in puzzled amazement to see them centre in nothing, and each end, not in a beginning of adequate impulsive force, but in empty vacuity; but so long as one keeps his eyes shut to these things, it gives him a sketch of a being who might have lived at that time; in a word, of a possible man. We are asked to consider him the product of the ordinary

---

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 15, 16.

influences about him; of school life, and manly rebellion against its traditional lore; of the influences of John the Baptist; and of the experience of the painfully deep and sharp contest between the high and the low in a society that lacked a middle class (p. 25). We are asked to behold him, after that, as first an ascetic anchorite, drawing out a solitary hermit's life in the wilderness, and then, after John's imprisonment, "conscious of the power within him, of genius chastened by ascetic probation, and full of the great message which there was none now left to declare to men since Hanan was no more," "once the learned Rabbi, but now the zealous Essene," "hastening back to his native land to take upon him the fallen mantle of his Master" (p. 71, cf. p. 85). The contradiction of this picture with the "honest" and "trustworthy" narrative of Simeon is characteristic: according to it Jesus was confessedly John's Master (Mark i. 7); he began his preaching before John's death (i. 14); the "hermit life" is limited to forty days (i. 13); and it is a false view of "that fox, Herod Antipas," which makes him, like our author, only John the Baptist risen from the dead.

Coming thus as an Essene, and with an Essene's reputation for prophecy and magical healings, and being withal not only a "great scholar," a "poet," a "devout ascetic," a "pure-minded and gentle Rabbi," but also "a great physician," who healed the diseases and won the love and admiring wonder of the rabble; it is not strange that Jésus obtained sudden fame as a miracle-worker (which reputation he vainly disclaimed), and perhaps, also, in a narrower circle as a prophet. As his life, so his teaching was essentially Essenic; there is little original in what he taught, though his authoritative manner contrasted with the method of the Scribes, who were anxious to trace each statement back to some learned authority. He also dealt originally with the law, though he never came in conflict with its teaching (p. 99). And in two points the matter even of his teaching may be called new: "his doctrine of the poor and ignorant," and "his doctrine of the expected Messiah, whom he claimed to be" (p. 97). The first of these was, however, in essence Essenic (p. 99), and the second he shared with most of his contemporaries (p. 103); but

not, it should be noticed, with the Essenes. He did not at first believe in his own Messiahship, but when once he reached that conviction he held it confidently (p. 121), and it gradually changed materially the character of his mission (p. 85). In his own view, his Messianic life and work came to so swallow up everything else that his teaching is of comparative unimportance. Thus his recorded utterances are fragmentary and without connexion, and "no great ethical system, no strikingly novel views of morality, nothing in short beyond the teaching of the law of Moses, as studied according to its original spirit, is found in the sayings of Rabbi Jeshua" (p. 111). It is thus his character which is of chief importance. But he does not appear to have been essentially elevated above his age. His morality was asceticism, and its standard an impossible one, though his "stern fanaticism" "condemned without scruple all who hesitated to go the same lengths with himself in the zealous pursuit of holiness" (p. 102). His exegesis, although it returned to the spirit of the Old Testament writers, led him into false views and expectations. His faith was Oriental fatalism (p. 128), led by which he marched calmly to his doom (p. 121). His philosophy was poor (p. 120). his logic Rabbinical (p. 118); even ignoble casuistry was not foreign to him (p. 110). He was, in a word, a well-meaning man, but just a man of his times and nothing more.

It is the less necessary to enter into any extended refutation of this view of the life of Jesus, that it is clearly inconsistent in its every detail with the one document on which it is professedly founded. Just those especial traits and "facts" which transform Mark's narrative irrecognisably are supplied from the fancy of the modern writer. The distinctive feature of this reading of the biography, the germ out of which all else grows and which determines its whole course, is the representation of John the Baptist as an Essene, his baptism of Christ as a conversion to Essenism, and the gathering of disciples around Jesus as the founding of an Essenic community. But what authority is there for making John an Essene? Neither the "artless" narrative of Rabbi Simeon, nor the artful one of Josephus, nor anything in the Talmud where the Essenes are not even mentioned, drops a hint to

suggest it; but on the contrary, the sources manage in a very few words to make it the most unlikely of hypotheses. Even with Mark alone beneath us we may repeat Godet's words: "If John was taught by the Essenes, it must be admitted that the only thing their instruction did for him was to lead him to take entirely opposite views on all points."<sup>1</sup> We may glance, however, at the assertions by which our author attempts to support his view, if only to gain some knowledge of his methods of work. John, then, he tells us, "as a member of the sect of Hasaya, inculcated the duty of washing in cold water as conducive to chastity" (p. 6). He passed his life in exhortation, denunciation, and "in the purifying rites of frequent washings" (p. 7). "Rabbi Simeon," however, tells us that the meaning of John's baptism was a totally different one from this, viz., unto the remission of sins, and that it was administered only on confession of sins; and that Jesus and his followers—who were, according to "Rabbi Jeshua," John's disciples—so far from inculcating frequent washings, were marked men for the opposite tendency (Mark vii. 1 *sq.*), to say nothing of the implication (Mark xi. 30) that John was not understood to be continuing a distinctive practice of a well known sect. Moreover, John's Messianic hopes, his doctrine of sin as a matter of will, his isolated life, his free association with the people—all are in direct disproof of any Essenic tendency in him. And Jesus himself an Essene! One could have hoped that among English-speaking writers, at least, this out-worn fancy were long since consigned to deserved oblivion. One laughs at the elaborate proof that is offered (p. 89 *sq.*) in support of so impossible a proposition. Even such facts as that Christ sometimes visited the trans-Jordanic region, that he was a man of peace, that he was unmarried, that he believed in the immutability of the soul, are made to do duty in this interest. Facts are even invented, as that Jesus lived a hermit life, the duration of which is not set by Mark (p. 27, but cf. Mark i. 13), that he lived as an ascetic, and taught the duty of celibacy and of communion of goods and frequent ablutions. The main arguments are, however, drawn from his mild teaching, his asserted neglect of the great feasts at Jeru-

---

<sup>1</sup> Com. on Luke, E. T. I., 118.

saalem and of sacrifices, and his success as a physician. We may well content ourselves for reply to a reference of the reader to some discussion of this matter among recent writers.' Here let us only note how inconsistent with the "trustworthy" chronicle of Simeon the whole contention is. Christ, whenever he was in Jerusalem, appears continually in the temple (Mark xi. 11, 15; xii. 35; xiii. 1; xiv. 49); he ate the passover, involving the sacrifice (xiv. 12), though our author tries to escape this; he commands others to sacrifice (i. 44); and he comes to Jerusalem in order to attend at least one feast. Many of the traits of Jesus' life are the direct antipodes of Essenic requirement, *e. g.*, they were the strictest known Sabbatarians (Jos. B. J., ii., 8, 9); Jesus was not (Mark ii. 23—iii. 6); they made much of constant lustrations (Jos. B. J., ii., 8, 5), Jesus did not (Mark vii. 1—23); they morbidly dreaded defilement, and avoided every contact not only with strangers, but with all not of their sect (Jos. B. J., ii., 8, 5, and 10), Jesus mixed freely with all (Mark ii. 15); they distinctly denied the resurrection (Jos. B. J., ii., 8, 11), it was precisely the resurrection that Jesus affirmed (Mark xii. 18 *sq.*); they commended celibacy, while such passages as Mark x. 5 *sq.* (cf. ii. 19 *sq.*) sufficiently prove that Jesus had no low estimation of marriage. In suppressing these facts, it looks very much as if our author were suppressing truth. We ought not to be, however, ungrateful to him; there is a depth beyond even him to which he might have gone. Or was Birnie's book, as well as Seydel's, published too late to be of service to him? <sup>2</sup>

Of course, such a man as "Rabbi Jeshua" is pictured, could not fail to come into conflict with the Sadduceeism of the ruling party. Like Savanarola, he became a political martyr—the vanquished opponent of established tyranny, and the instrument of

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Lightfoot's *Com. on Col.*, p. 158 *sq.*, where the refutation is complete. Cf. also the passage in *The Legend of Thomas Didymus*, p. 297.

<sup>2</sup> Birnie's "De invloed van de Hindoebeschaving," etc. (Deventer, 1881), goes so far as to hold that Buddhist doctrine and asceticism had already penetrated to Egypt, and Christ had visited Alexandria and learned of them. Seydel (1882) holds that Christ knew Buddhism, and accounts for much in the Gospels from its influence.



his death was the same—"unscrupulous falsification of evidence." We wish we had space to quote the whole account of the trial and condemnation in our author's words; it must suffice, however, to indicate that he supposes Jesus to have been condemned by a trick of the high priest. "Blasphemy among the Jews consisted . . . in the utterance of the divine name, and the Mishna states clearly that the blasphemer was not guilty until he expressed the name, 'which, when the judges heard, they were instructed to stand up and rend their garments, which might never again be sewn.' How, then, are we to understand the fact that after the simple answer, 'I am,' had been given by the prisoner, the high priest arose at once and called the Sanhedrim to witness, by the rending of his garments, that the divine name had been uttered, the pronunciation of which, according to its letters, condemned the prisoner to death. There is but one explanation possible, and this we find in reading the chronicle in Hebrew, for the word 'I am' was the ancient and original form of the holy name, by which Jehovah himself had made himself known to Moses. With hateful cunning the high priest placed on the words with which Rabbi Jeshua naturally answered the direct question, perhaps asked with that very object, a construction which must have appeared plainly unjust to every person present. He declared that the divine name had been spoken, when only an affirmative answer of the same sound had been given; and on this malicious and arbitrary decision the death doom of Rabbi Jeshua, whom the assembled Sanhedrim had been unable to find guilty in any other matter, was cruelly pronounced."<sup>1</sup> The "cynical Roman's" consent was easily obtained and the populace quickly yielded their favor when they learned of the wilful blasphemy. So he was hurried to his death. And worse. "Like a Savonarola" here, too. "Rabbi Jeshua was fated to leave not even a relic of his mortality. The women who came to embalm his body found the tomb broken open, the body no longer within. The stone had been rolled away and the vanishing figure of a white-robed stranger was seen or believed to be seen by the terrified and dismayed mourners, who fled forthwith from the sepul-

---

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 139-141.

chre." Thus the curtain falls, for ever. "Many were the legends which arose in consequence of this mysterious sequel to the history of the great Rabbi; but the chronicle of Simeon-bar-Sad-dik closes with the account of the open tomb and the trembling women; and of Rabbi Jeshua, as of Moses, it may truly be said that, 'no man knoweth his sepulchre unto this day.'"<sup>1</sup>

Thus our author leaves us standing over an empty tomb. It bears no message to him but of a broken sepulchre and a fleeing thief. How symbolic of the effect upon the reader of his own history! We gaze into its pages only to feel again that we are standing by an empty tomb. And can he actually think that the empty tomb under the walls of Jerusalem is not enough to found Christianity upon, and yet offer us his empty tomb as a substitute? He may hide from his readers that Mark's Gospel closes in a poor torn and broken edge—prophetic of something beyond. But he cannot hide from students of history that his own gospel stretches out a terribly lame arm for the grasp of the future. Not the Christian only, seeking his Lord, but the historian also, seeking an adequate origin for all that has come from "the Galilean prophet," will point out to him that he has violently torn out the heart of the story, will shake wise heads as they observe him busied with the husks from which the life has fled. Not thus—not in this only—could have arisen that faith which believed and made the world believe in a Risen Lord.

#### DR. ABBOTT'S "PHILOCHRISTUS" AND "ONESIMUS."<sup>2</sup>

To pass from "Rabbi Jeshua" to "Onesimus" and "Philochristus" is like passing into a new world. The improvement in breadth of information, minuteness, and soundness of scholarship and literary power, is so vast, that we feel for a moment as if we had passed from some arid Sahara to a rich and fertile upland, and begin to steep our senses in the new delight. It is not long,

<sup>1</sup> P. 150.

<sup>2</sup> *Philochristus. Memoirs of a Disciple of our Lord.* Second Edition. Boston: Roberts Bros., 1878. And *Onesimus. Memoirs of a Disciple of St. Paul*, by the author of "Philochristus." Ditto, 1882.

The secret is so open that it is no longer a secret that both books are by Rev. Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, Head Master of the City of London School.

however, before we learn that, despite its external beauty, we have not yet reached a land in which a man may live. The luxuriant growth covers plague-spots from which arise poisonous exhalations, and we are soon almost ready to declare a preference for the hard, dry, and deadly, but at least not treacherous, air of the desert. The frank rationalism of "Rabbi Jeshua" may be more unlovely to look upon, but it is scarcely more pernicious, and it presents a sturdier and more manly front than the half timid but no less obnoxious rationalising of "Philochristus."

The deeper and more sensitive scholarship with which we have to deal is shown at once in the theory of the origin of the Gospels which our new books set themselves to commend. This is chiefly set forth in "Onesimus," which, therefore, though the latest written of the two, demands our first consideration, inasmuch as it furnishes the basis of criticism of the documents on which the exposition of the Life of Christ, given in "Philochristus," is founded. Here, too, Strauss preceded Baur; but Strauss's labors can but rank as baseless fabrics of dreams until Baur's thesis is justified. It is not our purpose, however, to enter upon a detailed criticism of the documentary hypothesis of this author either. This is the less necessary that these books are understood to come from the same pen that gave us the learned article "Gospels" in the latest edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, to which "Onesimus" kindly directs our attention (p. 307), and in which a detailed and scientific account and defence of the theory here illustrated may be read in a sufficiently succinct form. Our object is fulfilled in giving a simple exhibition of its essential elements.

Dr. Abbott, then, accounts for the resemblances between the Synoptic Gospels, not on the hypothesis that they borrowed from one another, but on the supposition that they are all three based on a common traditionary source, which he calls the "Triple Tradition," and which he would restore by picking out the parts of the gospel narrative common to Matthew, Mark, and Luke. This "Triple Tradition" represents the most original form of the gospel history, and is most closely followed by Mark—though that Gospel only very roughly corresponds to it. So far we may go fairly well with Dr. Abbott; but from this point we diverge

from him most widely. For, when we come to ask whether this "Triple Tradition" gives itself a trustworthy account of the life of Christ, the third book of "Onesimus" gives us an emphatic negative for reply. Dr. Abbott holds that already before the "Tradition" had come to the hands of the Gospel-writers, it had passed through several stages of growth<sup>1</sup> and had developed into almost irrecongnisable shapes. Men in the early Church even seemed to vie with one another in inventing fulfilments for every Old Testament sentence in Jesus' life, and in transferring to the region of literal fact every trope used by or of him.<sup>2</sup> Nor is the matter added to the "Triple Tradition" by our written Gospels any more trustworthy. The eighth book describes Onesimus's amazement when he first heard it, and tries to illustrate its legendary origin. It was not until "towards the end of the reign of Vespasianus, or not much before," that "the churches began to commit to writing the traditions and acts of the Lord;"<sup>3</sup> and not until "the second year of the Emperor Domitianus"<sup>4</sup> that Onesimus first became acquainted with our Matthew, which seemed to him "a new Gospel," "so great a change had fallen on the Church since I had last tarried in the great city about fifteen years before," and the origin of which was absolutely uncertain.<sup>5</sup> It was only after long and trying debate with himself that Onesimus could decide what he ought to do with the three written books of the gospel; but at last, being persuaded that if he let falsehood in upon the Church, the Lord would provide some future teachers who could "have skill to sift" it out again,<sup>6</sup> he determined, on a plea of expediency, to allow his flock to read them. For himself, however, he had knowledge of the truth; "there was a certain Philochristus, a Jew by birth, but not one of the Jewish faction, a man of some learning, who had studied Greek letters at Alexandria; and he had been a disciple of the Lord Jesus, having himself seen the Lord in the flesh." "From the lips of this, my beloved teacher, I received the tradition of the words and deeds of the Lord, pure and uncorrupted; and it was no small strength and refreshment to hear the very sayings of Christ himself from one whose love of truth appeared in this

<sup>1</sup> "Onesimus," p. 86. <sup>2</sup> P. 87. <sup>3</sup> P. 268. <sup>4</sup> P. 272. <sup>5</sup> P. 274. <sup>6</sup> P. 285.

saying of his: . . . that 'he loved to think of the Lord Jesus as Son of man and also as Son of God; but he loved no less to think of him as the Eternal Truth, whom no lie could serve nor please.'"<sup>1</sup>

Thus, in true apocryphal fashion, Dr. Abbott puts forth "Philochristus" as the original and true Gospel in opposition to the corruptions of the canonical Gospels. Its acceptance as such involves the rejection of the Gospel of John entire,<sup>2</sup> and with it of all of the Synoptics which is not part of the Triple Tradition, as unknown to the immediate disciples of the Lord<sup>3</sup> and probably false.<sup>4</sup> It involves still farther the rationalising of everything miraculous contained in the Triple Tradition itself; and the total reconstruction of its narrative on non-miraculous lines. The reader of the article "Gospels," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, alone is not in a position to fully understand Dr. Abbott's attitude towards the gospel-history. It is not for us to say whether or not "Onesimus" represents a later stage in the development of his opinions. But certainly from "Onesimus" we gain a clearer insight into the extreme radicalness of his attitude; here all semblance of historical caution is lost, and Dr. Abbott frankly undertakes to reconstruct the Triple Tradition itself on fanciful and non-historical principles. We are at once exonerated from any attempt to refute his theories by this circumstance, and need only remark in passing from them, that in approaching Philochristus the reader is to expect to find—from Dr. Abbott's standpoint, mentally sublimated truth—from our standpoint,

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 269, 272.

<sup>2</sup> The Gospel of John had not been written when Philochristus and Onesimus wrote (although the Apostle John was already dead), and little is therefore said of it. But the "editor" of "Philochristus" kindly tells us that the author "makes no mention of any of the acts or long discourses nor set dialogues of that Gospel," yet holds the theology of it. In other words, the *acts* of John are apocryphal; perhaps the *theology* true. From the article "Gospels," in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, we learn that John is a late forgery at Ephesus, which may possibly preserve some historical traditions, though this cannot be proved. This article occupies in every way, however, a more cautious position than "Onesimus."

<sup>3</sup> "Onesimus," p. 283. <sup>4</sup> P. 273.

only an emasculated and harmonising Gospel, a Life of Christ which not only is founded on a contracted documentary basis, but which refuses to follow even that frankly; which, in short, first rejects most of the historical material and then reconstructs what it retained on the covert assumption that the supernatural, if not impossible, is at least incredible. We have before us, in other words, only another apocryphal Gospel, basing its facts on subjective feeling instead of historical testimony, and seeking to overturn in the interests of heresy the true account in the canonical books.

We do not care to pause in this brief essay to go into the theology of Philochristus; it must suffice to remark that it, too, is anti-supernaturalistic,<sup>1</sup> and while professing to see in Jesus both the Son of man and the Son of God, represents him not only as "verily a man in all points, sin only [but *not* errors, which are frequent] excepted,"<sup>2</sup> but also as mere man—perhaps something less than man. Dr. Abbott will not be found entirely consistent in other things. Though professing "to make no mention of any of the acts, nor of the long discourses, nor set dialogues, of that Gospel," he yet does frequently accept the testimony of John, both as to matters of action and teaching.<sup>3</sup> Though professing to substitute the true account for false accretions in the gospel history, he manufactures false accretions himself.<sup>4</sup> But in this he is always consistent: the supernatural is to him always a *σκάνδαλον*, and he will perform any mental gyration to be rid of it.

---

<sup>1</sup> Observe the treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in "Philochristus," pp. 173, 175, 206, 305, 322, 337, 340, 349; whence it is difficult to believe that Dr. Abbott believes in his personality. As to the person of Christ, he apparently holds an extreme *Kenosis* view. Compare his doctrine of the Eucharist, p. 345, and his denial of the legitimacy of prayer for earthly things, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> "Onesimus," p. 242.

<sup>3</sup> *E. g.*, p. 35, John baptizing at Bethany beyond Jordan; p. 198, his brothers did not believe in him; p. 204, the bread from heaven; p. 239, no man can come to him except the Father draw him; p. 258, "the Word of God"; p. 305, last promise, the Spirit; p. 308 (doubtfully), washing the disciples' feet; p. 322, one fold and one shepherd; p. 341, the waste of the ointment.

<sup>4</sup> It would require too much space to collect these: a sufficient number to justify the statement will come out incidentally in the text.

It was not by inadvertence that we observed that the effect of Dr. Abbott's attempt to give us a Christ in no respect more than man was to place before us a figure somewhat less than man. And if Dr. Abbott's reconstruction of the gospel history were not already condemned by its unhistorical method, it would be sufficiently condemned by the hideousness of the result. We may recognise in the frankly human Rabbi Jeshua a human being like ourselves—the true product of his times, as human as any gifted Jew of his day. But Philochristus's Lord differs from other men, but differs in such a direction that he commands our pity rather than our love and admiration. Why should we hesitate to say it?—the Jesus of "Philochristus" disturbs, pains, even disgusts, us. We turn away from him, feeling that we have been observing one mentally weak; the creature of circumstance, the prey of chance—not unlikely mentally diseased.

The cause of this painful effect is simply Dr. Abbott's unmeasured zeal to be rid of the supernatural, and the misfortune of his position that forces him to deal with it in detail and not, like the author of "Rabbi Jeshua," *en masse*. He carries this so far as to have set the task before him to account elaborately on natural [?] grounds for everything unusual or striking in Christ's life. Not only are his miracles explained away; not only are his prophecies reduced to prognostications, but his every act is arranged for beforehand, and he is not allowed to have even the usual foresight or the usual self-determination of the average man. The life is so triumphantly rid of all super-human elements, that it is almost rid of all super-physical ones as well, and the hero perilously approaches at times a state of imbecility, and never escapes that of a puppet moved by wires from without. Dr. Abbott no doubt had a hard and delicate task before him; his measure of success in it is only another proof, if another were needed, that to take away the divine Jesus, is to leave us no Jesus at all; that his whole life was so transfused with his divinity that it cannot be separated out from it without tearing with it the humanity too.

To justify what we have said, we need only to beg our readers to observe with us—it is a trial to observe it anew, even for a good purpose—that Dr. Abbott not only denies to Jesus any well-

considered plan, but represents him as driven hither and thither (to the distress and disgust of his followers), without purpose of his own, and always by impulse from without; not only denies to him any independent or consistent mental life, but makes him heavy, slow-minded, changeable, wavering, and ever the recipient, rather than the source, of mental impression. The Jesus of Dr. Abbott, in both act and thought, is always the creature of external circumstances; he neither acts for himself nor thinks for himself, and he receives the thoughts of others with visible effort. On his very first appearance on the page of the history,<sup>1</sup> he is made to exhibit his essentially hesitating and uncertain disposition. He is standing before a possessed boy, and Philochristus (not unnaturally) " marvelled at the manner of his dealing with the youth." " For, first of all, when he looked upon the youth, his face seemed swallowed up with pity; and then of a sudden it changed again; he stretched out his arm as one having authority, and as if on the point to bid the evil spirits depart; and this he did twice, but twice again he drew back his arm, as if changing his purpose. Then, at the last, the pity came back into his face all in an instant, so that his features seemed even melted therewith, and he stooped down and embraced the boy and kissed him, and, as I thought, he whispered words in his ear. But this I know not for certain; howbeit the boy, in any case, ceased from his raging, and no longer struggled, but lay still and quiet, only muttering and moaning a little." This was not, however, a cure, for subsequently<sup>2</sup> the same boy comes before us as a raving demoniac, and then, happily, is cured. We do not know how this narrative may strike our readers; to us it seems altogether like other apocryphal miracles, even in a literary point of view infinitely below those of the Gospels. Its purpose is to suggest the difficulty to Jesus of the task of healing; for, throughout Philochristus's narrative, as at Nazareth (p. 199), " he laid his hands on a few [only] that were sick of slight diseases and healed them, and even these not without labor." But it suggests, equally with that, the unsteady, uncertain, wavering will and hesitating purpose of Jesus.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Philochristus," p. 48.<sup>2</sup> P. 98.



The same traits are made even more prominent in the healing of the Syro-Phœnician woman's daughter (p. 226); in the account of which the questions, which in the Gospel are questions of trial to the woman, are made questions of doubt in Jesus. "But he answered us, still not turning his face, 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' Yet as he spake, he slackened his going, and spake, as it were, like unto one doubting somewhat and willing to have his words amended. Now came the woman in haste up to him and threw herself before his feet and said, 'Lord, help me!' Then Jesus stayed. Yet did he still keep his eyes fixed on that which he saw afar off, and for a brief space he was silent; but then he said, as though he were asking a question of his own soul, 'It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it unto the dogs.' But the woman answered, 'Truth, O Master, yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from the master's table.' When Jesus heard these words, he turned his face straightway from the glory of the mountain and looked down on the woman; and behold he rejoiced more because of that which he beheld nigh unto him, than because of the glory that was afar off. For the fashion of his countenance was changed so as I cannot describe it. And immediately he stooped down and took the woman by the hand and raised her up and said unto her, 'O woman, great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt.' " Neither was this, however, a cure; as the writer is careful to explain, the girl was healed not by the word of Christ, but by a word concerning Christ, "even at the mention of the name of Jesus"; not, then, by Jesus, but by herself and her vivid imagination and hopes; for all of which the way had been characteristically prepared, some two pages beforehand, by the anxious explanation that the mother had instilled into her afflicted daughter the hope of being healed by Jesus; an explanation now reiterated, lest it should be forgotten and Jesus be given some credit by the unwary reader. The whole effect of the conversation between Jesus and the woman went forth not from him to any one, but from her to him. "But when Jesus had heard the words of the Syro-Phœnician woman, he was *no longer* minded to journey towards the north" (p. 227). "For the faith of the Syro-Phœni-

cian had strangely moved him, *insomuch* that he spake as if the Redemption were nearer than it had been before" (p. 228). "But whether it had been revealed to our Master through the words of the Syro-Phœnician, . . . concerning this I know nothing; but Quartus judgeth that it was so" (p. 228). Now, this is not only *a* but *the* characteristic feature of the life of Christ according to Philochristus. The *Kenosis* doctrine of the person of Christ is sufficiently distasteful to us, but this is Kenotism run mad; and the mode in which the gradual revelation of his nature and mission is represented as coming to Jesus is intolerable. Everything is from without, and the reception of a thought by Jesus is attended with throes as if of parturition. John repeats a Psalm and "when he came to the words: 'Thou which hast shewed me great and sore troubles, shalt give me life again and shalt bring me up from the depths of the earth;' then indeed the face of Jesus kindled with a marvellous light and he bade John cease. But he himself sat still musing, and his lips moved like unto one repeating the same words over and over again: 'Thou shalt bring me up again from the depths of the earth'" (p. 198). So the thought of a resurrection first dawned on his mind. Once again, the disciples were quoting Scripture and one of them said: "God will provide himself a lamb for the burnt-offering." "And at these words" "the countenance of Jesus changed as if he had heard some new word of God" and "he began at this time to see clearly that he must needs die for Israel, even as" [but apparently only as] "John the son of Zachariah had died" (p. 205). Even a *twit* brought revelations: when they wished to make him king, Jesus took no heed thereof, until one threw himself in the way, crying that "it was better for a man to lose his life as John the Prophet had lost it, than to save it as Jesus desired to save it. Thereat Jesus stayed for an instant and lifted his eyes from the ground; howbeit not in anger, but rather as he is wont to do . . . whensoever he heareth a Voice of God" (p. 191). The reader must guard himself, however, from imagining that Dr. Abbott wishes to represent Jesus as a second Socrates in these allusions to a "Voice of God;" no voice came to Jesus save through the external medium of a fellow-man's words, for Jesus was original

in nothing—never the leader, but always the led. He was not a second Socrates, then, only because he was less than Socrates.

Nor is this uncertainty, indecision, and painful insufficiency confined to his teaching only. In small and great affairs alike Philochristus's Jesus never knows what to do, and greatly tries his followers (if such a term may be used) by his aimless and visibly baffled behavior. The "shadow of doubt and expectancy" that clouded his brow never left him. It is impossible not to sympathise with the little body of weary disciples, dragged back and forth without purpose or result, at every hint of danger or freak of restlessness. No wonder that "some of them murmured concerning their many flights and wanderings" (p. 208); that "they accompanied him sorely against their will" (p. 224), and it seemed to them that there was no end to such flittings. No wonder that "the manner of Jesus . . . disquieted them and made some of them doubt," as "he appeared like unto one waiting for a message and marvelling somewhat that the message came not" (p. 224). It must have been weary work indeed! Not that Dr. Abbott fails to not only suggest but assign a reason for every movement. Now it is a light "held up by night in Tiberias (on I know not what report or rumor of some danger intended to Jesus by Herod, or some marching forth of the Thracian guard)" (p. 224); now any mere report of impending danger (p. 208), and a restless aimless seeking of "a revelation" on the part of Jesus; but always some special and momentary impulse. How different the Gospels! or Mark! or the "Triple Tradition"! There, all is order and settled, wisely-laid, and firmly-held plan. Jesus adapts his movements to the requirements of his work and every movement stands out lucidly as part of a great and accomplishing purpose—he bends circumstances to his will, and makes his very enemies work out his plans. Here he is but a feather in the grasp of the wind and drifts about at the pleasure of any one who will kindly supply a little motive power. There he attains a lofty independence of thought and action never attained by another son of man; here he is the most painfully dependent actor an account of whom history has preserved.

So eager is Philochristus to exclude every possibility of superhuman knowledge in Jesus that he elaborately explains beforehand every source of his knowledge, even of the most natural and minute facts. He would not, for the world, omit telling us, for instance, that Jesus saw Zaccheus in the tree (p. 291) as he passed, or that he was—somewhat startlingly and painfully—a hearer of his disciples' dispute as to preëminence (p. 266). He tells us (inconsistently quoting John) that Jesus "knew what was in man" (p. 280). But what notion he can attach to the phrase it puzzles us to make out. Jesus is jealously guarded by him from any exhibition of either forecast of acts, or insight into character. Even to the end he knows not whom to trust, nor what to do, save as guided and instructed by more sagacious friends. No more pitiable account of Jesus' last days, we are persuaded, has ever been penned than is here given to us, in this interest. It is due to a suggestion from Matthew that he rides into Jerusalem on an ass, for, as they entered Bethphage, Matthew saw an ass, and remembering, repeated the well-known prophecy. "Now Jesus overheard these words but said nothing; yet, as it seemed to me, he took note thereof" (p. 307). Accordingly he sent Matthew and a companion next day after the ass. It was due to an arrangement of Jesus' own that the multitudes met him with hosannahs as he entered the city. For "Jesus gave command . . . that certain of the disciples should go before the rest into Jerusalem, even to our friends and companions there, for to instruct them concerning the time of the going down of Jesus, that they might come forth to meet us" (pp. 307, 312). And yet in the midst of all these preparations he had not even yet a plan of action: "rather, he was as one waiting and expecting, looking perchance for some sign of the will of the Lord" (p. 313). He approached the gate of the city still "rapt in other matters; even as if he heard not the shouting nor the singing, neither understood the meaning thereof" (p. 315); his "countenance was wistful" and "there seemed, as it were, a shadow of doubt and expectancy upon his face" (p. 315). Yet when at length the Pharisees fairly drag his attention to the shouting multitudes he sees in their hosannahs, "the very voice of the Father in

Heaven speaking by his little ones on earth and showing unto him how there must be no sign of fire from heaven" (p. 316). So!—and so he was expecting *this*—and it was due only to this accident that he learned even at this late date not to expect it. It was not Jesus but Joseph of Aramathea, whose forecast of danger kept Jesus a day or two in quiet at Bethany; and whose skill it was which prepared the secret chamber for the passover and gave the secret sign for its discovery (p. 331). Nay, so little insight had Jesus into the character of men, that although he allowed himself to be led in this matter by Joseph, he had actually chosen Judas to be the medium of communication with him and was prevented from betraying all only by an accident (p. 338), and that accident was Judas's unexpected absence in conference with the priests. It was due only to instruction from others that he came at last to suspect Judas (p. 339). Even at the very end, the poor creaking machinery enters: it was only because a hasty and terrified messenger from Joseph pressed into the room that Jesus led his disciples from the passover-chamber; and once out he stood helpless, in characteristic but most painful perplexity. Can a more appalling spectacle be imagined than this poor hunted and harmless man standing there in the midnight street, in the midst of disciples depending on him for guidance (why they should continue to do so, who can tell?) "looking up to the sky" (p. 348). "First he made two or three steps towards the temple and the tower of Antonia"—"but then," his nobler impulse giving way, he turned in flight "towards the gate that leadeth to the vale of Kidron," evidently intending to seek safety in Bethany. A messenger meets him with information that his enemies beset the road (p. 352), and so ("therefore" says our author unhesitatingly) he turned aside to Gethsemane. There Judas found him. Alas! this poor timid hunted man is not the Jesus of history, and cannot be either the Lord of our souls or the founder of the Christian faith. To Philochristus also we must say: "You have taken away our Lord."

No one would expect such a Jesus as this to work miracles; and if Dr. Abbott started with this conception of the Master, we do not at all wonder that he felt bound to explain away the mira-

cles. Apart from this, his success as a "naturaliser" is not striking. First of all, he tries to limit the miracles to cases of healing. "Once only," we are told, "did Jesus so much as appear to adventure to alter the course of the world" (p. 235), and "methinks," it is added, "even here he did it only in appearance." In other words, Jesus' bidding the storm cease is entirely parallel—the comparison is Philochristus's own—with Cæsar's calming the frightened boatmen with the assurance that they bore quite too precious freight for the storm to overwhelm. We turn with mingled amazement and amusement from Philochristus's two pages to the few lines of the Triple Tradition: "*Let us go across to the other side. They took Hi(m) in a boat. They wak(e) Hi(m), say(ing), We perish: and he arising rebuked the win(d). And there was a calm. He said to them, Your faith! They said, 'Who is this that even the wind obey(eth) Him?' "*"<sup>1</sup> One would like to know who, behind this simple narrative, has favored Dr. Abbott with more accurate information. The raising of Jairus's daughter he accounts for by the remark: "All men *supposing* her to be dead" (p. 233). The miracles of the walking on the water and of the loaves and fishes—about both of which the "Triple Tradition" is perfectly explicit—are elaborately explained as misunderstood tropes. It is by such methods that he reduces all miracles to cases of healing. Next he limits the diseases healed: "As thou knowest, Jesus doth not adventure to heal all afflictions and all diseases. And even if the affliction be such as can be healed, yet he healeth not except there be first faith" (p. 147). "Then he passed along the ranks of the sick people; and wheresoever he perceived that any could be healed, he laid his hands on them, and lo! they were at once freed from their infirmities; and many unclean spirits were driven out from those that were possessed. Now, most of them that were healed had been possessed with evil spirits; but others were lunatic, or sick of the palsy, or of fever, or had impediments in

<sup>1</sup> Encyclopædia Britannica, ed. Stoddard, p. 705b. We quote from the Encyclopædia Britannica, inasmuch as we wish to use Dr. Abbott's own version of the Triple Tradition, and the little work recently published by him and Mr. Rashbrooke has not yet come to our hand.

their speech. But Jesus had a marvellous power to discern, methought, not only them that had faith from them that had not, but also such diseases as were to be cured from such as were not to be cured, because it was not prepared for him that he should cure them" (p. 100). We need not pause to point out how diverse this is from the few and simple words of the "Triple Tradition," for which it is substituted (*cf.* Mark i. 32-34), nor to ask what Onesimus would have thought of these accretions could he have seen them. Next, Dr. Abbott is careful to make the cures that he allows usually gradual and always difficult to Jesus, as has been already illustrated; and then uses his best endeavors to reduce most of them to the casting out of demons. A good deal of space is then devoted to an exposition of the nature of possession. It is traced to malaria (p. 42), and this judgment supported by an array of invented "facts," while no attempt is made to shield Jesus from the effects of the inevitable inference that he partook in or countenanced so gross a superstition. As the upshot of the whole matter, we cannot see why Carlyle's description of the Irvingites might not serve equally well as Dr. Abbott's description of Christ and his companions: were they not also a batch of "hysterical women and crack-brained enthusiasts"? and do not the words equally apply: "They also pretend to 'work miracles,' and have raised more than one weak bed-ridden woman, and cured people of 'nerves,' or, as they themselves say, 'cast devils out of them' " ?<sup>1</sup>

After the instances that have been incidentally given, it will not be necessary to give any extended examples of Dr. Abbott's dealing with individual miracles. It is enough to note for comparison with "Rabbi Jeshua" that he explains the healing of the Gadarene by supposing that the deluded man fancied in his ravings that he had a legion of swine in him, and that Jesus had ordered them back into "the abyss" (p. 133). It is not uninteresting to trace the growth of Dr. Abbott's confidence in this explanation. He first suggested it in "Through Nature to Christ," on the strength of a passage in the "Arabic Gospel of the Infancy," which declared of a demoniac who had been exor-

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter to his Mother, of October 20, 1831.

cised that "demons, in the shape of crows and serpents, began to go forth, fleeing out of his mouth."<sup>1</sup> When he wrote the article "Gospels," he thought it "perhaps more likely" that the story was entirely unhistorical, inasmuch as the names "Gadara," "Gerasene," and "Gergesa" might all be significant. In "Philochristus" he returns to his first guess. And in "Onesimus" (pp. 97-99) he makes Artimidorus discuss the matter at length, and elaborately illustrate and explain the origin of the "legend" on this supposition. It is needless to observe that there is no proof that such stories as that in the "Arabic Gospel of the Infancy" were current in Christ's time; that if they were, there is nothing to connect them with this narrative, which does not represent the swine as coming forth from the man; and that the "Triple Tradition" on this occurrence is thoroughly simple as to the main matter involved.

The resurrection of our Lord presents an especially difficult matter for Dr. Abbott to handle. Mark's Gospel ends abruptly at the empty tomb, and Dr. Abbott is on record as believing that Mark ends here "because the common [or triple] tradition ended here, and because he scrupled to add anything to the notes and traditions which he knew to rest on higher authority than his own."<sup>2</sup> (Oh that Dr. Abbott had either granted to Mark the benefit of his judgment—"if this be true, it stamps with the seal of a higher authority such traditions as have been preserved to us by so scrupulous a writer"—or imitated him at least in his scrupulousness!) Like "Rabbi Jeshua," then, "Philochristus" should have left us standing before an empty grave—to draw our own inferences. But Philochristus chose to be "here unlike himself" (p. 412) and "to depart from his usual course" and subscribe himself a witness to the Lord's "resurrection." Not that Dr. Abbott believes in a "resurrection"; he apparently follows Keim in spiritualising the fact away while retaining the name, and thus makes Onesimus (p. 110), after careful inquiry, say:

<sup>1</sup> Note the literary skill with which Dr. Abbott prepares for such explanations in "Philochristus" by prefixing an admirably written narrative of a similar exorcism at page 44.

<sup>2</sup> Encyc. Brit., art. "Gospels."



"The sum of all seems to be that the body of Christus was not indeed raised from the grave—for that were against all course of nature; and besides, if it had been so, why was the Tradition silent on the proofs of so great a wonder?—but that some kind of image or phantasm of the mind represented him to his followers after his decease." Thus he has no recourse save to the worn-out vision hypothesis, and we are condemned to see again all the Christian world—Paul most elaborately<sup>1</sup>—made out to be a pack of "crack-brained enthusiasts" or weak-minded visionaries, it matters little which you call them. The theory is discussed in "Onesimus," but to Philochristus is committed the task of giving it force by clothing it with a life-like narrative. But in his way, as in the way of others before him, a twofold difficulty stood: he must make universal vision-seeing appear natural, and he must gain a fair and natural starting-point for the vision-seeing. In the former matter he has fared about as ill as his predecessors. To account for the empty tomb, he suggests the removal of the body by the authorities (p. 375). To gain time, he does away with the historical "third day," elaborately explaining away Christ's prediction, and apparently forgetting Paul's testimony, and puts most of the visions at a long distance of time after Christ's death. And the only effect on the reader of the multiplication of the visionaries is here, too, an increasing sense of the unreality and impossibility of the whole account. In order to gain a starting-point for the visions—we are speaking now calmly and advisedly—Philochristus sinks to the lowest device ever yet adventured by critic or "apocryphalist." It was bad enough for Celsus to rail that the belief that Jesus had risen originated in the ravings of a half-mad woman, or for Renan to seize the hint and elaborate it into his famous chapter that makes it the creation of a grateful woman's love. Dr. Abbott actually dares to trace it back to the frenzy of a traitor's remorse, and to propagate it thence through a bereft follower's dreams. We repeat it—for we hope our readers will have difficulty in crediting it—just as Caracalla's remorseful fancy pictured his mur-

---

<sup>1</sup> "Onesimus," p. 243.

dered brother's wraith as continually pursuing him, so Judas's remorse pictured the betrayed Jesus on his track, and THIS was the origin of the faith in the resurrection of their Lord which brought peace back to the hearts and glorified the lives of the youthful Christian community. We prefer transcribing the terrible passage to abstracting it:

"As one in a dream, scarce knowing what I did, I bent my way towards the gate of the valley of Kidron. Here I was musing how but yesterday, in this very place, I had walked by the side of Jesus, even at his right hand, and how the touch of his arm had held me up in my stumbling; when behold, I started back as if I had seen a spirit. For the voice of one close to me in the twilight whispered with an hissing sound, 'He is not dead.' I looked, and behold! Judas stood before me. His face was pale and his eyes glared, and passion so wrought his features that they moved and quivered, as if against his will, like unto the features of one possessed by Satan. When I drew back from him, at first he would have stayed me; but seeing that I loathed him, he also drew back and said, 'Nay, be not afraid; I cannot betray another. But he is not dead. Hast thou not seen him?' I marvelled at him, but said nothing, only shaking my head. Then Judas replied, 'Think not that I have slain him; he liveth; he hunteth me to death; these three times have I seen him. I have not slain him. Why, then, doth he yet hunt me? But thou, thou didst love him; he thou at peace with me.' Saying these words, he came forward again to have taken me by the hand; but I could not. Then he turned away and laughed such a laugh as I pray God I may never hear again. But as he departed, he cried aloud, 'Thou rememberest his words, "It were better for him that he had never been born": verily he was a prophet.' Then he laughed again, even such another laugh as before; and he cursed the God that made him. With that he went his way, and I saw him no more.

"For awhile I stood where I was, as if in a trance, almost expecting that the words of Judas should prove true, and that Jesus should come forth to me out of the air around me. Then I passed through the gate of Kidron, and crossing the brook, I began to go out by the way which leadeth to Bethany. But even as I went up the mountain, I pondered over the words of Judas, 'He is not dead; I have seen him,' for I could not forget them, nor put them out of my mind, and behold, whithersoever I looked in the twilight, all things bore witness unto Jesus and seemed to say the same words, 'We have seen him; he is not dead' " (pp. 366, 367).

From this beginning grew everything! Surely, we may close the self-refuted book in silence. Do we not rightly judge that a

book which presents such a picture of Christ as this does, does not need refutation; that a book which seriously proposes to found the belief in Christ's resurrection in the ravings of a crazed murderer does not deserve refutation?

MR. HART'S "AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JUDAS."<sup>1</sup>

The passage is easy from a reconstruction of the life of Christ which assigns to Judas so important a function as the origination of the legend of the resurrection of his Master, to a formal autobiography of Judas himself, though the transition is otherwise marked enough, and we need to apologise to Mr. Hart for having brought his book into such company. For although in scholarship and literary character Mr. Hart's book is far below Dr. Abbott's, in reverence and truth it is far above them; and although Mr. Hart has not escaped the invention of some apocryphal details and rationalising explanations—some of them offensive—here and there<sup>2</sup> his book founds itself on the frank admission of the trustworthiness of our Gospels and seldom strays from them. Some of these sins, as well as some of those of omission, may be fitly explained, moreover, by the circumstance that the narrative is placed in the mouth of Judas, who neither knew all that Christ did or said, nor can be deemed incapable of occasional rationalism. It is a small matter that we cannot confess to have found the literary form which Mr. Hart has adopted sustained throughout. It is of more importance that we feel obliged to confess that, to our mind, he fails in its main purpose, and neither gives us a consistent and credible account of Judas's career, nor solves the problem of his motive in his treason. The sentimental ruffian, introspective scoundrel, and immoral moral-

<sup>1</sup> *The Autobiography of Judas Iscariot, a Character Study.* By the Rev. James W. T. Hart, M. A. London: Kegan Paul & Co., 1884.

<sup>2</sup> *E. g.*, p. 51, where the details of the process of the reanimation of the widow's son are given with the effect of losing the majesty of the narrative and suggesting a dubious theory of the working of Jesus' miraculous power; p. 70, where the need of deliberation in Jesus is needlessly asserted; p. 79, as to the process of recovery in the Gergeseno; p. 101, where a sentimental reason is given for the feeding of the five thousand, etc.

iser here held up to our view, seems to us a psychological impossibility; the man who could have written as Mr. Hart makes Judas write would have been capable of any mean villainy, except just that which he makes Judas commit; and we are not surprised that he plainly does not himself know whether he is writing a journal, a history, or a sermon, whether for his own sole eye or for his contemporaries or posterity. As for the motives of his treachery, we are grateful to Mr. Hart that he has not followed the rationalists and made a pet of the betrayer, and set himself to exhibit the sinlessness, if not nobility, of his action. But beyond that we cannot praise his effort to untangle the skein of his motives, still less to trace the evolution of his purpose. We do not, indeed, doubt that fear for himself, anger at his Master for his reproofs, and, above all, cupidity for wealth entered into his motives; but the Fourth Gospel much more satisfactorily exhibits the matter than Mr. Hart, and the introduction of outraged Messianic hopes only complicates instead of explaining the problem. Judas, like Satan, requires a Milton for his analyser, the evil that is in such men is pitched in a key of immensity, and is far less complex in its origin and outlets than we are inclined to think. The simple account of the Fourth Gospel stands, at all events, still as not only the most consistent and likely, but the sole probable one. Whatever other motives beyond what are there uncovered, entered into his Satanic purpose, we may be sure pierced it only as veins of ore pierce a mountain, and we but confuse our minds when we direct attention to them. Great evil, like great good, is apt to be simple; and the divine truth that, if the eye be single, the whole body shall be full of light, undoubtedly has its evil counterpart.

Mr. Hart warns us not to regard his little book as in any sense a life or study or history of Christ. We regret that we cannot help it. In the nature of the case, it is an apocryphal Gospel conceived from the standpoint—not indeed of Mr. Hart—but of Judas. It is an *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἰουδᾶ*. We rejoice, however, that we are exonerated from criticising it as a presentation of the history of Jesus, by the circumstance that, in the intention of the author himself, it does not stand for truth. It is professedly a

partial, broken, and incomplete view of the history, such a view as might be taken by a Judas, such a view as might be taken and yet the soul be lost; and yet a view which, just because recognising the essential facts of the history as facts, comes far nearer the truth than either of the books we have been criticising. Mr. Hart follows Stier in holding that Judas did not see even in his remorse that Jesus was more than the "Son of man," and failed of the knowledge of his sonship to God, which the Spirit only subsequently brought fully to the minds of his followers. It may be so; certainly it is overwhelmingly probable that Judas did not consciously betray the Lord God himself. "They sinned ignorantly, through unbelief." Alas! that men to-day, after the Resurrection, after Pentecost, after the fuller revelations of the Spirit through the apostles, can still be found who can take a Judas-view of the Son of God! "I tell you that if the mighty works that are done in thee had been done in Sodom and Gomorrah, they had repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes."

DR. CLARKE'S "LEGEND OF THOMAS DIDYMUS."<sup>1</sup>

It is interesting to observe how much more natural Jesus appears as seen through Mr. Hart's "Judas," despite its partial view, than as seen through Dr. Abbott's "Philochristus." It is a paradox, no doubt, but historic truth no less, that nothing is more entirely unnatural than the unnaturally natural Jesus that rationalism from Paulus down has invented for the wonder of the puzzled world, while in proportion as his supernatural character is admitted does Jesus appear historically natural. This great truth is illustrated again in Dr. Clarke's "Legend of Thomas Didymus." We are struck at once on opening it with the comparative naturalness of the Jesus it presents to us above the Jesus of "Rabbi Jeshua" or "Philochristus." And the reason lies open to every eye: "I am unable," says the preface, "to read the story without the conviction that Jesus possessed some extraordinary power over nature and life" (p. viii.); and accordingly,

<sup>1</sup> *The Legend of Thomas Didymus the Jewish Sceptic.* By James Freeman Clarke, etc. Boston: Lee & Shepard; New York: Charles T. Dillingham, 1881.

throughout the book, Jesus appears endowed with superhuman—no, preternatural—or at least unusual power and wisdom, and thus stands somewhat naturally in the place in the world's history which Jesus confessedly occupied. Above all, it is impossible to deny the resurrection of Christ and retain any historical probability; the life of Jesus, reduced to its lowest dimensions, demands the resurrection as its natural and necessary crown—the course of subsequent history rationalised to its extreme limit demands it as its root. It is actually easier to contend (with Loman, for instance) that there was no Jesus, than, admitting his existence, to deny his resurrection. It is a homage which all historical studies must pay to truth, on pain of betraying their origin in a non-natural and philosophising fancy, that they must frankly own the resurrection of Christ to have actually occurred. Here we see another reason for the stronger impression of probability which Dr. Clarke's Jesus makes on the reader's mind. Dr. Clarke says: "The main fact that Jesus after his death came again to his disciples in visible form, and created a faith in immortality which transformed their whole being, seems to me undeniable. . . . With all respect for those who believe that the apostles imagined that they saw their Master and that this self-illusion was the foundation on which the religion was built which converted Europe to faith in a Jewish Messiah, the supposition appears to me historically incredible. The house which is to stand must be founded on the rock of reality, not on the sand of delusion." (P. x.) Accordingly, in the history itself, Dr. Clarke represents the resurrection of Christ as an actual and very real occurrence. Now this is a great advance over the books we have hitherto had before us; and it is apparent that Dr. Clarke's historical conception of Jesus and the nature of the work he did must be very far above that of either "Rabbi Jeshua" or "Philochristus."

The influence of his truer historical sense becomes apparent again in his dealing with "the written books of the Gospel" as "Onesimus" calls them. In his hands, at last, John's Gospel obtains recognition, and the immense weight of the historical demonstration of the genuineness of our Gospels appears to be felt by him.

We must not leave the impression that his attitude towards or dealing with the narrative is altogether satisfactory; we only mean to say it is far more satisfactory than that of the other apocrypha we have been discussing. He admits that the books sprang from their traditionally reputed authors, although John's was actually penned (from his lips) by an Ephesian scribe; that they are authentic, genuine, and historically credible. The coloring of the narrative they give is not, however, treated as altogether trustworthy—perhaps Dr. Clarke would express it by saying that he does not hold them to be inerrant. Such passages as the following, which are not infrequent, will illustrate his dealing with the history:

“Near the road we saw a fig tree, which seemed full of fruit, and we went towards it to gather some of the figs; but what appeared like fruit were indeed dry leaves, for the fig tree was dying of drought or disease. Then I saw Jesus lift his eyes towards the city and the temple, on which the sun had just arisen, and he said sadly, ‘No one shall again eat thy fruit.’ Afterwards, Matthew and Simon” [*i. e.*, of course the Gospels of Matthew and Mark] “said that he had cursed the fig tree; but to me it appeared that he was speaking of Jerusalem, and that the barren fig tree had seemed to him a type of the nation which would not bring forth fruit to God. The next morning, when we passed that way again, the fig tree had withered almost wholly away, which caused Matthew to say that Jesus had cursed it and wrought a marvel to destroy it. But Jesus answered, ‘Verily I say unto you that if we have faith and do not doubt in our heart, we could lift this mountain and cause it to fall into the sea.’ And the disciples thought he spoke of the Mount of Olives. . . . but I . . . believe that he meant that their prejudice was as great as a mountain, preventing them from receiving the truth. He therefore was praying to God for power to roll away that mountain from their souls. . . . I suppose, therefore, that his disciples were mistaken in this, and did not see the Master's meaning” (p. 343).

“The Pharisees had everywhere circulated a report that Jesus could not be the Messiah who was to come, because he was not descended from David. . . . In answer to this, some of the preachers of the gospel” [represented by Matthew and Luke] “produced genealogies from the archives of the Levites, which were carefully kept in every city, to show that the Master was indeed descended from David, both by the father and mother. My brother Paul laughed at this, and said that whether Jesus was descended from David or not was of no moment, inasmuch as he was declared to be the Son of God with power, by the descent from

death into a higher life. Paul exhorted his disciples not to pay any attention to these endless genealogies and old-wives' fables. Nor, indeed, did Jesus claim any such outward descent from David, but rather declared that the Messiah ought not to be called David's son, since he was greater than David and the Master of David. . . . He did not say, 'Verily my mother and father are both descended from David, as your genealogies will show; and in truth I was not born at Nazareth, but at Bethlehem, the city of David.' Instead of this, he showed that the Coming One would not be a son of David" (pp. 354, 355).

Just so with reference to John's Gospel: it is taught that it was taken down from John's lips, somewhat piecemeal, and that the papers are "not well arranged," "because John himself, not having read them, did not see how they were placed together; for if he had, he would have altered the arrangement" (p. 367). Yet "in John's mind there are no joints, no fitting of one truth to the rest; each stands alone. Hence it easily happens that he may not have given his narrations to the scribe in any proper order, and they may sometimes be put in wrong places" (p. 374). It can be easily seen that by such dealing as this room is left for a considerable reconstruction of the history and a considerable number of rationalising explanations, which Dr. Clarke does not fail to take advantage of.

The way being thus opened for his doctrinal prepossessions and dislike of too much miracle to sway his judgment as to historical details, Dr. Clarke's actual history falls far below what his historical sense should have made it. As an actual historian, too, he fails still more through two more far-reaching faults: defective scholarship and insufficient literary sense. As a piece of literature, the "Legend of Thomas Didymus" is, indeed, somewhat of a marvel. We have not been able to persuade ourselves to undertake seriously its higher criticism; but a cursory reading suggests to us that it might be quite possible to prove that it was written piecemeal, with different purposes and on different plans, and then patched together into one whole—if the result can be called a whole—as an afterthought. Apparently at one time Dr. Clarke intended to compose a "Life of Christ" in a series of letters from various personages, and while he conveyed in them an account of the essential facts, at the same time to work out the



varied conceptions of Jesus' work and person which would naturally be taken by typical representatives of the several classes of the day. This would have given us a book founded somewhat on the method of the well-known works of Dr. Ingraham. The letters, apparently written in the prosecution of this plan, have been incorporated into the narrative of Christ's life, given by Thomas the Doubter to his Indian parishioners, somewhat confusedly and sometimes rather startlingly. The reader comes suddenly on letters of "Epinetus," "Ben 'Tabbai," Pilate's wife, or on the journal of Nicodemus, and wonders if the binder has carelessly sewn in leaves from another volume. The literary character of these letters is higher than that of the main narrative, and they appear to have been much more carefully, perhaps lovingly, composed. Indeed, Dr. Clarke does not seem to have been intended by nature as a writer of romances. We trust we may be forgiven for saying that we scarcely remember coming in any novel on so laughable a love scene as that between Miriam and Thomas; and Miriam's general vacuity and empty twaddle throughout the whole first section of the book is quite intolerable. Dr. Clarke's didactic purpose, again, has clashed with the needs of his romance. Thomas becomes worse than a lay figure in this interest, and a most innocent inquirer after just the information that Dr. Clarke wishes to communicate to his readers, in defiance of all the probabilities of his own situation. Thus he is as objective in speaking of his own people as a modern Sunday-school scholar (p. 40). He tells us himself, at page 26, that he had already "listened to the learned Rabbis," and yet he asks, at page 41, with the most charming show of interest, what "putting a fence around the law means," and, even after that, it is not until page 59 that he has ever seen or heard of a *Pharisee*. He first hears of the existence of the Book of Job at page 68—and the reader wishes he had remained in ignorance still longer, for Dr. Clarke takes occasion to insert at once a long and tiresome analysis of the book, occupying some eleven pages. He understands Greek, at page 81, and listens to Philo's lectures (does Dr. Clarke suppose that Philo lectured in Hebrew?), and yet has to learn Greek at page 96. He had lived in Jerusalem some

years, and yet never heard of Rachel's tomb till he takes a journey to the Dead Sea, at page 113. The climax is capped when in the most engaging simplicity he writes, quite in the strain of a modern tourist, an account of a journey taken with a broken heart as companion. These are only a few samples of what one finds every page or two, in the first half of the book especially. Even greater confusion is wrought by a queer habit of assuming that all of Christ's sayings were spoken more than once, and by repeating the most advanced of them at both the beginning and ending of his life, with the effect of destroying all growth in his teaching and hopelessly jumbling the chronology. Even the very nomenclature is strangely varied. Jesus, for instance, is indifferently Jesus, Joshua-bar-Joseph, and Joshua-bar-Yoseph; the name John appears now as John, now Johann, now Johanan, and anon Yochannan. Dr. Clarke tells us that he has gone over the book "several times with care." What, then, is the reason that such literary blemishes are left so thickly strewn over his pages? that he has allowed his book to leave his hand in a form that places it as a piece of literature well below all the others we have before us? The marks of defective scholarship we shall not attempt to illustrate; they are pervasive, and have not only to do with numerous points of detail, but also with the general tone of the book, and even the authorities relied on. Nor do we care to stay to point out such small slips as that, *e. g.*, by which circumcision is made a temple instead of a household ordinance (p. 53), and Thomas an elaborately educated man—both in conflict with New Testament testimony. We are glad to say that there is a marked improvement in both matter and style at the point where the narrative leaves the "*Zeitgeschichte*," and comes to the life of Christ proper.

We have hinted that Dr. Clarke's dogmatic prepossessions occasionally show themselves. We rejoice that they do not entirely overlay his book and that we have the edifying spectacle of a pronounced Unitarian dealing more soberly with the life of our Lord than works that come to us out of the bosom of the great Church of England. But Dr. Clarke's theology has none the less affected his whole understanding of the story of Jesus'

life; and we fear we must say has led him into some very unedifying dealing with its records. It would have been far better for him to have frankly taken his stand by the side of his co-religionist, Dr. Ellis, and admitted that the Christian records are imbued with "orthodoxy," and are therefore false; far more consistent, though no less unhistorical. Dr. Clarke stops at no rationalising to rid the history of the marks and confessions of Jesus' divinity. Let such passages as the following witness: "I asked him once why he forbade us to tell of all his goodness. And he said, 'Call not me good; none is good save God'" (p. 125). "And when they all cried aloud, and blessed him, he said, 'Bless God, not man; for every good gift is from him'" (p. 133). "Her love is great because her sin having been great, I have brought to her pardon from God" (p. 146). When the paralytic was healed, Jesus said, "'You think it easy to say to this man, 'Thy sins are forgiven,' but not easy to know if they are forgiven. You think that God alone can forgive sins. That is true, but God can give power to man to carry his divine love to other men'" (p. 196). "'Yes, God is my Father; but he is also your Father. . . . Do I boast when I say I am his son? No. . . . Each man is 'the son' to whom the Father says 'my child.' . . . Each one is 'the son' to whom the Father gives spiritual life. . . . As soon as ye are sons ye can raise dead men to life'" (p. 263). "But one said, 'We do not stone thee for thy good works, but because it is blasphemy for a man to make himself God.' Jesus replied, 'It is true I call God my Father; he is my Father, and your Father also when you love him and trust in him. . . . If I *had* called myself God, being a man, I should only do what Moses did. But I do not call myself God, but son of God'" (p. 273). "'I said not that I had seen Abraham, but that Abraham had seen me. Long before Abraham was born, I was chosen in the counsels of God to be what I am'" (p. 274). "He could not let himself be called 'good,' since all goodness flows . . . from God" (p. 298). "'I and my Father are indeed one, . . . all who love God are one with him'" (p. 318). "'Do not look at me,' he said, 'but look through me at him who sent me. For when ye see me, ye see not me but him'" (p. 360). "And Jesus said,

'How canst thou be with me, Philip, without seeing the Father? Dost thou not see that I am always with him and that he is always with me?' Thus, my children, when ye look in a lake, ye see the sun, because the lake reflects the sun, and so when ye look to Jesus, ye see the Father, because God is reflected in that heavenly spirit" (p. 371). "I had found my Master; I had also found my God; for I saw that the goodness and truth of my Master had not been suffered to go down in vain. I once again saw the God of justice and love protecting and guiding all things. Thus, in a moment, I had found my Master; and, in finding him, through him I had found his God and mine. All I could say was, 'MY MASTER AND MY GOD'" (p. 439). Dr. Clarke's further doctrinal prepossessions also show themselves, especially his denial of any true atonement or any second coming of Christ or general resurrection. We shall not stop, however, to illustrate how he manages to deny these things. What we have already given will suffice for our purpose, which was twofold: to point out how often Dr. Clarke is swayed by prejudice rather than by historical considerations, and how elaborate some of his misexplanations are, involving further that they are *conscious* efforts. An intellectual honesty that will despise such things appears to us one of the chief wants of the age.

Some of the passages we have quoted already hint to us how Dr. Clarke tries to make miracles easy to him, and why we have hesitated to say he admits the superhuman, supernatural, or even the preternatural into his narrative. So sure is Dr. Clarke that Jesus is only man that he wishes miracles, too, to appear within the powers of humanity. The text of his message on this matter is simply that miracles are not beyond human power, if only humanity could retain its proper powers. Let us, however, illustrate his conception of the matter from his own words. "Whatever Jesus did, was done so easily and peacefully that it all seemed to belong to the very movement of nature. When I saw Peter thus moving over the waves, it looked natural and as that which any one might do. . . . I thought how often in my dreams I had seemed to myself . . . [as if] . . . I could float without wings in the air. Perhaps, indeed, such dreams are a prophecy

of the time to come when the laws of lightness and weight will be understood and men will be able to learn how to destroy for a time the weight of their bodies" (p. 181). It was the compassion of the Master which "drew forth in him this strange human faculty. I call it human, for all his actions were human—either such as men do now or may do hereafter" (p. 181). He proceeds to explain that in this Jesus was simply "the type and perfect model of what man ought to be," just as the one perfect oak in a grove of stunted oaks is the true type of oaks. He is consequently never tired of speaking of miracle-working as "part of the order of nature" (p. 184); as a natural power (p. 185); "as no violent incursion of the power of God, but a vast unfolding of the powers latent in man" (p. 193), which may take thousands of years to unfold in other men, but which some time may be the heritage of all. So, too, when the voice of thunder answered Jesus at his call, this was natural: "I thought that he indeed needed no voice, but that the heavens and earth sympathised with every great event and that whosoever needed a voice from heaven would have it" (p. 359). It is even elaborately explained how this power of miracle-working is attained, in words professing to come from Jesus himself: "He told us, moreover, how when he lived thus close to God, not only the truth and love of his Father came and dwelt in him, but also the power of the Father. Nature in all her parts became submissive to his will. He had only to wish strongly, and the sick man arose and walked; with a word he could release the madman and lunatic from their bitter bondage; with a word cause the plague of leprosy to flee away. Yet he knew that all this power was not his own, but his Father's, and to be used only for the good of the Father's other children, and to cause the kingdom of love and truth to come" (p. 212). In one passage even a spiritualistic theory of the working of the physical powers of nature is hinted at as possible (p. 192). Even the raising of the dead may be a purely human work: "The limits between life and death—when life is just departed—are not to be known" (p. 193). "Who can tell when seeming death is real death? And may not death itself in its beginnings be arrested by the same hidden power of the soul which can conquer and dispel disease? There-

fore . . . I could . . . believe, and yet believe that this was no violent incursion of the power of God, but a vast unfolding of powers latent in man. It was not God coming down, but man going up." Even the raising of Lazarus may be "only a proof of the exceptional physical or vital force of the Master, shown in a less degree by his curing other [*sic*!] diseases. It was the highest example of the power of the soul over body—of spirit over matter—of vital forces over physical atoms" (p. 329). From all of which we may begin to see what Dr. Clarke's frank admission that Jesus "possessed some extraordinary power" means: "Rabbi Jeshua's" solution of the problem was that Jesus did nothing remarkable; "Philochristus's," that what he did was not very remarkable; "Thomas's" is, that it is human to do remarkable things. The one simply lowers miracles to human capacity; the other elevates human capacity to miracles; in their conception of the person of Jesus while in the world and his manifestation of himself, there is scarcely a choice between them.

Yet Dr. Clarke finds himself bound to engage in the work of lowering our conception of the miracles too. We have already seen examples of this, as for instance in his remarks on the raising of the dead. And indeed, the task of lifting humanity so high is a great one; if it is to succeed, at least miracles must not be either multiplied or magnified unduly. Dr. Clarke frankly admits that some miracles happened, as, for example, cures in general, and especially cases of demoniacs, the walking on the water, the raising of the dead—even of Lazarus. Even these are lowered, however, as much as possible by the assumption that the action of the miraculous power was *slow* (pp. 132, 136, 186, 277)—as if that made it any more explicable—sometimes by a hint that it was even *incomplete* (p. 277). Other miracles have doubt thrown on them—as, for example, the seven demons cast out of Mary Magdalene appear to have been only bad mental states, like "despair, the most deadly" of them all (p. 173). Others are frankly explained away. The money found in the fish's mouth is but a misunderstood trope; the descent of the dove at Jesus' baptism was but John's poetical words misinterpreted literally; the temptation was a parable; the falling down

of the mob in Gethsemane was owing to the pushing back of the front rank, etc. The miracle of the loaves and fishes furnishes perhaps the best example of Dr. Clarke's methods: "The prayer was so heavenly that all of my own hunger went away. . . . The people took the little morsels from his hands and tasted, and gave it quickly to their neighbors. I saw many who had concealed their food to keep it for their own use; and they also brought it forward to be blessed, and gave it speedily to each other" (p. 179). No wonder, if no one was hungry, and no one ate, and "many" brought out hidden food, there were twelve baskets full of fragments gathered up! The reader will observe, however, that Dr. Clarke, when his purpose serves, can suggest explanations of a class which neither "Philochristus" nor "Rabbi Jeshua" would care to countenance.

Of course, Jesus' foresight goes with his miracles. We are told sententiously: "The Master's foresight was insight" (p. 309); but how "insight" which was not "foresight" could have told him just how many times Peter would deny him (p. 311), or that the distant Lazarus was dead (p. 319), Dr. Clarke has neglected to explain.

We do not purpose, however, in the case of Dr. Clarke, any more than in the cases of the other books we have had before us, to enter into any detailed refutation of the views put forth. Our purpose has been simply expository, and we judge that we have already said enough to exhibit the insufficiency of the narrative Dr. Clarke has put forth to stand as a "Life of Christ." One thing else has, perhaps, been made evident: Dr. Clarke's methods of work are similar to, perhaps not a whit sounder than, those of the authors of "Rabbi Jeshua" and "Philochristus." We, for one, cannot see why Dr. Clarke has not gone quite as far as they, except that his dogmatic or critical prepossessions did not demand it of him. He has gone just as far as his prejudices went, and the result is necessarily only another parody on the divine life of which the Gospels tell.

Are our readers ready to take these four "Gospels" in the place of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John? We must confess

that our study of them has not predisposed us in their favor. It is all too plain why they are what they are, and—omitting Mr. Hart's "Judas," which may stand as the representative of *orthodox* "apocrypha"—their parallelism with the heretical apocryphal Gospels of the early Church is startling. Even the methods of the chief heretics are reproduced in them: at one extreme, "Rabbi Jeshua," like Marcion, uses the shears; at the other, Dr. Clarke, like Valentinus, through desire "*uti integro instrumento*," seeks relief through strange exegesis. They stand together in this, however, that to one and all alike the motive of writing is hatred of the supernatural—it is miracle which is the common *σκανδαλον*. The actual conception of the character and dramatisation of the acts of the non-miraculous Christ whom they invent is more difficult to account for. Lord Tennyson, in a recent letter, complains of certain critics who "impute themselves" to their victim. "There are many historians," writes Gibbon, "who put us in mind of the admirable saying of the great Condé to Cardinal de Retz: '*Ces coquins nous font parler et agir comme ils auroient fait eux-mêmes à notre place*.'" Can this be the explanation of these so painfully grating portraiture of Jesus? At all events, as historical studies, our apocrypha must be pronounced valueless and undeserving of serious refutation. In reading them, we have felt with unwonted vividness the truth of M. Renan's words—words which may be taken as having special reference to studies of this class and of this tendency—for is not he himself a notable writer of apocrypha?—"I was drawn towards the historical sciences—little conjectural sciences, which are pulled down as often as they are set up, and which will be neglected an hundred years hence."<sup>1</sup> "A hundred years hence!" Ah! the great historico-romanticist has given far too long a lease of life to such books as ours. No doubt, he would himself admit it, for was he not speaking of himself in these words? and was he not speaking of our authors in these: "*En réalité, pas de personnes ont le droit de ne pas croire au Christianisme*" ? in which we fully agree with him. For the rest, we wish only in

---

<sup>1</sup> In "Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse," 1883.



conclusion to remind our authors and all of like mind with them that *criticism of sources* is not to be confined to those who wrote two thousand years ago—that modern writers, too, may be ordered to stand and give account of their authorities—especially when they are found fashioning strange stories—(may we be allowed one word of Greek?)—

ὁθεν καί τις οὐδε ἰδοίτο.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

## ARTICLE VII.

### AN EXPOSITION OF ROMANS VI. 4.

Perhaps no portion of God's word has been less understood, and more perverted, than the one which the writer now proposes to expound. Some of the most dangerous errors of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches in ancient times had their origin in a wrong interpretation of this Scripture; and beyond doubt, many of the injurious and false teachings of Baptists, Campbellites, and Mormons in modern days had the same origin. This text, misunderstood and perverted, has in all ages been the main resource of immersionists, from Tertullian and others in the second century down to J. R. Graves, Alexander Campbell, and Joe Smith the Mormon, in this nineteenth century. Therefore, before proceeding to a direct exposition of the text, we will first storm and capture this stronghold of the immersionists, and instead of spiking their big gun, will turn it heavily loaded against their vulnerable ranks. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Now, please to observe here, that God's word in this text affirms that by baptism we are buried into *death*, while immersionists teach that we ought to be buried into *water*. The Lord teaches one thing, and immersionists teach another and very different thing. Death is one thing, water is quite another

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—12.

thing. The Lord buries his people into *death*. Immersionists bury their followers into water. Such is the very wide and irreconcilable difference between the Lord of glory and the immersionists. Whom shall we follow, the immersionists or the Lord? We say, the Lord.

But, say the immersionists, the water is implied in the text, even if it is not expressly named, because there can be no baptism without water. Not so fast, if you please. Not so thought John the Baptizer, when he said that Christ should baptize "with [or in] the Holy Ghost" (Mark iii. 3). Not so thought the Lord Jesus, when he said to his disciples, "Ye shall be baptized with [or in] the Holy Ghost" (Acts i. 5). Not so thought the inspired apostle Paul, when he said, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13). There may, therefore, be, and there certainly is, a scriptural and very precious baptism without water. What right has any mortal man to see or read water between the lines, when the Lord has not put water, but rather death, in the line? Who has the right to alter and amend the word of God by striking out the word *death* and inserting the word *water*? Let him who dares to do the deed, answer to God for his heaven-daring impiety.

And yet no longer ago than last May, we heard an immersionist utter in a sermon the following assertion: "We read in the Scriptures that in the days of the apostles, when any one wished to be baptized, he went down into the water, was buried in it, and then came up out of it." Next day when respectfully asked to tell where the Scriptures said anything about a burial in water, he referred to the very text on which we are now commenting, thus showing that he had erased the word *death* from this text and had amended it by inserting water. And he stands not alone in his sin. Thousands of others are constantly doing the same thing; and after thus shamefully interpolating this Scripture, they flout the false charge in the face of all others that they are unbaptized because they have not been buried in water, and therefore that they are unfit for a place at the Lord's table. "O shame, where is thy blush?"

Again, it is wholly from this text and the similar one in Col.

ii. 12 that immersionists derive their absurd theory that water-baptism is a sign or symbol of the burial and resurrection of Christ and his people. Now let us consider this shallow theory. According to the faith of all Christians, both orthodox and heretic, the sacrament of the Supper symbolises Christ and his work for our salvation. And according to the faith of multitudes of good Christians, the only other sacrament, which is baptism with water, symbolises the Holy Spirit and his indispensable work in and upon our hearts for our regeneration and sanctification. Christ's work and the Spirit's work make up the *whole* of our salvation. And thus, according to this scriptural and common-sense theory, the only two sacraments in the Christian Church symbolise and visibly set forth the whole of our redemption. But immersionists, who erroneously make water-baptism symbolise the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, have no sacrament at all to tell them anything about the blessed Spirit and his gracious work, without which no man can be saved. Thus, according to their lame theory, the half of our salvation remains untaught and unrepresented by divine sacramental symbols. What symbolises the Spirit and his operations if water baptism does not? Verily, as the prophet declares, "The legs of the lame are not equal." Moreover, why should we have two sacraments to symbolise our one Lord Christ? Immersionists will answer: one of these sacraments reminds us of our Lord's death, and the other of his burial and resurrection. But we reply, that it is wholly unscriptural and unwarrantable to confine the sacrament of the Supper to the *death* of Christ. When he instituted this sacrament, he said to his disciples, "This do in remembrance of ME" (Luke xxii. 19). Observe well that the Lord says, "in remembrance of *me*," and not simply in remembrance of my death. While this sacrament does remind Christians of their Redeemer's death, it also, at the same time, reminds them of him and of his whole life and work. The Christian at the Lord's table, who does not remember Jesus from the manger in Bethlehem to his mediatorial throne in glory, fails more or less to obey his Lord's dying command, "This do in remembrance of *me*." Where, then, is there a need of another sacrament to remind us of the Lord Jesus Christ? But, still

further, why should we have any sacrament at all to remind us of the *burial* of Christ? Does his *burial* avail anything towards our salvation? The Scriptures affirm again and again that Christ was born for us, lived for us, humbled himself for us, prayed for us, taught for us, obeyed for us, suffered for us, was made a curse for us, died for us, arose for us, and ascended to heaven for us; but where is it even hinted that *he was buried for us*? From the word of God we can see no reason why our redemption would not have been just as complete as it now is, even if Christ had not been buried at all. And in the name of the Lord, and in behalf of his sacred cause, we call on all the advocates of the burial theory of water baptism to point out even one text of Scripture which teaches plainly that Christ's *burial* avails anything towards our redemption, or that the baptism with water was instituted to remind us of the *burial* of our divine Redeemer. But we know well that no mortal man can comply with this reasonable demand for a "thus saith the Lord." Therefore we demand again, in the name of the Lord, why should we believe and teach, as immersionists erroneously do, that one of the only two sacraments in the Christian Church was instituted to remind us of an event in our Lord's history, when that event does no Christian any good whatever, while we will thus be left without any sacrament at all to remind us of the blessed Spirit and of his all-important operations, without which no human soul can be saved? Such an ignoring of the gracious Spirit and of his divine work of grace must be very offensive to his loving and tender heart. But to speak the whole truth on this point, it should be said that Christ was not really buried at all. He was simply laid temporarily in Joseph's new tomb, to remain there no longer than the continuance of the Sabbath, which was so near at hand when he died that his friends had only time sufficient to give him then a hasty temporary interment before the beginning of the Sabbath. And therefore we are told that, when his friends went to his sepulchre early on the morning of the third day, they carried with them the spices which they had prepared for his burial (Mark xvi. 1 and Luke xxiii. 56). Hence our Lord's burial was never completed, because, when they arrived at his grave to bury

him, they found that he had already risen and had left the place of his temporary interment. Yes, the burial theory of water baptism is wholly unscriptural and unreasonable, and therefore, we ask, can water baptism be valid, when the administrator of it perverts its meaning by teaching that he baptizes his converts in order to remind them and others of the burial of Christ, instead of teaching correctly, as John the Baptizer did, saying, "I baptize you with water, but he [Christ] shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost"? If, in administering the Lord's Supper, we should teach the people that the Supper must be eaten in remembrance of the Holy Ghost, would that Supper be a valid sacrament? We trow not. In like manner, we can see no validity in the sacrament of baptism when the administrator perverts or destroys its significancy by falsely teaching the people that it symbolises the burial and resurrection of Christ.

But now let the theory of the immersionists be turned against their practice. Let us, for the moment, suppose that water baptism does symbolise our Lord's burial; let us further suppose that we ought to be baptized with water in the same way in which Christ was buried, or in which the dead are usually buried. Then what will follow? Why, of course it will follow that the practice of immersionists in baptizing is wholly at fault. Who ever saw a dead man walk down into his own grave, as all immersed persons do walk into what they unscripturally style their "liquid graves"? Who ever saw a dead man rise out of his grave as soon as he has been put into it? Christ did not walk into his temporary tomb; neither was he thrust or plunged into it, as immersionists are plunged into their "liquid graves." Christ's temporary resting-place was a room cut out of a solid rock above ground, with a door in the side, and resembled an ordinary house more than a "liquid grave" or any other grave; and when he was reverently borne into it, the act of burying him was very much like the act of men bearing a dead man into the room of an ordinary dwelling-house, but not at all like the act of an immersionist plunging a man into a "liquid grave" in some muddy creek or river. But we have often heard immersionists say that people ought to be baptized just as they will be

buried when dead. Well, when our friends die, do we take them out to the grave-yard and then push, thrust, or plunge them into the earth just as immersionists push, thrust, or plunge their converts into a "liquid grave"? We trow not. No, we lay them gently down, and then pour or put the *earth upon them*, just as we put clean water upon the living man when we baptize him with water. Hence this champion text of the immersionists is *against them* and in our favor, even if it does teach that water baptism is a burial.

Furthermore, in this connexion, immersionists make much use of the verse following the text under consideration: "For if we have been *planted* together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." And they often ask us, with an air of triumph, "If you should sprinkle a little handful of earth upon a dead man's head, could you say that you had planted or buried him?" By way of reply, we ask them a reasonable question, How does the planter plant his seed? Does he plant as the immersionist baptizes? Does he throw, thrust, or plunge the seed into the earth? Or does he not rather put the earth *upon* the seed, just as we baptize by putting the water upon the subject? Therefore, if baptism with water be either a burial or a planting, the practice of immersionists is wholly wrong, and they must amend either their theory or their practice, for they are as wide apart as the distant poles. Let them, therefore, put the water on their converts just as they put the earth on their dead friends, and just as they put the earth on their seed when they bury or plant; or let them abandon their absurd theory that water baptism is a burial. Their favorite text, even on their own theory, is fully against them and wholly in our favor.

But observe further. When immersionists attempt to define the original of the word baptize, they persistently insist upon giving it what they incorrectly style its *primary* meaning, immerse. Now, we will turn the tables on them by giving the *primary* meaning of the original word in the text translated "buried," which is *burned up*. Hence, if we take the *primary* meaning of the Greek word, we might translate thus: "Therefore we are

burned up with him by baptism into death," etc., or more briefly, we are burned to death. And such a translation would bring us much nearer to a correct understanding of the text than we could possibly derive by listening to the watery harangues of immersionists upon the subject. There are many facts to sustain such a translation. Paul wrote this text in Greek, and he uses a Greek word which originally signified to burn up, or consume into ashes. He wrote to the Romans; and it is well known that the Greeks, Romans, and other ancient peoples usually burned up their dead, as some people, even in these United States, now do. Now we ask, what resemblance is there between burning up a dead body and plunging a living body into the water?

But lastly, immersionists teach that water baptism symbolises the *resurrection* as well as the burial of Christ, and they base their faith in such a theory wholly on this text. And it is true that, while this verse says nothing at all about Christ's burial, it does speak very plainly of his resurrection. But does it say that, as Christ was raised up from the dead, even so must we be raised up out of the water, or out of a "liquid grave"? Far from it. And yet that is exactly the construction which immersionists give to this latter part of the verse. Hence all their nonsensical twaddle about "liquid graves," and being raised up out of "liquid graves," just as Christ was raised up out of his grave, and of following Christ into and out of the grave, etc., etc. "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." That is the teaching of inspiration. "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should be raised up from a 'liquid grave.'" The latter is the teaching of the immersionists. And such is the manner in which they mutilate, interpolate, and amend or alter the sacred Scriptures. And on the strength of such perversions of God's word, they complacently assert: We are the people of God. We are the only true Church, and all others are outsiders and not fit to eat and to drink with us. Alas! alas!!

Thus have we fulfilled our promise to storm and capture the stronghold of the immersionists, and to turn their big gun,

heavily charged and shotted, against their broken and demoralised ranks. And now, with their big gun, let us give the Baptists a parting shot. If Baptists are justified in making this verse teach a water baptism and a literal burial of the living body in a liquid grave, then they are wholly unjustifiable in their bitter opposition to Alexander Campbellism. The latter part of this fourth verse positively affirms that after we have been buried with Christ by baptism into death, we arise "to walk in newness of life." Therefore nothing can be plainer than the fact that Paul is here speaking of a baptism which washes away sin and renews the soul; and, therefore, if he here speaks of a water baptism, he must assuredly be teaching that water baptism does effectually wash away sin and renew the soul, which is Campbellism. And therefore, upon their own theory, the Baptists are in error and the Campbellites are right; and consequently every Baptist, to be consistent, ought to join the Campbellite Church and believe and teach as they do, namely, that not "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son," but *water*, "cleanseth us from all sin."

And now a farewell shot at the Campbellites. If Campbellites are right in teaching that sin is washed away by or in water baptism, they all ought to forsake their own Church and join the Mormons, who by immersion in water wash away their sins every Sabbath day. All men sin every week; and if immersion in water will wash away sin, all men, including Campbellites, cannot be immersed too often.

What has been said is not intended as an assertion, or even an insinuation, that there are not vast multitudes of good Christian people in the Baptist denomination. Far from our heart be such a thought! But we do not only insinuate, but also assert, that the Baptist who stops short of Campbellism and Mormonism, after arriving at the conclusion that Paul speaks of water baptism in this text, and that therefore water baptism is a water burial, acts inconsistently and illogically, and ought not to oppose Campbellites and Mormons in the matter of baptism with water.

Having now removed the rubbish out of the way, and having swept aside the false glosses with which errorists have obscured the real meaning of the text, we are prepared for its fuller exposition.



In the preceding chapters of this Epistle Paul had clearly and emphatically taught the doctrine of justification by faith without the deeds of the law; and in this sixth chapter he anticipates and answers an obvious objection to the doctrine. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" (verse 1). As if he had said, Inasmuch as we are saved by grace, through faith, and not by works, shall we say, Then upon that theory we need not perform good works at all, but we should rather continue to sin more and more, because the more sin we commit, the more will God's abundant grace be magnified in our salvation? Having raised and clearly stated the objection to the doctrine he had previously taught, the apostle in verse 2d replies, "God forbid!" and asks the question, "How shall we that are *dead to sin*, live any longer therein?" As much as to say, The same grace which justifies us by faith, without the deeds of the law, also and at the same time kills us to the love and practice of sin, and makes us alive to God and to good works; and therefore we cannot continue in sin, and we have no wish to sin. Thus he shows that the doctrine of free and full justification by grace, through faith, without works, has no tendency to encourage Christians to give a loose rein to licentiousness. He teaches here the same truth which John taught, when he said: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his *seed remaineth in him*; and he *cannot sin*, because he is born of God" (1 John iii. 9). Then, in the third verse, the apostle goes on to show how we become dead to sin, so that we cannot live any longer therein, saying, "Know ye not that so many of us as were *baptized into Jesus Christ* were baptized into his death?" Observe well that he says nothing about any one being baptized into water, or into a "liquid grave," but that he does affirm that we were baptized into *Christ*, and into his *death*. Here we are taught one of the greatest, sublimest, and, at the same time, the most real and precious of all the many mysteries of the gospel—"baptized into Christ" and "into his death." Paul does not say that we are baptized in or into the *name* of Christ. By or with *water* we were baptized in, or into, the *name* of the Lord. But here we are told of a baptism which really and effectually puts us

into Christ himself and into his death, and not merely into his name. What this baptism is the apostle himself tells us in 1 Cor. xii. 13, by saying: "For by one *Spirit* (not by one water) are we all *baptized into one body*," to wit, Christ or Christ's body. The baptism of the Holy Ghost is not a figure or a figurative baptism, as some ignorantly and erroneously affirm, but is a real and most efficient baptism, putting us really and spiritually into Christ, whereby we become wholly identified with him, and altogether one with him in all things pertaining to life and godliness. Our complete, but spiritual, union with and in Christ is plainly taught in many other portions of Scripture. Besides our Lord's parable of the vine and the branches in the fifteenth chapter of John, and Paul's parable of the good olive tree and its branches in the eleventh chapter of Romans, take the following texts as examples: "Now are ye the body of Christ, and members in particular" (1 Cor. xii. 27). "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones" (Eph. v. 30). On this point we should not overlook our Lord's prayer, with its reach of comprehension and its depth of spiritual significance: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for all them who shall believe on me, through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be ONE IN US" (John xvii. 20, 21).

No mortal man can explain the manner in which this vital and spiritual union of all Christians with their Lord is accomplished. Our Lord himself tells us that the mode of the Spirit's operations in causing the new birth of the soul, is just as inexplicable and mysterious as is the blowing of the unseen wind. But while we cannot understand how the invisible winds blow, we yet do know that they do blow, and that they sometimes blow with fearful and devastating power. And in like manner, although we cannot tell how the divine Spirit baptizes us into Christ, and into his death, and thus crucifies us to the love and wilful practice of sin, and raises us up new creatures; yet, by experience and observation and the testimony of God, we know that this good work has been most efficiently performed for the salvation of countless millions. In the fourth verse the apostle repeats and enlarges

upon the glorious theme, saying, "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." As if he had said: As we were baptized by the Holy Ghost into Christ and into his death, it follows that we were in Christ when he died, and died with and in him; and we were in him when he was laid in Joseph's new tomb; and then the old Adam in us was crucified with and in him, and was buried, or laid away, for ever out of life and out of sight; and because of this our union with and in him, when he rose from the dead the third day, we also arose with him, and leaving the old Adam behind buried in the tomb to rise no more, we go forth new creatures to walk in newness of life. The preceding sentence tells what took place potentially, and in the purpose of God, at the time of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, and what is actualised from time to time in the real experience of Christians. Our whole salvation potentially, and in the divine purpose, was accomplished when Christ died and rose again. But each individual's salvation becomes an experienced and actual fact only at the moment when he believes in the Lord Jesus Christ.

We are now fully prepared to grasp and comprehend the length and depth and breadth and height of the apostle's argument. It is substantially the following: By our baptism into Christ by one Spirit we died to sin in him, and our depraved nature was crucified and buried with him to rise no more, but out of this spiritual death and burial our renewed souls arose with him to new spiritual life, to walk, not in sin, but in newness of life; and therefore we cannot, and we will not, continue in sin. Consequently, the doctrine of full and free justification and salvation, by grace through faith, without the deeds of the law, will not lead to licentiousness; nor will it encourage any Christian to live or continue in sin that grace may abound, because Christians are dead to sin and cannot live any longer therein.

This exposition of the text is confirmed by a consideration of the sixth verse: "Knowing this, that our old man (the old Adam in us) is crucified (put to death) with him, that the body of sin

(our inbred corruption) might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." From this verse we learn *what is dead and buried*. It is lawful to bury the dead, but it is not lawful to bury the living. Paul here tells us that the "old man" is crucified, or put to death. Therefore let the old man be buried out of sight for ever and ever; and the old man, by the baptism of the Holy Ghost at our regeneration, is both crucified and buried for ever and for evermore. We here again see the very wide and irreconcilable variance between the Lord and the immersionists. The Lord buries the dead; but the immersionists bury the living. The Lord crucifies and buries the old Adam; but the immersionists bury the living bodies of flesh.

In the eleventh verse the apostle draws the final conclusion of his whole argument, saying, "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be *dead indeed unto sin*, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Now, in view of the mighty effects and salutary and lasting fruits of the baptism of which Paul speaks in the text, will any one venture to assert that he had in mind only a burial in water, or in a liquid grave? If any should persist in misinterpreting and perverting this sublime text to the support of dangerous errors, and should continue to eviscerate and destroy this most instructive and comforting passage of God's word by asserting that it teaches a burial in a liquid grave, they must expect some honest lover of God's truth to enter a protest, loud, earnest, and persistent.

GROVES H. CARTLEDGE.

## ARTICLE VIII.

## THE COMING OF THE LORD.

Premillennarians, in dealing with this subject, are generally very positive in their statements. They do not always agree with each other, but they all see clearly and are very decided notwithstanding. With admirable point, if not correctness, they sometimes bring the discussion down to a sort of mathematical diagram, illustrating the subject before the eye as well as submitting it to the understanding. For this they are to be commended. Truth is a positive thing, and the faith that cannot be positively stated and defended is not worth having.

Those who reject their views have not always, perhaps, been equally famous in this regard. They have dealt rather in criticism and objection than in the positive statement of what they hold to be true. This is an easy method of conducting the discussion, but it is not satisfactory. If a given theory be shown to be encumbered with unanswerable difficulties, the other side may still need elucidation and proof. The apostolic motto, "By manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience," contains the true method of argumentation.

With but slight attention, therefore, to other theories and interpretations, it is proposed to give in these pages what we hold to be the plain and positive teaching of Scripture on this subject. The truth will vindicate itself; and we are fully persuaded that the mind of the Spirit may be as clearly discerned and as positively formulated on this as on any other point.

In presenting it, our Saviour and his apostles employ various forms of expression, such as *coming, cometh, will come, come again, come quickly, appear, appearing, reveal, revelation, day of the Lord, that day, day of visitation, at the door, draweth nigh*, etc. These are so numerous, and are used with such solemn emphasis, that the subject is kept constantly prominent as one of abiding and overwhelming importance. Twenty verses out of every hundred, it is alleged, refer to it in some form or other.

Beyond all question, our Lord intended that it should occupy a large place in the thoughts of mankind as well as in the affections of his people. Above all others, perhaps, it seems to be *the truth* by which he would comfort the Church and warn the world. To understand it correctly is therefore in the highest degree important and salutary.

Before inquiring into the New Testament aspects of the doctrine of his coming, or into the usage of the above terms as there presented, let us consult the Old Testament Scriptures for a moment, that we may see what was the usage of the Spirit in the earliest times. Beginning with Gen. xi. 5, and scattered all the way through to the very last verse of Malachi, we have such language as the following: "The Lord came down to see the city." Ex. xx. 24. "In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee." 2 Sam. xxii. 10, 11. "He bowed the heavens also and came down, and darkness was under his feet. He rode upon a cherub and did fly; and he was seen upon the wings of the wind." Joel ii. 1. "For the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand." Zeph. i. 14. "The great day of the Lord is near, it is near."<sup>1</sup>

These, with the marginal references just given, are by no means all the instances in which such language is used. Whoever will take the trouble to consult his Concordance will probably be surprised to see how such phrases abound in the Old Testament. From the very day when God visited Adam in the Garden to the close of the volume *the appearance of the Lord, the coming of the Lord, the nearness of his coming, at the door, at hand, drawing nigh*, all these are among the most familiar representations concerning the most High. The Israelites had these pregnant utterances from the beginning, and were accustomed to look, wait, pray for, or dread the event which they portrayed. Times without number the Lord came to them, appeared among them or for them, visited them in mercy or in wrath. Their enemies trembled at his coming and fled away in confusion.

---

<sup>1</sup> See also Ex. xxxiii. 5; Ps. l. 3, lxxx. 2, cxliv. 5; Isa. ii. 12, x. 3, xiii. 6, 9, xix. 1, xxvi. 21, xxxv. 4, lxiv. 1, 3; Micah i. 3, 5, vii. 4; Mal. iv. 6.

The very idols were moved at his presence and fell prostrate before him.

The strength and explicitness of these utterances, too, as well as the frequency and the latitude with which they are employed, are worthy of special notice. "He bowed the heavens and came down, and darkness was under his feet. He rode upon a cherub and did fly, and he was seen upon the wings of the wind." "I will come up into the midst of thee in a moment and will consume thee." Ex. xxxiii. 5. Nothing stronger or more explicit is found anywhere. And yet no one supposes for a moment that any personal or visible coming is denoted by such language. It is clearly providential and spiritual in its bearing. No specific form or time of coming is described. The history abundantly shews that the Lord came when he had some special design to accomplish, whenever his people sought him aright, abode with them while they walked in his ways, departed from them when they forsook his law, and returned again in waking up the spirit of penitence or in visiting them for their sin. In other words, according to Old Testament usage, *the coming of the Lord is a generic event*. Any special visitation of mercy or of judgment is *a coming, a day, a great day, a terrible day of the Lord*, as the Spirit chose to designate. God himself encouraged the people with the promise, or warned them with the threat, of his coming. They longed for it or dreaded it according to their circumstances. The idea of it entered constantly into their prayers and songs, and was a chief element of their hopes and fears. All this lies on the very surface of the record, too plainly to be overlooked or denied, and has, as we believe, an important bearing on the correct understanding of the whole subject.

Coming now to the New Testament, where these forms of expression so greatly abound, the reasonable presumption is that they are here used very much in the same sense. Our Lord and his apostles were imbued in mind and spirit with the Jewish Scriptures. So, for the most part, were the people whom they addressed. It would be exceedingly natural, therefore, to say the least, that when employing the same or similar terms they should use them in the familiar signification. Such we believe is

actually the fact, as will appear in the sequel. This much, at any rate, may be fairly concluded in advance, that the mere employment of such terms does not necessarily involve the idea of a personal coming, or show that they apply to one specific event, any more than it did under the old dispensation. The sense in which they are used, as under the former economy, is to be determined in each separate instance by the connexion in which they are found and by the analogy of the whole. In the neglect of this, or rather in the quiet but groundless assumption of their substantial uniformity of reference to a single and definite form of coming, we have the first grand mistake of premilenarians. They see only one thing in all these utterances, as appears in almost all their writings. Want of discrimination here is the main source of embarrassment on the whole subject.

Without laying undue stress, however, on the above presumption, we pass now to the examination of what was said to the early Church by its founders. If we mistake not, there is a distinct line of truth, at once simple, clear, consistent, and comprehensive, running through the New Testament, which may be readily presented under three general propositions.

I. *The introduction and establishment of the gospel dispensation is presented as The Coming of the Son of Man.*

The first allusion of our Lord to the subject of his coming again is in these words: "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come." Matt. x. 23. He was sending out the twelve to "preach the gospel of the kingdom," which John the Baptist and he himself also had declared to be "at hand." He had forbidden their going "into the way of the Gentiles," or "into any city of the Samaritans." He had limited them to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and so far as the record shews, makes his first allusion to a future coming in the words above. Whatever the advent here announced may be, it was to be an accomplished fact before they had gone over the small territory of Palestine or were at liberty to preach the gospel to the Gentiles. The impossibility of denying this will be still more apparent under the next proposition; but for the present this one unequivocal declaration is sufficient. There was



to be a true and real coming of the Son of man within that generation. Surely, literalism can desire nothing plainer or more certain.<sup>1</sup>

In what way was this coming to be realised? Turning forward to the next allusion (Matt. xvi. 18, and to the parallel passages, Mark ix. 1 and Luke ix. 27), we have light. "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming *in his kingdom*." "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they *see the kingdom of God*." Beyond all question these four varying forms of expression refer to and describe the same event, and are mutually explanatory of each other. To "see the kingdom of God" (Luke) was to "see the Son of man come" (Matthew).

But what is meant by "the kingdom of God" which the men of that generation were to see? The gospel dispensation undoubtedly. Daniel foretells it when he says, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." John the Baptist announces it when, as the herald before the King, he cries, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." The idea underlies and runs all through the parables. In Luke ix. 2, it is said, "He sent them to preach *the kingdom of God*;" and in verse 6, "They departed and went through the towns *preaching the gospel*." To preach the gospel was to preach the kingdom. To see and receive the gospel was to see and receive the kingdom. Hence the Saviour says, "Since the days of John the Baptist the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Believing souls actually saw it, entered it, the moment they accepted him. Precisely in the same sense our missionaries carry the kingdom with them when they go to the heathen, and those who accept their message "see the Son of man come," "see the king-

---

<sup>1</sup> The effort to parry the force of this verse by laying emphasis on the original word for "gone over," *i. e.*, finished, or completed, and then claiming that their work is not yet "finished," is too puerile to need serious refutation. It is done, however, and is but a sample both of the straits in which premillenarians find themselves and of the explanatory criticisms to which they are compelled to resort.

dom come with power," enter into it, and are partakers of its privileges and blessings. What the apostles saw in their day all succeeding ages have witnessed. This simple and natural interpretation is forced upon us by the passages in question. They need no gloss or violence to make them intelligible, nor can any such thing, however ingenious, wrest them from their true import. Torture itself cannot twist them into anything else that will bear scrutiny.

Nor was it simply once, and for that age, that the Son of man thus came. The idea is generic. It was to inaugurate a great and blessed system, according to which he has been "coming in his kingdom" ever since, and will continue to come until the dispensation is ended. The prayer which he put into the mouth of the disciples, "Thy kingdom come," is precisely to this import. They were to see and enter it themselves, then pray and labor for its advancement, as all succeeding generations have been permitted and required to do. The great missionary work of the Church is but the effort to embody and carry out this grand enterprise.

An illustration of the whole subject may be drawn from the planting and growth of our national republic. With the destruction of the tea in Boston harbor, the battle of Bunker Hill, and the mutterings of discontent all over the land, it might have been said, The birth of a new nation is at hand. It was said, in substance, by leading minds in both hemispheres. Many of our fathers anxiously awaited its appearance, praying and expecting to see it before tasting death. Nor were they disappointed. Soon the happy vision was granted. With the Declaration of Independence and the successful issue of the war that followed, they saw the young republic set up—were part and parcel of it themselves. It was the same republic then as now, though not so fully developed. It has stood unchanged, yet advancing, ever since. Every agitation from without or from within, as well as the peaceful patriotic efforts of the citizens, has but caused its roots to strike deeper into the soil and its branches to spread wider over the surface. With true principles of human liberty, and with almost unlimited territory to be occupied, it has opened

its doors to the world. Accepting the invitation, the people have come from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, and have entered into the inheritance, enlarging the nation, but not changing its identity. Thus the republic came at the beginning and has been coming ever since. May its shadow never grow less.

So with the kingdom of God. It was set up by the Lord of Glory himself. The disciples saw it in their day. The people entered it in throngs in their time. It has stood unchanged and yet advancing on the whole ever since. It has levelled down mountain barriers, leaped over troubled oceans, lifted up the slaves of sin, broken off the shackles of bondage, and brought to light the brotherhood of men under "the King of kings." It has come and is still coming "in power and great glory." No weapon that is formed against it shall prosper.

With great confidence we plant our feet here. Rejecting the premillennial advent entirely, we at the same time deny also that the overthrow of Jerusalem, or the final judgment, taken separately or combined, constitute "the coming" of the Lord" in any special or exclusive sense. The prime ground idea of the whole subject is, the inauguration and administration of the gospel kingdom, of which these are only parts. This administration embraces everything, and is no more personal and visible in its later than in its earlier stages, until the time of the end. It is now in progress. "There was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end." Hence he says: "The Father . . . hath committed all judgment to the Son." "I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hell and of death."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> There is no force in the objection that we spiritualise "the coming." The Saviour himself evidently does the same, as we have seen. So do all premillenarians when it suits them. There is no possible way of interpreting the Bible without it. Beyond all question the spiritual and providential is the prevailing idea, the personal and visible the exceptional, in both dispensations, as we shall see more and more clearly in the sequel. Premillenarians reverse the inspired order.

In assuming the functions of this administration he came. The precise moment or method we pretend not to fix; but they who saw the kingdom set up saw the Son of man come. In the discharge of these functions he is "Head over all things to the Church which is his body." From him "all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together increaseth with the increase of God." This is the kingdom and the administration against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. Glorious things are spoken of it. Prophecy, promise, parable, and doctrine alike do travail in setting forth its nature and its career. "And the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High." "It cometh not with observation;" but "he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet."

In further confirmation of what has been said, it is worthy of notice that the beloved John opens his great *Apokalupsis* by condensing the entire dispensation into a single sentence—"The Revelation of Jesus Christ." This refers not to a particular and definite incident, but covers the whole period of the mediatorial administration, and gives the key note not only of this mysterious book, but of all history as well. It is all a revelation of Jesus, who has gone "forth conquering and to conquer;" and who, while opening the seals as the ages roll along, is challenging the universe to "come and see."

As coincident with these views, the prophetic glimpses of his kingdom are worthy of notice. In these he is constantly presented in a twofold character, *i. e.*, as a mighty Conqueror, and yet a mild and peaceful Prince winning his way by gentle and spiritual agencies. In the former aspect the strongest martial language is employed. "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron: thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." "He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill the places with the dead bodies; he shall wound the heads over many countries." "I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth." In the latter aspect, "He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be

heard in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth." "He shall be called . . . the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever."

How are these almost contradictory aspects of his kingdom to be reconciled? Some seem to think that they pertain to different dispensations; as though the Prince of Peace were now trying the latter method, which will not be successful, and will therefore come in person at some future day to set up his kingdom as a mighty temporal ruler. Not so, however, do we understand the matter. In our apprehension, these aspects of his kingdom have a contemporaneous existence. So it was under the old dispensation. Providence and grace wrought together in delivering the people from bondage and bringing them into the land of promise. Even so also under the present dispensation is Jesus raising up and casting down the nations according to his mighty power, and at the same time binding up the broken hearted, proclaiming liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound. This he is doing all the while. As Canon Farrar pointedly asks, "Is not all history one long vast commentary on these great prophecies? In the destinies of nations and of races has not the Christ returned again and again to deliver and to judge?"

In this, the primary and comprehensive sense of the terms, the contemporaries of our Lord saw "the Son of man come in power and great glory." In this sense he is now visible to the faith of the Church, and is carrying forward his glorious kingdom which, in its inauguration, development, and close, is to constitute the grand drama of the world's history. Terrible judgments and amazing mercies, fearful desolations and glorious reorganisations, have marked his pathway; and even greater things than these are perhaps to be expected in the future. How soon his mediatorial reign will end, or in what precise condition he will find the Church and the world when he comes in person to wind up the

affairs of earth, has not been revealed. The glowing language of Scripture may well excite our highest hopes, and move us to press on most earnestly in our efforts to possess the world for Christ; for "He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law."<sup>1</sup>

These views of the mediatorial reign of Christ pervade the entire volume of inspiration. Believing this to be true, it is an overwhelming objection to the premillennial theory that it disparages the present dispensation, and denies to our Lord Jesus Christ, for the present at least, his kingdom and his kingship. Doctors Demarest and Gordon, in their *Christocracy*, p. 24, tell us explicitly, "Our blessed Redeemer came, at his first advent, as Priest, to offer up his spotless human nature for man's redemption; at his second advent his mission will be, as King, to begin, continue, and accomplish the removal of all evil." This, if we mistake not, is the common belief with their school. Christ is not King as yet, nor will he be until he comes personally to assume the throne of David in Jerusalem. Then he will "begin" to be King! What they make of the present dispensation one can scarcely say. A witness-bearing age, to save a few comparatively and condemn the remainder, seems to be the prevalent idea. But where is Jesus meanwhile? Like Mary, we can only say, "They have taken away the Lord, and we know not where they have laid him." In our estimation, the gravity of this error, at war as it is with the whole tenor of Scripture, can scarcely be overstated. It contradicts the faith of Christendom, and, should it become general, must enervate the Church.

---

<sup>1</sup> There will undoubtedly be a general, prolonged, and glorious triumph of the gospel; but in our view the Scriptures do not teach that the time will ever come when all the world will be truly pious. There will be tares with the wheat until the end. We utterly demur, therefore, when premillenarians, as they so often do, define a millennium to suit themselves, and then argue from it that no such state is to precede the coming of the Lord. The whole doctrine of the millennium needs elucidation. Resting, as it does, in the popular conception mainly on a single obscure passage of Scripture, it certainly cannot be made the basis of argument, or the criterion for determining the meaning of other Scripture, the intent of which is plain and obvious.

II. *Under this divine and kingly administration of the gospel, any special manifestation of mercy or wrath, whether promised, threatened, or actually occurring, to friend or foe, is spoken of as The Coming of the Lord.*

It is here especially that the congruity of the Old and New Testament is most strikingly manifest. In Ex. xx. 24, God says to Moses, "In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee." Here a merciful and spiritual coming, undoubtedly, is promised, not to Moses only, but to all sincere worshippers. Wherever an acceptable altar should be erected, there the Lord engaged to come and bless. In precise accordance with this, the Saviour (John xiv. 18) says to his disciples, "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you." That this is a promise of spiritual presence or coming will not be questioned. He makes it also generic by saying (v. 23), "If a man," *i. e.*, if *any* man, "love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." The Church of every age and country, understanding the promise in this sense, has incorporated this "blessed hope" into her very being. In the longings of her heart, she has cried out for his coming, and has praised him for the oft-repeated fulfilment of his gracious words.

Take another passage of the same nature, Rev. iii. 20, "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." This, of course, can be understood only in a spiritual and generic sense. To how many millions the Lord has thus come, and how unspeakably precious his visitations have been, who can tell? Have God's people been mistaken in their apprehension of these spiritual comings?

His providential coming also is presented in the same light. In Ex. xxxiii. 5, it is thus written, "Say unto the children of Israel, Ye are a stiff-necked people. I will come up into the midst of thee in a moment, and consume thee." This fearful threatening of speedy punishment for sin, although given in the most positive language, was not realised because the people repented. But the nature of the coming spoken of is obvious. In

other places these providential visitations are to be viewed as merciful rather than punitive, or perhaps as both combined. Ps. cxliv. 5, 6: "Bow thy heavens, O Lord, and come down: touch the mountains, and they shall smoke. Cast forth lightning, and scatter them: shoot out thine arrows, and destroy them." Isa. lxiv. 3: "When thou didst terrible things which we looked not for, thou camest down, the mountains flowed down at thy presence." Thus Jehovah constantly revealed himself to Israel.

Take now, in comparison, the following utterances of our Lord, Rev. ii. 5, 16, and iii. 3: "Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place." "Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against thee with the sword of my mouth." "If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee." Surely, none can fail to see that the coming here spoken of is of the same providential nature as that announced to the Jews. It was simply a threat of punishment for sin, for which they were to watch as for a thief in the night. The fulfilment depended on their conduct. If they repented, he would not come; if they persisted in sin, he would and that speedily.

The threatening language above quoted was addressed to three of the seven churches of Asia. The corresponding message to another ("Behold, I stand at the door," etc.) we have already noticed. To two other of these churches he says (Rev. ii. 25): "But that which ye have already hold fast till I come." Rev. iii. 11: "Behold, I come quickly: hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." These encouraging words stand in precisely the same relation as the threatenings which, as we have seen, are clearly providential and spiritual. We submit, therefore, that they must be understood in the same way. This is required by the analogy, and is confirmed also by the corresponding message to the other one of the seven, Rev. ii. 10: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Nothing is said here of "coming"; but manifestly the reward promised at death stands in the place of that connected



with his coming to the others. Death, therefore, involving in it providential removal and spiritual blessing, is to this church the coming of the Lord. In none of these instances is there any reference to a personal advent. All the seven are alike warned or comforted with the assurance of speedy retribution. And this being true, what reason is there to believe that in the closing chapter of this book, where similar language is employed and where the aged apostle cries out, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus," a personal and visible advent is intended? Certainly there is no necessity for so believing. To do so, is contrary to the analogy of the book, and, at best, can be viewed as only an assumption—an assumption by no means uncommon in the premises.

The examples thus far adduced are amply sufficient to sustain the proposition now under consideration. So far as its truthfulness, therefore, is concerned, we might rest here, but the discussion would not be complete without the examination of Matt. xxiv. with the parallel passages in Mark xiii. and Luke xxi. What view or views of our Lord's coming do these chapters contain?

First of all, let it be particularly noted that the whole discussion grows out of the intimation of an impending providential visitation. "Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." This is the starting point with each of the evangelists; and on their inquiring, "When shall these things be?" he proceeds to unfold to them the doctrine of his coming. Now on the premillennial theory that his coming is to be in a personal and visible form, which even yet, after the lapse of eighteen centuries, has not taken place, what connexion had that with the overthrow of these buildings? Why a question about the latter should lead him to enlarge on the former, we fail to see. On the theory we are advocating, however, it is perfectly natural and logical that, beginning with the impending ruin of "these buildings," he should proceed to enlighten them on the whole subject. And in our judgment, this is precisely the course he takes. He cautions them at the outset against the delusion of believing his personal coming to be very near. "Take heed that ye be not deceived;

for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and the time draweth near; go ye not therefore after them." He assures them that his providential coming, in the overthrow of these buildings, shall soon take place; for they were to see "the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not." He inculcates, moreover, the broad truth, that over individuals and nations such visitations are always hanging. "Be *ye also* ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh." And then he teaches that finally he will appear in person to wind up the series in the judgment of good and bad. All this is woven into his discourse in mingled or alternate threads, and stands out distinctly in a comprehensive view of the whole.

Again: admitting, as we certainly do, that a personal and visible advent is contained in these chapters, it is impossible to understand it in the premillennial sense. That sense is, that on his appearance he is to assume a literal throne in Jerusalem, is to usher in his kingdom by the resurrection of vast multitudes, the terrible overthrow of wicked nations, and the gathering of the dispersed Jews to their native land; that at his ascension the disciples were left under the imperative impression that he might come any day or hour for these purposes; and that they were required, therefore, to be constantly watching and waiting for his return. Now we say it is impossible to interpret these chapters as teaching or authorising the expectation of such a coming, for the obvious reason that a series of events, which, as they could not fail to see, must require very considerable delay, is interjected. When they approached him "privately, saying, Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" he answers, "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ: and shall deceive many. And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled; for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines and pestilences and earthquakes in divers places. All these are the beginning of sorrows. . . . Many false prophets shall arise and deceive many. . . . And this gospel of

the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." That intelligent men, in the face of all this, should have expected his personal return in the millenarian sense, at any day or hour, is past our comprehension or belief. That our Lord should have intended them so to understand him is, to us, utterly incredible.

In fact we see not how it is possible for our premillennial brethren now to believe their own theory. The "man of sin," if we understand them aright, is to be a person. He is to have great prominence and power: "Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." Has this "man of sin" yet been revealed? If so, where is he? If not, how can that coming, which is to consume him, be expected any day or hour? Is he "possibly" to arise, run his course, and be destroyed in a day? Still farther: most of them, if we mistake not, expect the return of the Jews to their own land before the advent. Bishop Nicholson, in his address before the New York Council in 1878, pointing to chapter and verse, tells us, "There will be two distinct stages in the process of their gathering: the first before the great Epiphany of the Lord Jesus, the second after it; the first partial, the second complete." Has this first gathering yet taken place? If so, when? If not, how he or any others agreeing with him can expect the return of our Lord any day or hour, we cannot see.

Again, whatever is or is not included in the coming here spoken of, it is impossible to understand or interpret these chapters as teaching *only* his personal and visible advent. By each of the three evangelists it is said, "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." This includes his coming as part of "all these things" which were to transpire within that generation. True, the effort is sometimes made to make "generation" equal the human race, or the Jewish race, thus giving the whole period of human or Jewish existence as the time within which "all these things" shall occur. Others try, by some sort of critical legerdemain, to separate "the coming of the Son of man" from "all these things," as though the former were not embraced in the concise and comprehensive words of our

Lord. Both these expedients shew the straits of the system, and are utterly inadmissible. The language is too explicit. And beside, if such violence could be accepted, the difficulty would not be removed. For in several other places, as we have already shown, where no such gloss is possible, the same thing is stated as to the proximity of his coming. Matt. x. 23 and xvi. 28: "Verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come." "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Mark and Luke reëcho the same sound. Surely, no one can fail to see that again and again, with a "verily" every time, his coming within that generation is positively affirmed. No ingenuity of man can cover it up or explain it away. The criticism that can elude it can do anything that the support of a pet theory may demand. The jargon that has been made out of these simple declarations, under the straits of a theory, is as unnecessary as it is unavailing and inadmissible. If language has any meaning, there must be a true and legitimate sense in which his words were verified to that generation. What is that sense? Canon Farrar, in his "Life of Christ," puts it thus: "It is evident that Jesus turned the thoughts of the disciples to two horizons, one near and one far off, as he suffered them to see one brief glimpse of the landscape of the future. The boundary line of either horizon marked the winding up of an *αἰών*, the *συντέλεια αἰῶνος*; each was a great *τέλος* or ending; of each it was true that the then existing *γενεά*—first in its literal sense of 'generation' and then in its wider sense of race—should not pass away until all had been fulfilled. And the one was a type of the other; the judgment of Jerusalem followed by the establishment of the visible Church on earth foreshadowed the judgment of the world and the establishment of Christ's kingdom at his second coming."

Like many of the prophecies which describe David and Christ, or Zion and the Church, in the same terms, these chapters set forth at least a double coming. If it be objected that the expression, "Then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory," was not fulfilled at the destruction

of Jerusalem, we answer: *First*, who knows what was seen on that fearful occasion? *Secondly*, in each of the narratives the language in question precedes the solemn declaration that "all these things" should be witnessed by that generation, and therefore must have been fulfilled in some sense. *Thirdly*, the mingled description of the two events in the same phraseology does not necessarily imply that all the features of the one are found in the other. *Fourthly*, Old Testament usage may at least justify the question, Is a visible appearing necessarily involved in the language here employed? "He rode upon a cherub and did fly; and he was seen upon the wings of the wind" (2 Sam. xxii. 11). Was this a personal and visible appearing of Jehovah? So with the words in question. They may or may not have been literally fulfilled as to visibility in that generation; but that one coming of our Lord must have occurred at that time is beyond question. He came in "affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be." The anti-type will follow in due season.

It remains now to consider whether these two comings exhaust the discussion of our subject as found in these chapters. We think they do not. In the first place, the fact that two distinct and widely separated events are described in one and the same set of words is evidence of the generic nature of the events themselves. They are alike from the Lord, and are providential and spiritual visitations. Hence one set of terms suits both. But if two such events are thus joined together, why may not others also, in which the same essential features are found, be embraced therein? In the next place, the repeated declaration, "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled," involves the generic idea. The false Christs were not all to arise in one generation. The wars and rumors of wars, the earthquakes, famines, and troubles, were undoubtedly to spread over many generations. Yet that generation was to witness "all these things." Witness them how? Certainly not as a finished series of events, the like of which there should be no more, but as facts and samples of his great administration. These they were to see, and, on the principle that history is continually repeating

itself, all other ages and peoples are to see the same things. Hence, toward the close of the discussion, he gives the subject this broad application. People shall be found at their ordinary employment, and one shall be taken and another left. Business shall go on as he comes from time to time in his discriminating providence and grace. To the disciples themselves, therefore, he adds: "Be ye also *ready*, for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh." Go about your work, be faithful, be ready, I will come for you soon.

In this practical turn of the subject, it could not have been his personal and visible advent with which he admonishes them, for he had distinctly put that at a distance. It could not have been the overthrow of Jerusalem either, for as to that they were not to be involved in it, but were to recognise its approach and fly from the city. It could have been only in the generic sense of his speedy providential and spiritual coming that they were to find admonition and comfort. And so widening the great thought still more, he asks, "Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing." On the other hand: "If that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming, . . . the Lord shall come in a day when he looketh not for him . . . and shall cut him asunder," etc. If this is not generalising the whole subject by making it alike applicable to all people and to all ages, it were difficult to see how such an idea could have been conveyed. He lays upon them, and upon every man's heart and conscience throughout the ages, the joy or the terror of his speedy and certain coming. It is no mere "possible" event which may occur soon or may not come till the man has rested in his grave for thousands of years. It is a certain event impending every hour, from which none can flee or hide. Therefore be ready. The whole force of the exhortation lies in this conception of it. In other words, Jesus himself makes his coming generic, and, between the two horizons so well described by Farrar, holds up an ever-recurring advent for the perpetual admonition of men. Down through the ages comes the echo,

"Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." This, as we believe, is the purport of these solemn chapters, including Matthew xxv. In them is found (a) the specific coming to overthrow Jerusalem; (b) the generic coming to all men and nations as the ages pass along; and (c) the final coming to separate and reward eternally the righteous and the wicked.

In the light of these ever-repeated providential and spiritual comings, as we have seen in the case of the seven churches of Asia, we are to understand and interpret the great majority of the references to the subject. Take, for example, Luke xii. 35-40, where the exhortation is given, be "ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he will return from the wedding;" or Luke xix. 12-27, where, in reference to the pounds, it is said, "Occupy till I come;" or Matt. xxv. 1-13, where it is said to the virgins at midnight, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him;" or take such expressions as the following: "The night is far spent, the day is at hand;" "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand;" "Be ye also patient: stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh;" "Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned; behold, the judge standeth before the door;" "Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Take all this large class of scriptures, and, while it is not denied that the general idea of his final coming is involved in them, yet it is contended that the generic idea underlies the whole of them as the thing that was mainly to press upon the heart and conscience of men. Our Lord had distinctly told his disciples that a long series of events was to precede his personal coming. Thirty years after his ascension the Apostle Paul says to the Thessalonians, "Be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled . . . as that the day of Christ is at hand." How, then, could this same event be represented as "at hand," "before the door"? It is not only a contradiction in terms, but it is also untrue as to fact, for, understood of his visible personal appearing, it was certainly more than eighteen centuries

distant. In the sense we are advocating, no such violence is necessary.

As, under the old dispensation, all individual and national affairs were in the hands of God, who came time and again in special ways to reward or punish, so under the new are all things in the hands of Jesus, who holds all to an immediately impending account. Dr. Kellogg, in the *Presbyterian Review* for July, 1882, admits that the coming spoken of to the seven churches of Asia is "providential." Yet to one of these it is said, "I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee." To another, "Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." To another, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." If such be his providential and spiritual coming in these cases, what more than the extension of the idea is needed for the correct understanding of all these scriptures? In the whole of them his coming is presented in its generic rather than its specific bearing. This is just as true of the New Testament as of the Old. In this sense, like a cloud of mercy or wrath, it is always "at hand," "at the door," "drawing near." "For this men are to watch and be ready." Here, as the ages pass along, lies the practical pith and point of the whole subject. An event represented as "always immediately impending" and yet actually delayed for eighteen centuries (and possibly twenty or more centuries distant still), can have little effect as a motive to daily watchfulness. It is not in even sanctified human nature so to regard it from generation to generation. Spasms of such faith may arise, but they cannot and do not last, as history attests. To expect it is as unreasonable as the doctrine is unscriptural. The coming that is really impending and is to move the soul is individual and unavoidable, always *actually*, not merely *possibly*, near. In the face of all this, that every real or even imaginary allusion to the general subject should be forced to do duty for chiliasm is simply amazing.<sup>1</sup>

III. *The personal and visible coming of the Lord will be to wind up the series in the general judgment.*

---

<sup>1</sup> See the famous one hundred Theses submitted to the New York Council by Dr. Brooks.



As to the fact of a personal advent, there is no difference between premillenarians and ourselves. We do not, indeed, admit all they claim as to the necessary and exclusive import of the terms, *παρουσία, ἐπιφάνεια*. We do not believe that "the man of sin" is a person, that the *παρουσία* of Matt. xxiv. 3, as the Saviour explains it, is exclusive of his providential coming to Jerusalem, or to men and nations in general, or that the *ἐπιφάνεια* of Titus ii. 13, has anything whatever to do with a personal coming. But be these as they may, we do believe in a personal advent. In this all who believe the Scriptures are of one mind, so that the citation of proof is superfluous. The points of interest and of divergence in this regard are as to time and design.

As to the first of these, *time*: we aver that our Lord and his apostles did not represent his personal coming as imminent, or even "always possibly near." The very first note of the Jerusalem discourse, Matt. xxiv., in answer to the direct question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming?" is a note of warning against its being so understood or represented. "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name saying, I am Christ: and shall deceive many. And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars; see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom," etc. "All these are the *beginning* of sorrows." If this is representing it as imminent or "always possibly near," we simply confess to being incapable of understanding the force of language. True enough, this coming, like all others as a general thing, will be unexpected when it does occur; the world will not be looking for it, it will need no sign, it will be self-evidencing and overwhelming; but the Saviour does not teach the disciples to view it as near, or to expect it very soon. A vein of warning against such a notion runs through the entire discourse. To the same import is the familiar passage in 2 Thess. ii. 2, 3: "Be not soon shaken in mind or be troubled . . . as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you; for that day shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed. . . . For ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—14.

his time; . . . only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way." Something was then restraining the mystery of iniquity, lest he be revealed out of time, and was to continue so doing "until he be taken out of the way." This is given too, be it remembered, as the reason why they should not view "the day of Christ as at hand." A strange way, certainly, of teaching them that it was "always possibly near." Look at 1 Tim. iv. 1-6; 2 Tim. iii. 12, and iv. 3, 4, all of which imply delay, speaking of "the latter times," "the last days," and "the time . . . when they will not endure sound doctrine." Even the Apostle Peter, who is perhaps most explicit of any as to this coming, puts it at a distance—represents some as denying the whole doctrine because of the long delay. "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (2 Pet. iii. 4). He then reasons the matter with the saints lest even their faith should be shaken by the same delay: "Be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promises." He then gives them a reason for the delay: "The Lord is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." And then he confirms their faith still further by saying, "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night;" while in the meantime they were to "account that the longsuffering 'delay' of our Lord is salvation." The force of these scriptures will appear clearer and stronger when we come to consider the design of his coming, with which they are intimately connected. But before and without this, to us it seems impossible to reconcile them with the idea of an ever-impending possible coming in the premillennial sense, or indeed in any personal sense. There was a great work to be done first. "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations," as the New Version renders Matt. xxviii. 19. There were great and long protracted political changes and struggles to take place first: "Nation shall rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom." Long and severe trials and bitter persecutions were to be endured by the Church first. Many false prophets and pretended Christs

were to arise first. All these things must have put his personal coming at a distance, and were adduced, most of them, for the very purpose of showing it. And yet they were to regard it as impending every hour!

Old and New Testament prophecy also equally forbid this conception. Take, for example, the vision of the four beasts (Dan. vii.); the last of which, by common consent, stood for the Roman Empire. In the days of our Saviour and down to the end of the apostolic age, that Empire was in the height of its power and glory. Out of its ruins "ten kings" were to arise, and after them another "who shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High and think to change times and laws." Into his hands "they shall be given until a time and times and the dividing of time." Take the vision of the two beasts (Rev. xiii.), who were to exercise such wondrous power and do such wonderful things. Were these beasts and kings to arise, flourish, and pass away after the *παρουσία*? If not, how could it have been considered as "possible" any day or hour? Were all these changes and successions of wondrous things to take place "possibly" within sixty minutes?

We cannot pass from this point without a little further notice of this "always-possibly-near" theory. If we understand it aright, the idea is, that the personal and visible coming of Christ to set up his throne in Jerusalem, with all the alleged concomitants of that coming, was so presented by our Lord and the apostles to the early Church, that believers were not only authorised, but required to be constantly looking and watching for it as possible any day or hour after his ascension. One of the speakers in the New York Conference thought he might come while they were yet in session. So, doubtless, might the Jerusalem conference (Acts xv.) have thought with equal propriety; (if not, when did the time arrive when it might be so regarded?) In the Review article before referred to, Dr. Kellogg says, "We affirm with the utmost confidence that this command to watch carries with it, by necessary implication, a command to regard the coming of the Lord as always possibly at hand." "True," he adds, "in the light of eighteen hundred years of history" we know now that it

was not to occur within that time. "But," he continues, "the early Church had no experience to guide or suggest to them such a long interval," and hence "to human knowledge the advent might be so possible within that generation as to make it imperative to watch for the indications of its more imminent approach." This strikes us indeed as a singularly cautious and obscure sentence, but nevertheless such is the theory. So impending always that believers of every age may expect it any time, and must stand watching "for the indications of its more imminent approach." That is to say, an event which was not to occur in twenty centuries was revealed to them as possible within twenty-four hours, and they must watch accordingly!

Now, if it were simply said that the disciples and early Christians did so view the matter (which we do not believe), we should care but little about it; for they evidently held private opinions and indulged hopes which were not authorised, as when they asked, "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" But when it is affirmed that they were intentionally put and left under "imperative" impressions which history has shown to have been unfounded, we cannot but regard it as a very grave matter. Did our Lord deceive them? Is a false impression necessary to enforce truth? We shudder at the painful thoughts unavoidably suggested by such an allegation.<sup>1</sup>

Far better to leave the question just where the Saviour put it in answer to the inquiry above given: "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own

---

<sup>1</sup> Should it be alleged that we are most assuredly required to watch and be ready for his coming in some sense, we admit it, of course. But, as to the seven churches of Asia, it is his providential and spiritual, not his personal and visible, coming that is intended. Sardis was to watch as for a "thief." So with all men. This coming is really imminent all the time, to the world and to the individual. As a matter of fact, the other has not been so for eighteen centuries, at any rate, and, in our apprehension, is not so represented in the word of God. Of "the kingdom of heaven" (the gospel dispensation) John the Baptist said, it "is at hand," meaning, it is here, it has come. With equal explicitness the Apostle Paul says the day of Christ's personal coming is not "at hand." When or by whom has this note been changed so as to read *is "at hand,"* or possibly near?

power." Shutting them off without an answer to their curious or selfish question, he promises to them the gift of the Holy Spirit, and sends them out to be witnesses for him "in Jerusalem and in all Judæa and in Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts i. 8). To do this work, which necessarily implies long delay, was to them the business of life. Is the case different at the present moment? Has the gospel been offered "to the uttermost parts of the earth"? Is not the caution just as applicable to us as to the Thessalonians, "Be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled . . . as that the day of Christ is at hand"? When did the Church cross the line which forbade the Thessalonians to regard his coming as thus near?¹

As to *design*: at his first coming the Jews rejected and murdered him because he did not meet their expectations by setting up a temporal kingdom in accordance with their views of prophetic teaching. For this they were in turn rejected, the kingdom taken from them, their city destroyed, and their "age" or dispensation ended. Is it possible that when he comes again his mission will be to do for them the very thing they rejected and murdered him for not doing at his first advent? And yet, in our judgment, this is substantially, if not precisely, what the premillennial theory requires us to believe he will do! Passing over all that the Christian Church has done and endured for the faith, waiting until the gospel dispensation shall have almost died out by decay, his first great work will be to destroy all the nations where the descendants of his betrayers and murderers are scattered, and gather up this dispersion to make of them the head

¹ The force of this passage cannot be evaded by the rendering "*just at hand*," or "*now present*." For 1. These particles are a gloss. They are not in the original. 2. Even if admitted, the rendering still denies the "immediately impending" theory. His coming is not "*now present*." What is that but saying, not immediately impending? 3. The other signs of delay still remain, the falling away, the revelation of the man of sin, etc. Could that be represented as imminent which in the same breath is delayed for these indefinite events? 4. The numerous indications of delay elsewhere given—the work assigned to the Church, the wars, famines, pestilences, persecutions, etc., forbid such a gloss. The idea of our common version is undoubtedly the correct one—not at hand, *i. e.*, not immediately impending.

and the glory of the Messianic kingdom! A recent writer tells us, "In the day when the Lord shall save Jacob from the land of his captivity, he will make a full end of all the nations whither he had scattered him."<sup>1</sup> Were he then to appear to-morrow (as they tell us we are "imperatively" required to believe he may), what would become of all the enlightened nations of the world? Must there not be some grand mistake about this theory? What it is may be learned from the Appendix.

But passing this, we notice next the bearing of his advent on the conversion of the world. We should be glad to cite every scripture in which his personal coming is confessedly taught. As this is impracticable, we must content ourselves with the confident averment that in no one of them is there the slightest hint that this coming is to have anything to do with the conversion of men. With but two or three exceptions, where the reference is undoubtedly to a spiritual coming (as John xiv. 23, Rev. iii. 20), this may be safely affirmed of every allusion to the subject in any form whatever that is found in the New Testament. In the parables of the pounds, the talents, the great supper, the tares and the wheat, the virgins, the journey into a far country, etc., be the coming what it may, it has nothing to do with saving souls. On the contrary, the uniform representation is, that it is to take account of those concerned and reward them accordingly. "When the bridegroom came they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut" (Matt. xxv. 10). Knocking was vain after this; no place for repentance remained.

This is especially clear and unquestionable as to the personal coming of our Lord. Examine the solemn statement of Matt. xxv. 31-46. It is to separate the sheep from the goats and assign to each their eternal abode. Take the parable of the tares and the wheat, Matt. xiii. 24. Be the *συντέλεια αἰῶνος* what it may—end of the age or end of the world—it makes no difference as to this point. There is no more hope for the wicked; for at the harvest the angels "shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

---

<sup>1</sup> Prediction and Fulfilment, p. 183.

Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." See 2 Thess. i. 7-10. He comes "in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," and "to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." See 2 Peter iii. 10: "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." Take Jude 14, 15: "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment on all and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds." Not a word or a hint in all these scriptures of converting men or extending the gospel kingdom by his coming. Retribution is the one great idea that runs through the whole of them. His coming is uniformly represented as blessed to the righteous, but terrible to the wicked; and is delayed for the express purpose of completing the work of redemption before it take place. "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise of 'coming' as some men count slackness: but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish" (as all unbelievers must when he comes), "but that all should come to repentance" (2 Pet. iii. 9). How all this can be reconciled with the idea of extending the gospel and of securing its chief conquests by and after his coming, we are utterly unable to see. The whole weight of all these utterances is against such a notion.

In addition to this, the whole drift also of all other Bible teaching is, that the triumphs of the gospel are to be realised under the present dispensation. Prophets foretold the wonderful effusion of the Holy Spirit that should characterise the latter days. Concerning the pentecostal baptism, as showing both the agent and the method of Messianic triumph, it is said, Acts ii. 16: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel;" and again, ii. 33-35: "Being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord said

unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, *until I make thy foes thy footstool.*" Here is his position and the result for which he waits: "*expecting* till his enemies be made his footstool" (Heb. x. 13). Even that oft repeated passage, Acts iii. 19-21, clearly shows that his redemptive work is to be completed before he leaves his heavenly position. Of the "restitution" there spoken of, Dr. J. A. Alexander, *in loco*, says it means "simply the completion or winding up of that stupendous plan which God is carrying into execution, with a view to his own glory and the salvation of his elect people. This consummation may be called a *restitution*, in allusion to a circle which returns into itself, or more probably because it really involves the healing of all curable disorder and the restoration to communion with the Deity of all that he has chosen to be so restored. Till this great cycle has achieved its revolution, and this great remedial process has accomplished its design, the glorified body of the risen and ascended Christ not only may, but must, as an appointed means to that accomplishment, be resident in heaven and not on earth." Exalted at the right hand of God, it is his province to give repentance and remission of sins; but when he comes personally it will be to close the dispensation and deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all. (1 Cor. xv. 24, 25.)

The three simple propositions under which the doctrine of the coming of the Lord has now been formulated are, as we believe, alike scriptural, impregnable, and exhaustive. They cover the whole ground, leaving no room for any other form of coming. They are not brought in to prop up a theory, but are brought out by induction, and rest upon no constrained or unnatural interpretation. Founded on explicit statements of the divine word, they also lie on the face of Scripture and express the faith of Christendom, while they summarise and harmonise the voice of inspiration.

In closing, it is but proper to notice briefly the practical bearing of the subject as it has been presented. To the individual believer and to the Church at large it is in the highest degree animating and comforting. To both alike it brings Jesus inexpressibly and constantly near, according to his parting promise,



“Lo, I am with you alway.” Instead of leaving us to wait in uncertain longing expectancy—an expectancy that never yet has been realised to any one of his followers; instead of a prolonged agonising orphanage like this, he has come to the believing soul and Church, and comes nearer and nearer every day according to our faith. Every saint has in his personal experience an epitome of the whole subject: Christ “revealed” in his conversion, Christ coming to him time after time in providential dealing and spiritual favor, and finally “coming again” in person to receive him to himself. To every generation, like that of the Saviour’s day, all these things have been fulfilled; and the fulfilment is blessed beyond expression.

Far be it from us, therefore, to detract anything from the “power of his coming,” which our brethren so fondly magnify. Nay, verily, we magnify it more than they. Our greatest objection to their theory is that, while they misinterpret the Scripture as to the true nature of his coming, they at the same time (unintentionally, of course) weaken, if they do not destroy, the power of it. With them it is prospective only and possibly far removed. After vainly waiting for nearly two millenniums, there may be still as many centuries of unrealised hope before them. With us it is present and real all the while. “The world seeth me no more: but ye see me.” We sup with him and he with us. He guards his flock and leads it forward by his real presence. Under the former dispensation, a present Jehovah working in them and for them was their glory and their strength. Much more is all this true and intensified under the Christian economy; and going forward in this spirit, what is there that the Church or the believer cannot do? All things are ours. Instead, therefore, of vainly looking for another dispensation, which, in some degree at least, is to supersede faith by rendering things visible, and to supplant the Holy Spirit’s work by some other kind of power, let us rather glory in the things now freely given. We are not alone. We “can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth” us. Any theory which contravenes this by putting him off the throne and teaching that the present is mainly a witness-bearing age is, in our judgment, at war with the spirit of the

gospel, and, in the very midst of the fight, adapted to paralyse the right arm of the Church. It was the sin and ruin of Israel that she put far from her her almighty King. Equally fatal will it be to us if we dethrone our King. While science and philosophy in the hands of some are trying to put God out of his universe, let it be the mission of the Church to bring Jesus, the Creator and Upholder of all things, more and more within the view of human faith. \*And let us never doubt for a moment that, as the wearied dove, finding no resting-place for her feet, came back to the ark, so science and philosophy, unable to supersede the Bible or find a resting-place for the soul of man, will eventually bow at the feet of Jesus, in perfect harmony with the blood-bought Church, confessing that he is Lord of all to the glory of God the Father.

On the other hand, the views presented are equally full of warning and terror to the wicked. Jesus reigns; and he will quickly come to every unfaithful soul, Church, and nation. There is no "perhaps," or "may," or "possibly near" to deaden the fearful reality. It is as certain as the revolving of the planets; and within the horizon of their earthly life. When or how, no one can say. It may be oft-repeated in providential visitations. It may be once and suddenly in some terrible overthrow or calamity. It may be in sickness, famine, pestilence, war, or death. But come he will. To all, this reigning Jesus ever "stands before the door." Not one has escaped him of all the ages past, nor is it possible for any to avoid him in time to come. If they repent, they shall fall into the company of the faithful and be dealt with accordingly. But if they repent not, "He will quickly come and fight against them with the sword of his mouth."

And finally, when invitations and warnings are to cease; when the gospel dispensation is ready to be wound up, he will appear in person, "with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power: when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day."

## APPENDIX.

The mistake referred to on a preceding page consists in the assumption that the Jews are still the heirs of the inheritance promised to Abraham and his seed. This we deny. We hold that the Christian Church, not in a mere metaphorical or spiritual sense, but in the true and scriptural meaning of the terms, is now "the Israel of God" (Gal. vi. 16), and therefore heir of the promises. The proof of this, while it cannot be elaborated here, is yet too important to be omitted entirely. It is found in facts and considerations like the following;

I. Christ is now King of kings and Lord of lords, and occupies the throne of David. Rev. iii. 7, vii. 14, xix. 16; Acts ii. 36, v. 31. The Christian Church, over which he presides, is, therefore, the true succession. The denial of this turns the whole gospel dispensation into confusion.

II. When he came, he established his kingdom among the Jews. Immense numbers of them received him as their Messiah King. In addition to the "great multitudes" who went out to John's baptism, see the following consecutive scriptures: John ii. 23, iv. 39, 41, vii. 31, viii. 30, x. 42, xi. 45, xii. 11, 19, 42; Acts ii. 41, 47, iv. 4, 32, v. 14, vi. 7, xi. 21, xii. 24, xiii. 43, xiv. 1. So numerous were the converts that his enemies cried out, "Behold, the world is gone after him;" and the Apostle James, ignoring Israel after the flesh, addresses his Epistle to "the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad," as though there were no other true Jews. To these "the kingdom" was given.

III. In receiving Jesus, these Jews either perpetuated Israel and continued to be heirs of the promises, or they cut themselves off by accepting their Messiah. Who can believe that by their faith in the long-expected Deliverer they forfeited the promises made to the fathers, while those who rejected him, with their descendants, remained heirs to the future preëminence that is claimed for them? To our mind, the very supposition is monstrous! Believers are the true Israel.

IV. Our Saviour told the unbelieving Jews that "the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing

forth the fruits thereof." The unbelievers, therefore, lost everything.

V. The original promises and predictions never included all the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. From the beginning they pertained to a spiritual rather than to a literal seed. "They are not all Israel which are of Israel: neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children: but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Rom. ix. 6-8. "Now we brethren"—*i. e.*, all Christians—"as Isaac was, are the children of promise." Gal. iv. 28. "For the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Rom. iv. 13. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. iii. 29. The promise never included all the natural seed, but from the beginning had reference to a spiritual seed, and that seed is, first Christ (Gal. iii. 16), and then all that are Christ's. The Christian Church, therefore, is the true seed of Abraham and heir of the promises.

VI. Neither the lopping off of the literal seed, nor the incorporation of proselytes, under the old dispensation, affected the identity of the true seed; nor does it under the new economy. The believing Jews, enlarged by the ingathering of the Gentiles, are still the heirs of the promises. Hence,

VII. The Gentile converts (Eph. ii. 19) "are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." What can this mean but that the Church, under both dispensations, is one "building fitly framed together . . . a holy temple in the Lord," all alike incorporated into Christ the King and Ruler of the whole?

VIII. The identity and perpetuity of the Church is shown most explicitly in Rom. xi.: "Hath God cast away his people? God forbid." Why not? What proof does the apostle give? That Israel after the flesh still retains the succession? Not at

all. But here is the proof: "God hath not cast away his people *which he foreknew*." As of old there were seven thousand who bowed not the knee to Baal, "even so then at this present time there is a remnant according to the election of grace." These are the perpetuation and the heirs. I myself am one of them, he says. All believers, whether Jew or Gentile, are "fellow-citizens" of the kingdom. What then? "Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for: but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded." Is it possible that these blinded ones are still heirs, and the "elect" shut out?

IX. Into this diminished but perpetuated old stock, the natural branches having been broken off, the Gentiles were "grafted," and thus made partakers of "the root and fatness of the olive tree." The same old tree lives on, with new branches.

X. Into this *perpetuated tree*, the broken off branch, "if it abide not in unbelief, shall be grafted: for God is able to graft them in again." Does this look like grafting the Christian Church into the old withered stock of Judaism once more? Does it not plainly show that in the Christian tree the Church of God lives, and that the only hope of the Jew is to be incorporated again into it?

XI. The whole spirit of the gospel and the oft-repeated explicit statement that faith, not form or natural descent, constitutes the true Israelite, shows the same thing. Rom. ii. 28, 29, ix. 6, 7, 8; Gal. iii. 3.

XII. And finally, what is the Christian Church if it is not "the kingdom of God"? And what is Jesus to his Church if he is not King? It is impossible to find a satisfactory answer to these questions on the premillennial theory.

Arguments like these might be multiplied, but it is not necessary. Like sunlight on the face of nature, the truth is spread all over the pages of inspiration. The subjects of Messiah compose the kingdom. The Christian Church is Israel. The glowing prophecies of Isaiah point to gospel days no less than the preaching of John the Baptist. The spiritual consciousness of believing souls, deriving its life alike from Old and New Testament utterances, testifies to the unity and perpetuity of the kingdom. We feel it and glory in it in our every spiritual pulsation, just as we

do our inherited civil liberties descending to us from our illustrious forefathers. "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly, . . . but he is a Jew which is one inwardly."

If this be the true position of the Christian Church, it is far-reaching in its bearing. The inheritance, in its length, breadth, and fulness, is ours. There is nothing left for the Jew, as such, but to come in, if he will, like any other, and nothing for his land or his people but to share in the common privileges and blessings of the gospel, received in the ordinary way. The predictions and promises of the Old Testament, so far as they had a literal and local application, have received their fulfilment. All that remains in them belongs to the true Israel, "the election of grace," and not to those who rejected their Messiah. Ezekiel's temple, with its exact measurements and its division of the land by parallel lines, is ideal, not literal. The return of the people to their own land has already taken place. "Let the redeemed of the Lord say so, whom he *hath* redeemed from the hand of the enemy; and gathered them out of the lands, from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south" (Ps. cvii. 2, 3). "*Thou hast brought back the captivity of Jacob*" (Ps. lxxxv. 1).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The return foretold by Jeremiah specifies Babylon and Chaldea as the place from which they were to be gathered, and denounces terrible judgments that were to follow on that city and people. "Israel is a scattered sheep; the lions have driven him away: first the king of Assyria hath devoured him; and last this Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, hath broken his bones. Therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Behold, I will punish the king of Babylon and his land, as I have punished the king of Assyria. And I will bring Israel again to his habitation, and he shall feed on Carmel and Bashan, and his soul shall be satisfied upon mount Ephraim and Gilead. *In those days and in that time, saith the Lord*" (not at some far distant future time, be it noted), "the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sins of Judah, and they shall not be found: for I will pardon them whom I reserve" (Jer. i. 17-20). Ezra and Nehemiah tell us when and how this return occurred, with the rebuilding of the temple on its "heaps," and the walls and the city. The triumphant Psalms show with what glad acclaim the people accepted the fulfilment. "When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion, we were like them that dream. Then was our mouth filled with laughter, and our tongue with singing; then said they among the heathen, The Lord hath done great things for them.

These literal gatherings foreshadowed the more wonderful spiritual gathering under the Prince of Peace. Jerusalem, the temple, the land, under the new dispensation cease to be local and material. Everything becomes spiritual and world-wide. Like a dissolving view, the old economy, having been on exhibition, having had its lights and shades and having answered its purpose, has passed into the new, while many of the old terms, places, and associations remain and are employed in describing the picture. The historic people, with all their institutions, possessions, and experiences, were, at the same time, adumbrations of the spiritual and the enlarged. They have had their day and are gone. To think of going back to these shadows "of good things to come," is to reverse the whole order of the kingdom and to materialise the dispensation of the Spirit. We see no other possible way to harmonise the prophets with Jesus and his apostles on this point.

There are difficulties, no doubt, in interpreting some parts of Old Testament prophecy on this basis,<sup>1</sup> but they are trivial com-

---

The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad." And yet, ignoring all this, we are to believe that the return is still future!

Still further. Not only are the time, the people, and the localities thus fixed, but the return is everywhere spoken of as from "captivity." Where are the Jews now in "captivity"? Who has forcibly led them away to the lands they now inhabit? Even into Russia, where perhaps their lot is hardest, they were voluntary immigrants. They are, indeed, in some places restrained, like other serfs or citizens, as to the privileges of emigration; but no where that we know of are they in any proper sense in "captivity." We insist, therefore, that if, according to Old Testament prophecy, there is to be another return, there must first be another "captivity" before it can take place.

<sup>1</sup> Those expressions, *c. g.*, which seem to teach or imply the everlasting continuance of the kingdom under the regular successors of David. Of this difficulty it may be said, (1) that premillenarians find a ready way of meeting the same in regard to (*αἰών*) "for ever" in the New Testament; it should occasion no embarrassment to them therefore; (2) that on their theory there has been a vacancy of more than eighteen hundred years in the kingdom and the throne, which shows that their explanation cannot be the true one; and (3) that the temporal favors promised to the Jews were conditioned upon continued obedience. Failing this, they forfeited everything national, while the covenant with Abraham in regard to the true seed remained in force and is being carried out under the gospel. Deut. xxx. 15-20 compared with Gal. iii. 8, 16, 17.

pared with the task of showing that the Christian Church is not now "The Israel of God"; and that Jesus is not now "on the throne of David." These great truths stand out so clearly, and chime in so fully with the revealed fact that the kingdom is spiritual, not material or visible, that no imaginary or even real difficulties can shake them. Believing this to be true, we regard the whole argument founded upon anything alleged to be yet due to the Jews as swept away. They are no longer heirs. The utmost that can be fairly claimed, as to their future, from Rom. xi., is that after "the fulness of the Gentiles be come in"—not in order to it, by any means, but after it—there is reason to hope (perhaps believe) that the mass of them will be grafted in again into their old olive tree; grafted in, however, not to make either the root or the crown, but a last and lowly branch brought in through the "mercy" of the Gentiles and by the grace of God.

JOHN C. RANKIN.



THE  
SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

Rev. B. M. Smith  
HAMPDEN  
SIDNEY Va

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS.

Vol. XXXV.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXXIV.

No. 2.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. A BRIEF IN THE CASE OF THE MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER. By the Rev. Prof. L. G. BARBOUR, D. D., Richmond, Ky.. . . . .	191
II. THE SABBATH. By the Rev. K. M. McINTYRE, Bridges' Creek, N. C.,	215
III. A PLEA FOR EMPHASISING THE DIVINE RIGHT OF PRESBYTERY. By the Rev. JOHN W. PRIMROSE, Oxford, N. C. . . . .	231
IV. CALEB, A BIBLE STUDY. By Prof. J. T. L. PRESTON, LL. D., Lexington, Va., . . . . .	251
V. HEBREWS VI. 1-8 EXPLAINED. By the Rev. SAMUEL T. LOWRIE, D. D., Trenton, N. J., . . . . .	265
VI. THE FINAL PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS VERSUS CARNAL SECURITY. By the Rev. JAMES L. MARTIN, Abbeville, S. C., . . . .	290
VII. MARRIAGE BETWEEN NEAR OF KIN. By the Rev. C. W. HUMPHREYS, Perry, Mo., . . . . .	315

COLUMBIA, S. C.

PRINTED AT THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1884.

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. XXXV.—will find after their names, “Oct. '84,” which means that they have paid for the October number of 1884, and of course for all preceding it. If any one has paid for all past volumes, and one dollar on XXXV., he will find “Jan.” or “Jny, '84 and 25c. ;” which means that he has paid for the January number of 1884, 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 & Co., 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, Austin, Texas, or to JOHN B. ADGER, Pendleton, South Carolina.

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

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

# BOOK BINDERY.

---

In connexion with our Book and Job Printing Establishment, we have fitted up a BOOK BINDERY complete in all its branches.

BOOKS,

PERIODICALS.

MAGAZINES,

MUSIC, &c.,

Bound in any desired style, from a good durable Ordinary Binding to the Finest Library Work.

## **BLANK BOOKS**

Of every description manufactured to order.

---

## **RULING**

Of any pattern. By means of our new improved

### **STEAM STRIKER RULING MACHINE,**

Ruling can be done much more speedily and accurately than by the old Hand Machines.

---

## **PAGING AND NUMBERING.**

Figures of different sizes for paging Blank Books and consecutively numbering Checks, Tickets, Receipts, &c.

---

Our entire Bindery is fitted up with the BEST, LATEST, AND MOST IMPROVED MACHINERY to be had, and with experienced and skilful workmen we feel confident of being able to furnish satisfactory work at low prices.

By thus having the three departments of Job Printing, Ruling, and Binding in our own establishment, we are enabled to furnish work requiring two or more of them much more promptly and cheaply than heretofore.

## **PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING HOUSE,**


Opposite Court House, - - - COLUMBIA, S. C.


**JAMES WOODROW & CO., Proprietors.**


# 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 Proprietors, JAMES WOODROW & Co., 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 Publishers, 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.



81077081233



b89077089233a